

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 1973**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 1973

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.2 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that in connection with the overseas visit of the Minister for Primary Industries, His Excellency the Governor has, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896–1971, authorised and empowered the Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm, Minister for Mines and Main Roads, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Minister for Primary Industries by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 21 August 1973, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Victor Bruce Sullivan.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette notification of 18 August 1973 to this effect.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the Government Gazette upon the table.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamations under—

Justices Act 1886–1973.

Metric Conversion Act 1972.

Orders in Council under—

Rural Fires Act 1946–1970.

City of Brisbane Act 1924–1972.

Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922–1968.

Mining Act 1968–1973.

Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971–1972.

Health Act 1937–1973.

Local Government Act 1936–1973.

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Act 1924–1972.

Report of the National Trust of Queensland for the year 1972–73.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### REHABILITATION WORK, ASHGROVE QUARRY

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

With further reference to the Ashgrove Quarry—

(1) What rehabilitation of the land and removal of waste material and refuse does the company intend to undertake?

(2) When will the creation of buffer areas suitably planted between excavated areas and adjoining roads and lands take place?

(3) Will the company's rehabilitation plan be exhibited to the public before acceptance by the council?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "These matters are ones between the Brisbane City Council and the company carrying out the quarrying operations and are subject to the provisions of the Council's ordinances. Part 3 of Chapter 8 of the ordinances provides *inter alia* that a person who conducts an extractive industry and, if such person is not the owner of the subject land, the owner of the subject land shall comply with all requirements from time to time of the Council Registration Board regarding the rehabilitation of the land, the removal of waste material or refuse, the creation of buffer areas, suitably planted, between excavated areas and adjoining road and land, and to ensure the safety of the public in and the amenity of the area and the area adjacent thereto. The ordinances further provide that the Board may require the owner of the subject land to furnish the Council with a Bond, of an amount specified by the Board from a Bank, Insurance Company or Finance Company approved by the Council and in form satisfactory to the City Solicitor to secure to the Council the due fulfilment by the owner of the requirements imposed by the Board upon the owner as aforesaid. In the event that any requirements of the Board in respect of the subject land imposed as aforesaid are not complied with, the Council with or without engineers, servants, workmen, employees, contractors and other persons authorised by it have full and free right and liberty under the ordinances at all times to enter upon the subject land with or without mechanical devices and vehicles of any nature whatsoever for the purpose of carrying out such of the said requirements that have not been fulfilled. The matters mentioned are ones for the Brisbane City Council and accordingly I would suggest that the Honourable Member might approach the Ward Alderman concerned in relation thereto. As he is aware, the powers of individual aldermen were increased pursuant to recent amendments of the City of Brisbane Act, and they should now be in a position to effectively look after their constituents' interests. Any encroachment by the quarrying company on a dedicated road during the course of its operations would be a matter for my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Lands and Forestry."

OPERATIONS ON GAZETTED ROAD,  
ASHGROVE QUARRY

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

As the company operating the Ashgrove Quarry has illegally operated on a gazetted road, what action will he take to cause the company to retreat forthwith from operations on this road and to repair whatever damage its operations have caused?

Answer:—

"I presume that the Honourable Member refers to Norman Terrace, The Gap, which intersects portion 711, parish of Enoggera, held by Stirling Granite Company Pty. Ltd. Although there is some lack of survey markings in the area investigations by my Department indicate that a fence has been erected along part of the north-eastern boundary of that road, but no quarrying operations are proceeding thereon."

NEW BURNETT RIVER TRAFFIC BRIDGE  
AND ROAD WORKS, BUNDABERG

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

(1) Has a survey been carried out of the traffic flow over the Burnett River traffic bridge and, if so, what was the result?

(2) Is there any forward planning for a new bridge over the Burnett River from Maryborough Street to Queen Street in North Bundaberg?

(3) When does his Department expect to commence construction of a four-lane highway from the Bundaberg aerodrome approximately to the intersection of Takalvan and Bourbong Streets?

Answers:—

(1) "During 1971-72, manual traffic counts were taken on four separate days about three months apart to establish week day volumes. From these, the calculated A.A.D.T. (average annual daily traffic) for 1971-72 was 12,265."

(2) "Planning is being undertaken to establish the best location for a future bridge."

(3) "Provision has been made in the Tentative Works Programme for a start to be made on the Takalvan to Walker Street section in 1975-76—the balance being programmed to follow over three years. This is subject to availability of funds largely dependent upon the next Commonwealth-States Road Agreement."

INDUSTRIAL ESTATES, BUNDABERG

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

(1) What industries have been established on the two industrial estates at Bundaberg?

(2) How many other industries have taken options on the estates and with what types of products are they concerned?

(3) How much was spent on the estates in 1972-73 and what amount has been allocated for development in 1973-74?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "The estate currently being developed by the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development at Bundaberg known as the Bunda Industrial Estate comprises 110 acres. In addition the Department has under its administration some 40 acres of land at East Bundaberg to meet the future needs of industry in that area. The following industries are established on the Bunda Estate—(1) Spansteel Engineering Pty. Ltd.—steel fabrication and general engineering. (2) Humes Limited—manufacturers of concrete products. (3) C. E. & G. E. Smith—manufacturers of pre-mixed concrete and concrete products. The Irrigation and Water Supply Commission has also located a temporary design office and depot within the estate area. Three organisations hold options over sites on the estate. The operations proposed include electroplating and decorative chrome plating; the manufacture of pre-mixed concrete products; and the production of prefabricated building components respectively. A sum of \$73,914 has been spent to June 30, 1973, on developmental works associated with the estate of which \$12,911 was expended during 1972-73. A sum of \$30,000 has been provisionally programmed for further developmental works in the Bunda Industrial Estate during 1973-74. It will be appreciated however that the actual funds available for estate developmental purposes in the current financial year will not be known until the Budget is submitted to and approved by Parliament."

GROYNE AND BOAT HARBOUR,  
BURNETT HEADS

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

(1) Did the Woongarra Shire Council construct a groyne at Burnett Heads without the authority of his Department and, if so, what action has been taken by him?

(2) Has the council undertaken any other work or alterations in connection with the harbour under construction or at any other beach resort, without his authority?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "My Department of Harbours and Marine has no knowledge of a groyne or any other works constructed at Burnett Heads by the Woongarra Shire Council. The council undertook minor beach clearing and groyne construction works at Elliot Heads and Bargara some years ago without approval of the Governor in Council as required by section 86 of the Harbours Act. I am advised that these minor works have had an effect of slight improvement to the foreshores."

EFFLUENT DISCHARGE FROM GIBSON'S  
TANNERY, STAFFORD

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

(1) As the residents of Stafford and the surrounding suburbs are continuously being affected by pollution from the effluent and activities of Gibson Tannery, what action has been taken by the Government and/or the Brisbane City Council to have the problem rectified?

(2) As the company has six months from the proclamation of the Clean Waters Act to apply for a licence, has any application been made and, if so, what is the Government's attitude towards it?

(3) What action will be taken on any application to the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission for permission to discharge trade wastes from these premises into Kedron Brook when in flood or at any other time?

Answers:—

(1) "I am advised that the principal pollution problem from the premises in question is one of smell which comes within the ambit of the *Clean Air Act* 1963-1970. Enquiries have indicated that the Brisbane City Council will accept liquid wastes from the premises into its sewerage scheme provided the company undertakes suitable pre-treatment of the wastes. I understand that the company is proceeding with the installation of this pre-treatment."

(2) "The company has not applied for a licence under the *Clean Waters Act* 1971. A licence under that Act will not be required if the wastes be discharged to the Brisbane City Council sewerage scheme."

(3) "Under the assumption that the company intends to dispose of its treated wastes to the Brisbane City Council Sewerage Scheme, there should be no occasion to discharge any wastes to Kedron Brook. In the event that the company desires to discharge wastes to Kedron Brook a licence would have to be obtained under the *Clean Waters Act* 1971 which overrides the Water Acts in this regard."

UNION ENFORCEMENT OF COMMON-  
WEALTH GOVERNMENT POLITICAL  
DECISIONS

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

(1) Is there a threat to individual stands against tyranny from the new pattern of left-wing union intimidation for the enforcement of Commonwealth Government political decisions?

(2) Will urgent consideration be given to any steps that may be taken which would prevent union officials from becoming the "muscle-men" for extorting acceptance of any Commonwealth Government new order?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes, there is."

(2) "This Government is pledged to protect the right of Queenslanders to freedom of speech and association, and to freedom from coercion, intimidation or enforcement. This Government is pledged to preserve its system of conciliation and arbitration from attack by any form of tyranny or anarchy. This Government is pledged to accept, and encourage, responsible unionism but it will never tolerate extortion by union officials, or anyone else. If any union official confers upon himself unbridled power, authority and stances not acceptable under State law, he will run foul of a Government determined to fulfil the trust placed in it. However, if any union official assumes a mantle of authority conferred upon him under a law passed by the 'central' Government in Canberra, and exercises that authority with respect to a Federal Award to the detriment of a citizen of Queensland, my Government would have no power to protect that citizen. Therefore, if any union seeks to become an 'enforcer' of the 'central' Government's 'new order', as the Honourable Member suggests, may I, in turn suggest that all thinking citizens use their franchise in condemnation at the next Federal Election. I assure the Honourable Member that our Department of Industrial Affairs stands ready at all times to give objective industrial advice to anyone who considers he is being subjected to intimidation by union officials with respect to work under a State award or industrial agreement."

RECRUITING CAMPAIGN, POLICE FORCE

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

What specific planning is being carried out by the Police Department to step up the recruiting of more personnel for the Police Force to bring it up to the present approved strength?

*Answer:—*

"An intensive recruiting campaign has been undertaken by the Police Department based on the following:—(a) advertising over a period of five months in the metropolitan and country press and Armed Services publications; (b) the setting up of a Recruiting Section, whose activities include visits to high schools in the metropolitan and country areas, showing films designed to attract interest in the Police Force as a career; (c) the involvement of personnel at all police stations to assist in recruiting. Regional superintendents of police are actively engaged in the project."

#### CADETS AND PROBATIONARIES, POLICE ACADEMY, OXLEY

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

(1) What was the number of (a) cadets and (b) probationaries attending the Police Academy, Oxley, at July 31?

(2) How many, in each category, are provided with full accommodation at the academy?

(3) Of those not provided with full accommodation, what daily allowances are paid for accommodation and fares to the academy?

(4) Is any training which affects these persons still being carried out at the Petrie Terrace Police Barracks?

(5) When these persons have been sworn in as constables and allocated to various sections of the Police Force throughout the State, is accommodation made available and, if so, on what basis?

*Answers:—*

(1) "(a) 216; (b) 74."

(2) "125 cadets."

(3) "Cadets not provided with accommodation at the academy and not residing at home are paid living-away-from-home allowance as outlined in the Police Award—State. Probationaries do not receive this allowance. Fares are not reimbursed."

(4) "No."

(5) "Generally, departmental accommodation is not provided. Limited accommodation is available at some police stations by way of quarters for single personnel and residences for married men. Where available this accommodation is provided rent free, but in regard to departmental residences, occupiers are required to pay local authority service charges."

#### MOISTURE CONTENT, FROZEN POULTRY

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

(1) Are regular spot checks made to detect high moisture levels in frozen poultry at retail outlets and at poultry abattoirs?

(2) Is there evidence of high moisture content in the frozen poultry from New South Wales which is being sold in Queensland? If so, is there any way of controlling this in the interests of consumers?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Regular weight-gain tests are conducted at poultry abattoirs which use spin chillers for processing."

(2) "No. Regular weight-gain tests are also carried out in New South Wales in a similar manner to the tests conducted in Queensland. Such testing carried out at poultry abattoirs in both States is designed to give consumer protection."

#### EXEMPTION OF PRIMARY PRODUCERS FROM DEATH DUTIES

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

With respect to the exemption of primary producers from State death duties—

(1) How is a primary producer defined to be eligible for such exemption?

(2) Is a debt owed by a family company solely involved in primary production considered to be a primary production asset for the purposes of such exemption?

(3) Is he aware of the Commonwealth position in relation to this matter?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The Honourable Member is referred to Section 12E of the Succession and Probate Duties Act."

(2) "The assets which are subject to the concession are assets used for the purpose of carrying on a business of primary production as set out in the definition of 'rural property' in Section 12E (10) of the Succession and Probate Duties Act. A loan to a primary producer's company would not be 'rural property' in the lender's estate. However, where the deceased was a member of a primary producer's company as defined in the Act, a proportion of the value of his shares is regarded as rural property for the purposes of the concession based on the proportion which the gross value of the rural property of the company bears to the gross value of all assets of the company."

(3) "I am not aware of any significant difference between the Commonwealth and the Queensland legislation in this particular respect."

CONTROLS ON ADVERTISING OF  
VITAMINS

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

(1) Does the Government propose to introduce further controls on the advertising of vitamins?

(2) With special reference to the advertisement of vitamin C as a cold cure and vitamin E as a source of virility, is a joint State/Commonwealth approach regarding these controls being considered?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The National Health and Medical Research Council has recommended that advertisements relating to vitamin therapy shall: (i) not suggest that use of vitamin supplements can be justified by claims that soil depletion is robbing our foods of nutriment, that processed foods are less nutritious, or that 'natural' vitamins are better than synthetic vitamins; (ii) be required to indicate that vitamin therapy can be of assistance only if the diet is inadequate; (iii) contain no claims of benefits for irritability, nervousness, fatigue, stimulation of appetite, growth, recovery from illness or nutritional insurance; (iv) contain no claims that good looks, good health and long life can necessarily be attributed to the use of vitamins. In respect to the advertising of Vitamin C as a cold cure, the council recommends that such an advertisement can claim relief or alleviation in an acute condition, but if the cold is chronic or persistent, such a claim cannot be made. In respect to Vitamin E, council further recommends that an advertisement shall not contain, either directly or by implication, any reference to impotence. As various recommendations are received from the National Health and Medical Research Council they are incorporated into the Health Regulations if considered suitable for Queensland conditions."

STOCK MUSTERS, ABORIGINAL  
COMMUNITIES

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

(1) Has a complete muster of cattle and horses been conducted on the Government-controlled communities and, if so, on what date and with what result in each area?

(2) If not, what are the reasons and when is it expected that the musters will take place?

(3) Are the cattle overseers on these communities under the control of the manager?

(4) Are reports relating to cattle and horses submitted to the manager by the cattle overseers?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "‘Bangtail’ musters are carried out annually on Central and Southern Reserves as well as Palm Island and Yarrabah. On the larger Northern Areas, embracing some thousands of square miles, accepted local practices are followed, i.e. test checks on a 'run' basis. Kowanyama, Edward River and Weipa over the last two years showed a loss for adjustment slightly in excess of 2 per cent. Yarrabah, Cherbourg and Palm Island, excluding deaths, accounted for nil. The Central Queensland areas overall percentage loss was 3.75. This includes carcasses located."

(3) "Yes—for administration and discipline. In technical matters, cattle overseers are responsible to the Director of Pastoral Activities."

(4) "Yes, as applicable and where relevant."

SHORTAGE OF BUILDING MATERIALS,  
TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS

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

Further to my representation concerning shortages of building material at St. Pauls, Moa Island—

(1) Have these shortages been made up and, if so, on what date?

(2) Have shortages been experienced in building materials for similar projects on other islands and, if so, (a) on what islands and (b) have they now been rectified?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. The last of the advised items went forward on August 15, 1973."

(2) "It would be unrealistic to expect that some shortages of materials would not occur in the building programmes throughout Torres Strait when one considers the vast area being serviced, the volume of activity, as well as the most difficult conditions under which transport and supply is effected. Any shortages experienced, if not locally available, are notified by radio and replacements supplied, generally speaking, by next vessel or as soon thereafter as practicable. However, no detailed record is maintained and to ascertain data necessary to fully answer the Question would entail considerable work which does not, at the present time, appear justified."

PREMIER'S OFFICIAL VISIT TO  
TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) What was the total cost of his visit to Thursday Island on July 27?

(2) What other towns were visited?

(3) Did he visit Horn Island or Prince of Wales Island communities?

(4) Who travelled in the Government aircraft to and from Thursday Island?

(5) Who travelled in the chartered aircraft and what was the cost of (a) this charter and (b) accommodation and other expenses of the passengers?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The overall cost of my visit to Thursday Island on July 27 was minimal. The party was accommodated at the Government residence. Incidental expenditure incurred amounted to approximately \$75."

(2) "Service stops were made at Mackay, Collinsville and Cairns on July 27 and at Cairns and Townsville on July 29."

(3) "Naturally, as I landed at Horn Island, I took the opportunity of visiting the community. I did not visit Prince of Wales Island on this occasion."

(4) "The passengers who travelled on the aircraft on July 27, in addition to myself, were—The Honourable R. E. Camm, M.L.A., Minister for Mines and Main Roads (who left at Collinsville), Mr. W. Chadwick, Mr. A. Callaghan, Mr. R. Watson, A.B.C. On the return journey from Horn Island the passengers, in addition to myself, were—Mr. P. Killoran, Mr. W. Chadwick, Mr. A. Callaghan, Mr. R. Watson, A.B.C."

(5) "No other aircraft was chartered by the Queensland Government in connection with this visit."

#### WAITING TIME FOR DENTURES AND SCALE OF FEES, DENTAL HOSPITALS AND CLINICS

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

(1) What is the waiting time for appointments for new dentures at the Brisbane Dental Hospital, South Brisbane Dental Hospital and dental clinics at Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Townsville?

(2) When was the scale of fees for prosthetic and conservative dental operations last published in the *Queensland Government Gazette*?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Patients seeking dentures for the first time or where other dental urgency has been established are given priority in appointment and in the provision of dentures. Other patients seeking replacement dentures, where there is no urgent dental need or pathology involved, are placed on a waiting list. The waiting time for these patients at the various centres, with the exception of the Townsville Dental Clinic where there is no waiting time, is:—(a) Brisbane Dental Hospital—approximately 8 weeks. (b) South Brisbane Dental Hospital—approximately 6 weeks. (c) Toowoomba Hospital Dental

Clinic—approximately 8 weeks. (d) Rockhampton Hospital Dental Clinic—approximately 12–23 months, dependent upon patients' financial circumstances."

(2) "December 23, 1970."

#### DENTURE SERVICE TO PUBLIC BY DENTAL TECHNICIANS

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

(1) Has he familiarised himself with the recently enacted legislation in Victoria which provides chairside status for dental technicians and enables them to provide denture services to the public?

(2) If not, will he have officers of his Department examine the Victorian legislation with a view to establishing the desirability of enacting similar legislation?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "The legislation referred to by the Honourable Member is presently under examination by departmental officers."

#### APPLICATIONS FOR HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES AND PENSIONER UNITS

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

(1) How many applications for houses are being held by the Queensland Housing Commission and other agencies and what are the numbers at each office?

(2) How many applications for pensioner home units are held by the commission and what are the numbers at each office?

*Answers:—*

(1) "For rental houses—Metropolitan (31-7-73), With Priority—1,252; Without Priority—2,193. Other centres (30-6-73), With Priority—492; Without Priority—827."

(2) "For Aged Persons units—Metropolitan (31-7-73), With Priority—1,021; Other centres (30-6-73) With Priority—459. The Honourable Member will appreciate that in addition to its offices in Brisbane, Townsville and Rockhampton every Clerk of Court is a local representative of the Commission which has provided houses at some 176 centres in Queensland apart from the metropolitan area. To detail the applications on hand in each centre would involve considerable time and expense but if the Honourable Member has an interest in any particular locality I would be pleased to give him details thereof. The Honourable Member's main interest would no doubt be Rockhampton and the following are the figures for that city at June 30, 1973—Rental house applications with a priority, 18; without priority, 60; aged persons units, 14."

TRAINING OF APPRENTICES UNDER  
BLOCK RELEASE SCHEME

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

(1) How many apprentices have received training under the block release training scheme and what were the specific trades involved and the numbers in each trade?

(2) What future plans are in hand to cater for apprentices under the scheme in the larger provincial cities and towns?

Answers:—

(1) "A pilot scheme of block release training in the printing industry was introduced in 1972 and was attended by 377 apprentices. In 1973 block release training was extended to cover all of the food industries that is butchering, pastry cooking, baking and cooking. As at July 8 this year, 179 apprentices in the printing industry and 229 in the food industries have undertaken block release training in 1973.

Details of attendances are as follows:—

Calling	Number Attended	Number Passed	Number Failed
<b>PRINTING INDUSTRY</b>			
1972			
Composing .. ..	170	170	..
Photo Engraving .. ..	21	21	..
Bookbinding .. ..	19	19	..
Stereotyping .. ..	12	11	1
Lithographic Printing .. ..	50	50	..
Lithographic Camera .. ..	..	..	..
Operating .. ..	11	11	..
Letterpress Printing .. ..	96	94	(2 did not complete course)
	379	376	3
<b>PRINTING INDUSTRY</b>			
1973 (as at 8-7-73)			
Composing .. ..	85	84	1
Photo Engraving .. ..	7	7	..
Bookbinding .. ..	9	9	..
Letterpress Printing .. ..	50	49	1
Lithographic Printing .. ..	20	20	..
Lithographic Camera .. ..	..	..	..
Operating .. ..	8	8	..
	179	177	2
<b>FOOD INDUSTRIES</b>			
1973 (as at 8-7-73)			
Butchering .. ..	83	82	1
Baking .. ..	49	49	..
Cooking .. ..	70	66	4
Pastrycooking .. ..	27	27	..
	229	224	5 "

(2) "It is the ultimate intention to extend block release training to cover all apprenticeship callings in all industries. However, because a large number of apprentices will have to reside away from their homes to attend college for this type of training a pre-requisite is the provision at Brisbane and the provincial cities where there are technical colleges, of suitable residential accommodation and my colleague, the Minister for Education, is planning action in this regard. As far as is practicable it is planned that the facilities provided for training apprentices at the larger provincial cities will be utilised for block release training. This

will mean that in the majority of cases apprentices will be attending at the technical colleges that are closest to their respective places of residence. However, as the Honourable Member will appreciate, in some industries, only a small number of apprentices is involved, and in these instances it will not be practicable to provide training facilities at more than one centre in the State."

FRAUD SQUAD INVESTIGATION OF LAND  
TRANSACTIONS, WOOGOOPAH ISLAND

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

(1) With reference to the Fraud Squad investigation arising from a complaint lodged with the Commissioner's Office on July 20, 1970, regarding land transactions on Woogoopah Island by O. M. Alroy Pty. Ltd., is he now able to reveal the result of the completed investigation?

(2) If the investigation is not completed, when is it anticipated that it will be?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "It is anticipated that investigations will be completed in approximately one month."

TRAFFIC COUNTS, FORGAN SMITH AND  
HOSPITAL BRIDGES, MACKAY; NEW  
ROCLEIGH BRIDGE

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

(1) What number of vehicles per day, according to the latest traffic count, are using (a) the Forgan Smith Bridge, and (b) the Hospital Bridge, at Mackay?

(2) Has the assessment of the data obtained from site testing for the new Rocleigh Bridge been completed and, if not, what is the delay?

(3) If the assessment has been completed, has designing now commenced?

(4) Will the anticipated date of commencement of construction work still be in the 1975-76 financial year?

(5) Will the construction be supervised by the Main Roads Department or by a project board and will it be carried out by contract or by day labour?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) and (b) 16,000 and 3,800 A.A.D.T. (average annual daily traffic) approximately."

(2) "Yes. A geological report has been completed and is now being assessed."

(3) "Yes. Preliminary design is now being carried out."

(4) "Yes, but depends on the next Commonwealth Aid Act of which no details have been made available by the Commonwealth Government to date."

(5) "A direct supervised Main Roads scheme by contract is proposed."

RIGHT OF APPEAL UNDER REGULATIONS  
GOVERNING DAY CARE CENTRES

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Tourism,—

With reference to the regulations tabled on August 1, pertaining to day care centres, what rights of appeal have persons or companies who have had their licences refused or revoked by a local authority?

Answer:—

"No provision exists either in the *Children's Services Act 1965-1973* or the *Children's Services (Day Care Centres) Regulations of 1973* for any right of appeal for persons or companies who may have licences under the Regulations referred to refused or revoked by local authorities, as licensing or continuation of licensing is entirely dependent on compliance with the Regulations. This is in keeping with local authority practice in the issue of licences generally."

REPORT ON ESCAPES FROM BRISBANE  
PRISON

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Tourism,—

(1) Following the escape by two prisoners from the escape-proof section of Brisbane Prison in June, has the final report by Mr. P. J. Bredhauer been presented to Cabinet?

(2) What are the recommendations of the investigator and have any of the recommendations been implemented?

(3) Will the report be made public and tabled in this Parliament?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "In the terms of his appointment, Mr. Bredhauer is required to report to the Honourable the Premier."

INQUIRY INTO ALLOTMENT OF  
SURRENDERED LAND, CORINDA,  
UANDA AND RAINSBY HOLDINGS

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

(1) In regard to the land surrendered from Corinda, Uanda and Rainsby Holdings, what are the areas of the six blocks into which the surrendered land has been designed?

(2) Where was the additional area inquiry held, who presided over it and who gave evidence?

(3) How many persons submitted applications to the inquiry, what were their names and how much land did each hold at that time?

(4) What were the original findings, submissions and recommendations of the inquiry and were these subsequently altered in any way?

(5) If not, what were the names of the applicants who the inquiry recommended should receive land?

(6) Does the block which each successful applicant was, or is to be, offered adjoin his land, and, if not, how many do not adjoin and what are the applicants' names in each instance?

(7) In the course of the inquiry, did rangers report on the state of the property then held by each applicant and, if so, was cognisance taken of the fact that some applicants had developed and improved their property to a high degree, whilst others had allowed fencing to collapse and the property to be reduced to a dilapidated condition?

(8) If consideration was given to this matter, was it felt that all successful applicants had complied with the relevant Acts in the improvement of their respective properties?

Answers:—

(1) "The area surrendered from Corinda, Uanda and Rainsby Holdings has been designed into 6 blocks of about 8,800 acres, 9,200 acres, 10,380 acres, 14,160 acres, 16,370 acres and 17,250 acres."

(2) "The additional area inquiry was held at Hughenden and conducted by the Land Commissioner for the District, Mr. K. J. Imhoff. In each case, one or more of the lessee applicants appeared personally before the Land Commissioner."

(3) "Sixteen applications were submitted. Of those, six applicants conformed with the provisions of Section 269 of the Land Act relating to the eligibility of a person to receive an offer of an additional area, while the remainder did not conform to those provisions. Those who conformed with the provisions and the areas of their respective land holdings were J. A. and E. C. Rice, 37,838 acres; A. A. P. and A. G. McIntosh, 40,567 acres; C. Seccombe, 43,435 acres; A. H. C. Maclean, 70,400 acres; D. and J. M. I. Kleinschmidt, 83,158 acres; and P. Toohey, 57,840 acres. The remainder of the applicants and the areas of their respective land holdings were D. R. and B. T. B. Hill-Douglas, 57,600 acres; R. Herrod, 26,831 acres; J. A. Schulz and the Estate of J. J. Schulz, deceased, 53,517 acres; J. L. Mitchell and Estate of J. S. Mitchell, deceased, 42,900 acres; S. R. Allen, 16,307 acres; J., M. C. and G. L. Mitchell, 129,879 acres; D. Neill, 26,044 acres; H. M. Bode Junior, A. W., D. L. and I. L. Bode, 113,600 acres; S. E. Walker and P. C. and C. G. Rudd, 49,357 acres; and N. E. Fraser, 35,735 acres."

(4 and 5) "As in all additional area inquiries the report of the Land Commissioner holding the inquiry is for the information of the Land Administration Commission in making its recommendation to me as to the grant of additional areas and is not necessarily the whole of the material considered by the Commission or myself in making such recommendation and determination. In respect of the additional areas granted from the area surrendered from Corinda, Uanda and Rainsby Holdings, I would mention that one member of my Commission has, during his long service in the Department, carried out extensive and intensive inspections in the general locality of those lands including individual blocks held by the successful and unsuccessful applicants, and is fully aware of the capabilities and disabilities of each block."

(6) "Of the six successful applicants, the lands held by five of them, A. A. P. and A. G. McIntosh, C. Seccombe, A. H. C. Maclean, D. and J. M. I. Kleinschmidt and P. Toohey, do not adjoin their respective additional areas."

(7 and 8) "In all additional area cases full regard is had to all relevant factors and the eligibility of applicants is determined strictly in accordance with the provisions of Section 269 of the *Land Act* 1962-1973."

NEW EDITION, WORKERS'  
COMPENSATION BOOKLET

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

(1) In view of the popularity of the last edition of the State Government Insurance Office's workers' compensation booklet "Your Entitlement" and the need to update the information it contained, will another edition be printed?

(2) If so, when will it be available and how many copies will be printed and distributed?

Answers:—

(1) "An updated edition of this booklet is already drafted for publication under the title of 'Employers' Liability and the Workers' Entitlement under the *Workers' Compensation Act* 1916-1973'."

(2) "It is intended that 300,000 copies be printed and that the initial distribution be made about mid October 1973."

COMMONWEALTH-STATE RECIPROCITY,  
LONG SERVICE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS

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

(1) What action is he taking to assist employees on the question of reciprocity of recognition of service for long service

leave purposes and other emoluments, between the Commonwealth and the Queensland Governments?

(2) When is it expected that this reciprocal recognition will be successfully achieved?

Answer:—

"This matter is one for the consideration of the Honourable the Premier to whom I suggest the Honourable Member should direct his Question."

MOTOR VEHICLE REPLACEMENT  
WINDSCREENS

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

(1) Is he aware that the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland recently reported that some irresponsible firms have been importing replacement windscreens which are manufactured of plate glass?

(2) If so, what action is being taken in conformity with the Traffic Act, which requires that replacement windscreens be made from non-shatterable material?

(3) As the use of plate glass for windscreens is dangerous and could cause fatal accidents, will he ensure that the Act is rigidly enforced and introduce legislation to ban the practice of importing these articles?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2 and 3) "I would refer the Honourable Member to a similar Question by the Honourable Member for Cairns which I answered on October 12 last year which in part read—'The Traffic Regulations provide that all motor vehicles except motor cycles, manufactured on and after July 1, 1971, wherever in such vehicles glass is used for windscreens, windows or interior partitions, must be fitted with safety glass complying with the provisions of Australian Design Rule No. 8. All glass used bears the mark of the manufacturer which can be checked with the Register of Approved Marks held by the Registering Authorities. I am advised that all new cars being retailed in Queensland at present are fitted with safety glass which complies with Australian Design Rule No. 8.' As recently as July 26, following a communication from the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, I again raised this matter with the Australian Transport Advisory Council at its meeting in Canberra. I then informed Ministers of instances where unsafe glass had been sold in Queensland as 'safety glass' and asked the Federal Transport Minister and Conference Chairman, the Honourable C. K. Jones, M.P., to investigate the possibility of banning the import

of the dangerous unmarked glass through Customs Prohibited Imports Regulations. My request was accepted. The Australian Transport Advisory Council also resolved to publicise the fact that Ministers should insist on glass replacements having a mark indicating conformity with the approved safety standard. In addition, the meeting agreed to asked the Vehicle Performance Committee to advise on the possibility of requiring a mark by way of Regulation. Current Regulations require all glass to be safety glass but they do not require marking except in the case of vehicles manufactured after July 1, 1971, in which case Australian Design Rule No. 8 specifies as a minimum requirement the equivalent of Australian Standard R1/1968 and requires that all such glass shall carry an approved indelible mark or marks visible when the glass is fitted in the vehicle and identifying the type of glass and the relative standard to which it conforms. One of the difficulties in this matter is that it is not possible, except at the time of manufacture, when standards are determined or by subsequent destructive testing to establish whether, in fact, windscreen glass does meet the prescribed standards. So far as can be determined from enquiries made the glass referred to by the Honourable Member was distributed in Queensland in or about 1970 and the extent of such distribution and subsequent sale cannot now be readily ascertained. Enquiries made have failed to establish what stocks, if any, of sub-standard glass are held presently in Queensland, but if the Honourable Member can supply me with any information in this regard, further action will be taken."

#### MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVING LICENCE TESTS

**Mr. R. E. Moore**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

- (1) How many people were tested for driving licences in 1972, how many passed the first test and what were the general shortcomings of those who failed?
- (2) What was the proportion of failures of (a) those who attended driving schools and (b) those who received private tuition?

*Answers:—*

"Statistics are not available for the whole of the State. The following is the position in so far as the Brisbane Metropolitan Area is concerned:—

- (1) "31,947 applicants were tested. A total of 12,331 applicants failed to pass the tests. No statistics are maintained in relation to failures to pass at first test. The general shortcomings of those who failed were failure to give way; poor clutch control; lack of knowledge of the Traffic

Regulations; failure to drive as near as practicable to the left and inability to properly reverse park."

- (2) "(a) Of the 19,573 applicants attending driving schools, 7,376 or 37.68 per cent. failed. (b) Of the 12,374 applicants under private tuition, 4,955 or 40 per cent. failed."

#### BJELKE-PETERSEN ENTERPRISES PTY. LTD.

(a) **Mr. N. F. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

With reference to the Premier's Ministerial Statement on August 7, in which he said that he was not a member of Bjelke-Petersen Enterprises Pty. Ltd.—

- (1) Does the form of annual return of a company having a share capital, which was lodged on February 9, show Johannes Bjelke-Petersen as the registered shareholder of 45 ordinary shares and 900 A-class shares?
- (2) On what date did Johannes Bjelke-Petersen resign as a director of the company and on what date was the required form 43 lodged with the Companies Office?
- (3) Were particulars of the transfer of the shares held by Johannes Bjelke-Petersen in the company lodged with the Companies Office prior to August 7, 1973? If so, to whom were the shares transferred?

*Answers:—*

- (1) "The Annual Return referred to by the Honourable Member was made up to January 14, 1972, and showed Johannes Bjelke-Petersen as the holder of the shares mentioned. However, the Annual Return made up to January 14, 1973, did not show him as a shareholder."
- (2) "December 4, 1972. Form 43 was lodged with the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs on December 18, 1972."
- (3) "Since the commencement of *"The Companies Act of 1961"*, particulars of transfers of share have not been required to be lodged with the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs."

(b) **Mr. N. F. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

- (1) With regard to Bjelke-Petersen Enterprises Pty. Ltd., is he aware that an auditor's statement signed by the former secretary was lodged on February 9, 1973, the text of which stated—"As the accounts of Bjelke-Petersen Enterprises Pty. Ltd. laid before the company at its annual general meeting were not subject to audit, we cannot express an opinion in terms of section 159A of the *Companies Act 1961-1971*"?

(2) Do the circumstances as outlined by the auditor in his statement constitute a breach of section 159A of the Companies Act and, if so, what action is his Department taking?

*Answer:—*

"I am informed by the Acting Commissioner for Corporate Affairs as follows:—

- (1) "Yes."
- (2) "No."

REZONING PETITIONS, BRISBANE  
CITY COUNCIL

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

(1) After a petition against rezoning has been received by the Brisbane City Council, within what period must the council notify the petitioners of the result of the petition?

(2) If no notification of results is received, what redress have the citizens?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Where an objection is duly lodged against the granting of an application to the Brisbane City Council for a rezoning of land and the council or its delegate proposes to grant the application, the *City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1971* provides that the town clerk has to give notice accordingly to every person who has lodged such an objection. In terms of the Act, such notice has to be given within 40 days of the receipt of the application by the council or within such extended period as may have been approved by the Minister."

(2) "The Act provides that, where a person has duly objected to the granting of such an application, it shall not be determined until the time for institution of an appeal has expired or, if an appeal is duly instituted, until the appeal is determined. In the case of an appeal, in making its decision, the council or its delegate is bound by the determination of the appeal. It will be noted that the law provides that an application subject to objection cannot be finally decided by the council or its delegate until the applicant or the objector have had an opportunity to exercise their right of appeal to The Local Government Court."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL SUGAR  
CONFERENCE

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Before directing a question to the Premier, I remind him that when he returned from the previous international sugar conference he paid this Parliament the compliment of making a ministerial statement on the deliberations before issuing a Press release.

I now ask him: If the House is in session when he returns from the forthcoming conference, will he again observe this parliamentary ethic and establish that the "Morecambe and Wise" presentation of reporting to the nation as we saw last Saturday night in the Whitlam-Frost television confrontation will not be perpetuated in this State?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I appreciate that what the honourable member says is good, and that a report should be given to this Parliament on the proceedings of such an important event as the international sugar conference at Geneva. I did this on the previous occasion, and I will be quite happy to present to Parliament again a report on the deliberations. As to the suggestion that this should be done before any release is issued to the Press, I am sure the honourable member appreciates that there will have to be some release to the Press on certain aspects of the conference.

I desire to add that I deeply deplore and regret that the Leader of the Opposition should think that it behoves him and his party to make an outburst against the sugar industry in the way he did, seeking to belittle the importance of the forthcoming conference, which means so much to the sugar industry in this State and the economy not only of Queensland but of the whole of Australia as well. I doubt whether honourable members who represent sugar areas will appreciate his action, and I will remind the electors in those areas, as I go through them from time to time, of the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition and the A.L.P. generally towards the sugar industry and their contempt for it and its importance to this State.

POLICE INVESTIGATIONS INTO DOPING AT  
BRISBANE RACECOURSES

**Mr. HANLON:** I refer the Treasurer to a question I directed to him earlier this year—on 30 March—about a rash of positive swabs in Brisbane galloping events and whether any investigation was being initiated by the controlling body. In view of the resurgence or continuance of this trend of positive swabs in recent weeks, the call by the chairman of the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club for an inquiry, and Press reports that the Treasurer has now sought information from the Queensland Turf Club in this matter, can he inform the House if the reported police investigations in this regard derive only from trainers concerned with swabs returned from horses in their charge, or have the police—and, if not, why not—been given a brief by the controlling body and/or the Government to probe a wider field and ramifications of this whole pattern of doping, both in the interests of licensees, who may be innocent victims, and the public, who are indirect victims, having regard to the amount of money they channel into gambling on horses?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** I quite appreciate the seriousness of doping on racecourses. It is fairly evident that certain action has been taken by certain people in this State. I did discuss with the principal club—the Queensland Turf Club—events which followed on the positive swabs that were returned from two horses that raced in this State. I also obtained details of the inquiries conducted by the stewards into both occurrences. I believe that the Q.T.C. acted in accordance with the legislation and did all that was expected of it, in that, positive swabs having been returned, it held inquiries. In one instance it arrived at certain determinations, and in others deferred consideration until the results of certain police inquiries are known.

My interpretation of the Act is that the responsibility for making a complaint in relation to doping rests not with the Q.T.C. but with the owner, the trainer or any other person in charge of the horse involved. This procedure has been followed in the matters that have arisen in recent weeks. I am waiting for reports from the Police Department, and I can assure the honourable gentleman that when they come to hand the matter will be further considered by the Q.T.C. and a decision as to whether the basis of investigation should be widened will be arrived at.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) having given notice of a question dealing with Mosman Hall, Charters Towers.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why don't you see Mr. Speaker before asking a question like that?

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Why don't you shut your mouth, you old mug.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Archerfield not to use that type of language in the House. He may use it outside, but I do not like it being used here.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** You certainly will.

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—THIRD ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 9 August (see p. 184) on Mr. Frawley's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Minister for Justice) (12.1 p.m.): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which was moved so capably by the

honourable member for Murrumba and seconded by my colleague the honourable member for Ipswich.

**Mr. B. Wood:** You weren't here.

**Mr. KNOX:** I was, indeed. Before the House rose for the Royal Show recess, the Leader of the Opposition spoke for 40 minutes in the Address-in-Reply debate. Whilst I did not have the opportunity of hearing him on that occasion, I have read his speech in "Hansard". After doing so, I looked back through some of the Address-in-Reply speeches made in the last 15 years by Leaders of the Opposition, and, by comparison, his speech on this occasion fell short in many respects.

It is quite obvious that the main purpose of the Leader of the Opposition was to continue his role as the No. 1 apologist for the present Federal Government. In doing so, the honourable gentleman implored this Government to congratulate and thank the Federal Government for what it has done for this State, yet he was able to quote only one example of any action for which this State should be grateful to the Federal Government—it apparently provided money for the appointment of a doctor at Bamaga! As I say, I have read the speech by the Leader of the Opposition, and that was the only example that he could give of what Canberra has done for Queensland since December 2 last.

The Leader of the Opposition spent some time ridiculing the recent discussions that the Premier and I had in London. That was no surprise, as the honourable member for Lytton sought to sabotage the Premier's visit to London some months ago. One would expect that the one who now appears to be the temporary Leader of the Opposition would follow the example set for him by the honourable member for Lytton. There was nothing from the honourable member for Bulimba in defence of the federal system; no assurance that he would join with his own party colleagues in other States to resist the attempts by the Whitlam Government to destroy the power, the independence and the effectiveness of the States. His speech on this occasion was just another apology for the policies of the Whitlam Government—from the only State Labor leader in Australia who has never disagreed with the Federal Government since December of last year.

One could be excused for thinking that the Leader of the Opposition defends the Whitlam Government in the hope that it will extricate him from his unpleasant position as an Opposition Leader without power, just waiting for the day when one of his colleagues, the honourable member for Lytton, makes his move. It is obvious to me that the Leader of the Opposition would be happy to take one of the many "jobs for the boys" that Canberra has on offer. He knows that his days in his present position are numbered. In fact, he reminds me of Mr.

Graham, the former Labor Deputy Premier of Western Australia. He knew that the Tonkin Government was doomed to electoral defeat, so he took a well-paid Public Service position while he had the chance—and almost brought the Government to defeat even earlier than expected!

The House will recall the front-page story in "The Australian" of 2 May last. The headline was, "Houston in Line for Qantas Board Post", and the story read—

"Labor sources are confident that Mr. Houston has a good chance of gaining the position although it will mean he will have to retire as party leader."

The report said that Mr. Houston would not comment on the possibility of his appointment, but it added that he was sure to consider any offer seriously.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I rise to a point of order. That statement by the Minister is completely untrue. It is offensive to me, and I ask for its withdrawal.

**Mr. KNOX:** I withdraw it. However, the next day—

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister has not withdrawn.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I distinctly heard the Minister withdraw.

**Mr. KNOX:** The next day, the honourable member for Lytton, who probably master-minded the whole story, had this to say in a newspaper—

"Surely the offer of such a position would show how highly Mr. Houston is esteemed by the Federal Government."

The honourable member was doing all he could to push the Leader of the Opposition into the job. On the same day, the honourable member for Lytton said that if Mr. Houston stepped down, he would be a contender. He declined to say what would happen if Mr. Houston did not step down.

What an incredible situation—the Leader of the Opposition unable to comment on reports that he would be getting another job; the honourable member for Lytton stating publicly how well suited he would be for the Qantas job. Of course, as it turned out, the Press were very close to the mark. They just had the wrong Jack! It was a case of, "Jack be nimble, Jack be quick; Jack jump over Mr. Burns's stick."

More recently there was informed speculation in a leading Sydney newspaper that the Leader of the Opposition would succeed Dame Annabelle Rankin as High Commissioner to New Zealand. Having learnt from the earlier experience, the Leader of the Opposition quickly denied that report; but the fact remains that his hold on the leadership could be regarded, at the very best, as tenuous.

**Mr. Tucker:** Ha, ha!

**Mr. KNOX:** The honourable member should watch it; he is the first one to go before the Leader goes.

I have referred to these things to illustrate the complete failure of the Leader of the Opposition to do anything, or even to say anything constructive, about the rapid erosion of the powers of all the States by the present Federal Government. One reason for his failure to act, or speak, is his complete impotence in the party he purports to lead. He never gives the lead; he always trails behind like an obedient dog.

When it comes to the Federal Government, the Leader of the Opposition is no more than its principal apologist. In fact, if the Federal Government hands out prizes for loyalty, the Leader of the Opposition will beat even Mr. Kenneth Myer for the position of Governor-General.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** I rise to a point of order. It appears that the Minister is reading his speech. According to Standing Orders, he is not permitted to do so.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. I might remind the honourable member of that point when he next rises.

**Mr. KNOX:** In my view, the people of Queensland are entitled to be concerned and alarmed when the alternative Premier says little in defence of the constitutional rights of the States but plenty in support of the very Government that is attacking those rights. In this regard, he has a unique position in his party, but one of which he ought to be utterly ashamed rather than proud.

As far as I can ascertain, he is the only State Labor leader who has not disagreed with anything the Whitlam Government has said or done. He was the only State Labor leader to ridicule the conference of State authorities in London in June. He appears to be the only State Labor leader who agrees with everything the Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr. Connor, proposes. What Mr. Connor has proposed is centralism at its worst. He is appropriately known as "The Strangler". I say "appropriately" because Mr. Connor is determined to strangle the States in the area of mineral extraction and export. Yet the Leader of the Opposition in the State certain to be most adversely affected by the Connor proposals is one of his most vocal supporters!

The Prime Minister has chosen to describe the question of State's rights as a "phoney" issue. No doubt the Leader of the Opposition would echo those remarks. But if this is a phoney issue, then Australia has three phoney State Labor Governments, because the six States are unanimous on the fundamental aspects of States' rights.

Attempts by Federal Government spokesmen to portray the confrontation between the Commonwealth and the States as "the Liberals last hurrah" are completely destroyed

and denied by the facts. All States, three of which at present have Labor Governments, are opposed to the Commonwealth's actions in regard to Privy Council appeals and associated centralist proposals. This is not a phoney issue; it is one of the most crucial issues to face this nation in its history. That is why this Parliament, and the Opposition in particular, must decide which side it is on. Opposition members cannot have it both ways, because the gap is as wide as the ocean.

So far, the Opposition in this place—in complete contrast with the Labor Governments in Tasmania, South Australia and West Australia—has sided with the centralist Government in Canberra. If I am wrong, then let the Leader of the Opposition or his deputy deny it and disprove it.

**Mr. Tucker:** I thought you said that we are directed. Now you are saying we are not directed.

**Mr. KNOX:** The record shows that I am right. When the Leader of the Opposition had the chance—at the A.L.P. Federal Conference at Surfers Paradise—he sided with the Commonwealth and sold out his colleagues in the States with Labor Governments.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. KNOX:** It is in the records of that conference.

Earlier I referred to attempts by the Opposition's principal spokesman to sabotage the recent events in London. If the honourable member carried out his threats, then he failed miserably, because the discussions we had in London were outstandingly successful, and the States were seen to be unanimous in their opposition to the Whitlam plans to abolish appeals to the Privy Council without any reference to the States.

To illustrate this, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the House of the representatives who attended the discussions in London and who subsequently met the British Prime Minister and the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary. New South Wales was represented by the Premier (Sir Robert Askin) and the Attorney-General (Mr. McCaw); Victoria by its Premier (Mr. Hamer)—fresh from a landslide electoral victory fought on some of these issues; Tasmania by its Deputy Premier (Mr. Everett); South Australia by its Attorney-General (Mr. King); and Western Australia by the Premier (Mr. Tonkin). Queensland was represented by the Premier and myself.

As well, all States had their Solicitors-General in London. I wonder whether the Opposition believes that three senior State Labor Ministers, including a Premier, would participate in a "phoney" conference.

During the meeting, Sir Robert Askin said the Federal Government's ultimate aim was to make Australia a republic with one

all-powerful central Government. It did not take long for Sir Robert to be proven to be right on the mark. At the A.L.P. Federal Conference the Prime Minister said he was a firm and avowed centralist. When he was in Canada only a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Whitlam said that Australia would eventually become a republic. By his own words the Prime Minister has completely justified what Sir Robert Askin said when he was leading us in the London discussions.

The States were unanimous in their opposition to the methods by which the Whitlam Government intended to abolish appeals from State courts to the Privy Council. If Mr. Whitlam succeeds, then the precedent he sets has enormous implications for all State Governments and for the Federal system itself. It is the most serious and determined challenge to the States since federation. It has attracted the unanimous and vigorous opposition of all States. In fact, no-one has been more vigorous in his opposition to the Federal Government's tactics than the Premier of South Australia (Mr. Dunstan), who seems to have an affinity with a number of members of the Opposition in this House.

The Deputy Premier of Tasmania (Mr. Everett), who also happens to be the president of the Tasmanian A.L.P. and a member of the A.L.P. Federal Conference, was reported in "The Australian" of 7 June as having said that on the matter of Privy Council appeals Gough Whitlam was trying to destroy the Australian Constitution. I believe that to be the view of all the States; I believe there is no doubt that it is a completely accurate view, well substantiated by fact, and with alarming implications for all Australians.

Recently I tabled in this Parliament a copy of the memorandum by all the States in which they opposed, in most unqualified terms, the Commonwealth's intention to bypass the States by asking the British Government to help facilitate the abolition of appeals from State courts to the Privy Council.

The position was made even more urgent and crucial by the fact that the Commonwealth's action was designed to sabotage a petition from the Government of Tasmania and a similar petition lodged by Queensland seeking an advisory opinion from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in regard to the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill introduced by the Commonwealth Government early this year. That Bill was similar to the Bill introduced by the Gorton Government three years ago.

Both Queensland and Tasmania sought certain advice from the Privy Council in relation to the powers of the States as they relate to sovereignty below low-water mark. The Governments of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia prepared a memorandum supporting the two petitions—all members have copies of those documents now—and stating that if they were granted, then these States

would seek leave to appear before the Privy Council in support of Queensland and Tasmania. The early approval of the Whitlam plan would abort this process. It would deny the States their right—which they all desire to exercise—to seek an advisory opinion from the Privy Council in relation to a matter of critical importance to every State, namely, the control of territorial waters.

To use the words of the Labor Deputy Premier of Tasmania—and I remind honourable members that he is also president of the A.L.P. in that State—the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill seeks to gain Commonwealth control of the major source of wealth still open to the States. It is just another example of the centralist programme of the Federal Government; but it is one which every State will resist to the utmost. All the States opposed the legislation when, to its utter discredit, a Liberal-Country Party Federal Government sought to introduce it, and they will oppose it just as vigorously now.

It is interesting to note that on this issue as well Mr. Dunstan, the Premier of South Australia, has taken a strong stand. It is to his credit that he is no less outspoken against the Commonwealth legislation now than he was when there was a Liberal Government in office in Canberra.

Judging by the incredible exhibition by the Opposition in this House a few weeks ago, the people of Queensland can only assume that the A.L.P. in this House supports Canberra on this question as well. It is just another example of how this Opposition has sold out to centralism and deserted the three State Labor Governments. Despite the fact that the Prime Minister, and his Queensland apologists, ridiculed the London discussions, they were most successful. The British Government is in no doubt as to the unanimous view of the Australian States; public attention has also been drawn to the united attitude of the States.

There has been one other result of great significance. After the States' meeting in London and the favourable reaction it had in Australia, the Prime Minister was forced to back down from his previous stand in regard to Privy Council appeals. At his then weekly Press conference—they are now not held as often as weekly—on 19 June, Mr. Whitlam said in relation to the abolition of appeals that he would be happy to consider any alternative the States had. What a major change of heart when compared with his statement only a few weeks before that "Britain should tell the Premiers to jump in the Thames"!

In fact, Maximillian Walsh, a leading Canberra commentator, said in the "Financial Review" on 20 June—

"The Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, has virtually conceded defeat of his proposal to abolish all appeals to the Privy Council

from State as well as Federal Courts by a direct unilateral approach from Canberra to the British Government.

"It is obvious that he concedes that the States have won a victory and in their approach to the British Government over this question."

It is, to say the least, a most interesting observation.

The mere fact that the Prime Minister has been forced to retreat from his previous arrogant, dictator-like stand is a complete vindication of the discussions in London in which the Premier and I took part. The fact that the States were unanimous is of far more long-term significance for Australia. It surely means that there is still some hope for the maintenance of a federal system, and that there is still some hope for the rights of the State.

It is futile to suggest that the States are out of touch with reality in seeking to retain Privy Council appeals. That is not the major principle at stake; it is the federal system and the constitutional status of State Governments.

**Mr. Houston:** The colonial system is what you want to retain.

**Mr. KNOX:** All the honourable member wants to do is create colonies of Canberra. That is the whole purpose—a new form of colonialism in this country.

The States will resolve the question of appeals to the Privy Council in their own way and in their own time. What is important is that, by their united stand, they have prevented the Whitlam Government from interfering in an area of purely State responsibility. The States have also asserted, in a most telling manner, their constitutional status and their guaranteed rights. We have ample evidence today that the only State body of the A.L.P. that supports the Whitlam Government on this issue happens to be the Queensland Branch.

I am proud to have been able to play some small part in the success that the States have achieved. The Premier of this State deserves credit for the leadership that he has shown on this question. He has been able to display leadership because he has the complete support of the Government parties. The fact that the Leader of the Opposition has provided no leadership and has failed to support Labor Premiers and Labor leaders in other States is a condemnation of him and of the party that he purports to lead in this House.

There is no doubt where the Country and Liberal Parties stand. The silence of the Opposition on this issue can only be taken as complete subservience to the Canberra Government. In other words, the Opposition in Queensland puts blind loyalty to the party machine first and the future of State Governments last.

I turn now to an even more significant, and dangerous, aspect of the constitutional crisis that faces this country. Honourable members will recall the recent spectacle of the A.L.P. Federal Conference on the Gold Coast. When one tears away the trimmings and the good living that were associated with the conference, one finds that a number of most significant and binding decisions were made. Without exception, they were designed to centralise more power in Canberra at the expense of the States. But one decision stands out, and, because it has most frightening implications for Australia and Australians, it deserves to be examined very carefully.

The Legal and Constitutional Committee of the A.L.P., chaired by Senator Murphy, recommended that the Federal platform of the A.L.P. be amended by the addition of the following new clause—

“Reference by the States to the Commonwealth of such concurrent legislative powers as will assist to achieve the party’s objectives.”

I hope that all honourable members will stop and think for a moment what this proposal means in practice.

I think it is also important to remember that the A.L.P. Federal platform is binding on all Labor Governments, both State and Federal, and on all members of the party. It also supersedes any State platform. It has been described as the “Bible of the A.L.P.” I think a far more appropriate title would be, “A Recipe for National Disaster”. However, as it is binding on the party, it is a document of enormous significance. In case any member of the Opposition doubts the validity of the report of the Legal and Constitutional Committee, I have a copy with me. As the Leader of the Opposition was a member of that conference as well as a voting delegate to it, he should have a copy.

When the proposed addition was moved at the conference, on 13 July, it was strongly supported, as one would expect, by the Prime Minister. This is what he had to say—

“I am, always have been, and ever will be, a firm, avowed centralist. But I am also a regionalist.

“I don’t see any validity in the State boundaries that British public servants drew up in the last century.

“Where something affects the whole nation, let’s have one code. Where it affects people in regions, let’s have regionalisation.

“This is important so that anyone reading the party platform will know exactly what we stand for.”

Senator Murphy said—

“What we need is some means of clothing the Australian Parliament with power. This would be a significant and practical step forward.”

Neither of those two gentlemen left any doubt as to the intention of the new clause. It represented the most naked and blatant attempt at centralism yet seen in this country.

To his credit, the Premier of Western Australia, Mr. Tonkin, opposed the motion, as did Mr. Reece, the Premier of Tasmania.

Mr. Tonkin said—

“Despite the feelings of centralism that pervade many of you, I hope you will stop and think before adopting this proposal.”

He was supported by another delegate to the conference, Mr. J. Berinson, who is the Federal A.L.P. member for Perth and thus a member of the Whitlam Government. Mr. Berinson described the proposed new clause as a “breathtaking prescription for the dismemberment of the States. The end result would be that sovereign rights now held by the States would be destroyed.”

Writing in “The Australian” on 14 July, Mr. Alan Ramsay, who is known as a strong supporter of Mr. Whitlam, made these observations—

“The Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, yesterday won total authority from the Labor Party in his battle with the States to centralise Government powers in Canberra.

“Delegates to the party’s national conference in Surfers Paradise voted by 40 to 7 to endorse the Federal Government’s right to take over all necessary State legislative powers.

“It was the Prime Minister’s most significant achievement of the five-day conference.

“By its decision, the conference has committed the entire Labor Movement to the principle of centralised power in the hands of the national Government, overriding the rights of State sovereignty.

“It binds State Labor Premiers to the principle and will effectively prevent them publicly campaigning against Mr. Whitlam.”

Mr. Speaker, I have deliberately used these quotes so that honourable members need not take my word alone for what happened at the conference. Surely the words of Mr. Whitlam, Senator Murphy, Mr. Tonkin, Mr. Berinson and a friendly Canberra pressman clearly demonstrate the aim and the objective of the proposal—centralism by force and decree, and the ultimate destruction of State Governments.

This brings me to a most interesting question. Where was the Leader of the Opposition when all this was happening? He was a voting delegate to the conference, and I am told he was there. If, as the honourable gentleman was reported as having said last week, he believes in States, why did he not join Mr. Tonkin and Mr. Reece in opposition to this proposal? The fact of the matter is that the entire Queensland delegation voted for the proposal. I emphasise that point. If the Leader of the Opposition sincerely believes in States, surely this was the time for him to stand up and be counted. But no! Once again he has failed

the federal system, and this State in particular. Once again he put his own tenuous position before the future of the State of Queensland. As far as I am concerned, his latest claim to a belief in the States is no more than hollow words. In view of his immediate past actions, I doubt his sincerity. He has frequently been presented with the challenge to stand up for State rights and on every occasion he has thrown in the towel. Without fail, he has submitted to the will of a centralist Federal Government.

I reject the honourable member's belated claim to be concerned about State rights. His record of abject failure and total sell-out deserves to be exposed to the people of this State. He and the A.L.P. generally must not be allowed to masquerade behind silence and empty words on an issue that is of critical importance to this State and to every citizen of it.

The Leader of the Opposition has had his chance. He has failed miserably. He merits not sympathy, but complete contempt for his failure to act.

There is overwhelming evidence to prove that the present national Government is determined to destroy the federal system. The alternative it seeks to force on the Australian people is centralism—total control from the Canberra bureaucracy. The Whitlam regime is a "big States" Government. It cares only about Sydney, Melbourne and Canberra. It has no respect for the Constitution, and complete contempt for State Governments.

What is even more alarming—the honourable member for Toowong spoke about this recently—is the rapid erosion of individual rights and individual initiative in Australia since December last. The Whitlam A.L.P. Government cares little about the individual and even less about his rights. For my part—and I am sure every member of the Government agrees with me on this—I intend to do everything possible to resist centralism and to oppose the unconstitutional, stand-and-deliver tactics which the A.L.P. Government is using to force centralism on Australia.

I am proud of the fact that my party, at both State and Federal levels, has recommitted itself to the maintenance of federalism and to vigorously oppose centralist policies. We should be decentralising power and decision-making in this country, not centralising it in Canberra.

**Mr. Burns** interjected.

**Mr. B. Wood:** You are burying your head.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. KNOX:** This is not a "phoney" issue, as the honourable member for Lytton suggests.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Lytton and the honourable member for Barron River to refrain from interjecting. They will have their chance to speak if they so wish.

**Mr. KNOX:** This is, and will be demonstrated to be, a question of the whole future of the federal system of government in Australia. It is also a question of preserving the rights and freedoms of individuals in our country.

It is a real issue and one on which the people will want to know where their elected representatives stand. There is no doubt where the Liberal and Country Parties stand. We are united in our opposition to centralism. We are determined to make the federal system more effective, and to preserve and guarantee the rights of State Governments. We are not on trial. Our position is clear; it has not changed. The Opposition in this House is on trial because of the failure of its present leader and its potential leaders to put Queensland before their party views and position. If honourable members opposite want to tag along with their leader and their de facto leader, the honourable member for Lytton, in total subservience to a centralist Federal Government, then we will see that every elector in this State knows what side they are on.

The Leader of the Opposition said recently that the Government would try to make State rights the issue in the next election. That was his statement.

**Mr. Houston:** That is right.

**Mr. KNOX:** In fact, he was getting in early with his excuses for another certain electoral failure. If State rights is the most important issue in 1975, then the honourable gentleman can lay the blame for that squarely at the feet of the Whitlam Government. No-one will listen to his moaning and groaning. He has had his chance and he has failed.

The constitutional crisis that faces Australia is the most serious in our history. Victory for the centralist Government in this crisis would be a disaster for Australia; it would be even more disastrous for its citizens. We have demonstrated very clearly that we are prepared to act in defence of what we believe in. The failure of the A.L.P. to do likewise is evident for all to see. The federal system can be saved, and it must be saved. It will be, despite the attitude of the A.L.P. in this House. If the federal system is saved, then it will be an enormous tribute to the unity and determination of this Government and of the parties we represent.

The fact that a recent Gallup poll showed that a clear majority of Australian voters oppose centralism partly vindicates our stand. But our greatest vindication is the certain knowledge that an effective federal system is the best for Australia, and is the real alternative to the repressive centralism being practised by the temporary Labor Government

in Canberra. It will be for these reasons that the people of Queensland will again reject the Whitlam apologists who form the Opposition in this Parliament. The people will do so at the first opportunity and, for my part, the sooner the people get that opportunity, the better.

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville West) (12.33 p.m.): I was elected to this Parliament in 1960 and one memory that has stayed clearly in my mind was of the desperate efforts, in those early years, by the honourable member for Nundah to enter the Queensland Cabinet. In those days he was known in this House as the "Red boggy baiter". Time and time again in those days we heard the kind of speech he made today, and all of us were aware of his desperate attempts to impress his own side so that ultimately he might make Cabinet. Today we witnessed a repeat performance. Like all other Opposition members, I wonder what is behind his personal, bitter attack on the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It was not personal at all.

**Mr. TUCKER:** If it was not personal, I do not know what it was. To me, it was a very bitter, personal attack. I look ahead and ask, "Where does the Minister want to go now?" Does this mean that he is heading for the leadership stakes? Has he suddenly become aware that some avenue is going to open, and is he now using this type of speech in an attempt to launch himself to the leadership of the Liberal Party? I think he fully realises that the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services is breathing down his neck in the leadership stakes, hence these bitter, personal attacks on the Leader of the Opposition.

The Minister has endeavoured to create plots against the Leader of the Opposition, whilst the fact is that he himself is actively involved in his own quest for the leadership of the minority, rump political organisation known as the Liberal Party. He talks piously about State rights, but overlooks the fact that his Government is guilty of blatantly breaching the most democratic right in this State, which is the right of the people of Queensland to elect their Government by means of a fair and just election. Whilst he talks about State rights and democracy, he, the Liberal Party and the Government deny the people of Queensland their democratic rights.

Anything that he may say in this House neither concerns nor convinces me. He is here only by virtue of a tremendous gerrymander; he is not here because the Government was popularly elected. He is not even here because his party is wanted by the majority of the people of Queensland, because that majority wanted the Australian Labor Party. He is here because he is a member of the weak-kneed Liberal Party that he

soon hopes to lead. He bowed to the anti-democratic tactics of the Premier and the rigged electoral boundaries of this State, which would be a disgrace to any so-called democratic country or State.

Let us now consider the Leader of the Opposition whom the Minister has attempted to denigrate. He was re-elected to his position unopposed after both the 1969 and 1972 elections. As the Minister seeks to denigrate the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that his standing in Queensland is shown by the fact that under his leadership last year the Australian Labor Party gained over 48 per cent of the votes of the people of Queensland, whilst the coalition Government parties, of which the Minister is a member, received only 42 per cent of the votes. If the Minister gains the leadership of the Liberal Party for which he is hankering at present, and if he is able to stand up in this House as Leader after three years, and then six years, in office, I will listen to him. Despite attempts by the Minister to denigrate him, and irrespective of what might be quoted from newspapers concerning Qantas and New Zealand, the Leader of the Opposition is able to stand in the House with that record, and the whole Opposition, behind him. Let it be known that we of the Opposition have faith in our Leader, and we are not concerned about what the Minister may say of him.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Why are you protesting so much?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I am capable of putting my own points, which is more than can be said of the honourable member for Windsor. When he rises to make a speech, all that he produces is a jumble of words, and incoherent ones at that.

The Minister talks about State rights and fighting for Queensland, but the fact is that, on the last occasion when the people of Queensland had an opportunity to make their voice heard, they showed that they did not want the Premier or the Minister for Justice. They rejected the parties represented by them. Indeed, my hope is that the Minister does become leader of the Liberal Party, because I believe that would give the Australian Labor Party the greatest chance it has ever had at an election. If he becomes leader of the Liberal Party, the next election will be a lay-down misere for the Australian Labor Party. As I said earlier, the A.L.P. has a public mandate. By a gerrymander, it has been denied the right to govern, and one of the real perpetrators of that gerrymander was the Minister for Justice.

Let me turn now to other points that I wish to make. In this parliamentary session, which is still in its infancy, we have already witnessed a classic exhibition of the political paranoia of this Government. During the first week, the normal parliamentary standards and procedures and the normal parliamentary democracy were all brushed

aside to allow the Premier to pursue his senseless, pointless vendetta against the Federal Government. The Privy Council Bill—I will call it that—a Bill that lacked any sense of urgency, was smuggled into the Chamber without warning and steam-rolled through without time for consideration and without adequate provision for debate.

It is clear from the events that have occurred that the Premier is determined to convert this Legislative Assembly into some kind of three-ring circus for his own weird anti-Federal Government politicking. He wants to make this Chamber a forum for political stunts and for party-political grandstanding. That is my opinion, and the last weeks have proved it to be correct. Perhaps the Premier believes that his jaunt overseas at our expense—I refer particularly to his visit to Disneyland—has taught him something about promotional extravaganzas. But let the Government be warned! The Australian Labor Party Opposition does not intend to sit idly by while the ethical standards of this Parliament are thrust aside to permit a paranoid campaign against the popularly elected Government in Canberra. And up to this time, that is exactly what has been going on in the House.

The level of Government in Queensland is at rock bottom; the level of leadership is nil. As I said earlier, if the Minister for Justice became leader of the Liberal Party, it would, if possible, be less than that. Every Government member is acutely and uncomfortably conscious of the fact that the leadership is very poor. It is strange that the Minister for Justice should talk about the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition when there is absolutely no leadership in the Government of this State. The Government, backbenchers and Cabinet are aware that leadership is lacking, so they have adopted in Queensland President Nixon's tactics in the United States of America. President Nixon continues to raise the question of Cambodia to take the eyes of the people off Watergate: this Government attacks Gough Whitlam in a sort of feverish hope that the people will overlook its own ineptitude.

It is becoming a case of blaming Canberra for anything and everything. Last week we heard the Minister for Transport attempting to blame the Federal Government for the failure of the Queensland Government to honour an electoral promise that was made seven months before the Federal Government was elected. Things of that sort are happening all the time. That highlights the extent to which hysterical Queensland Ministers are prepared to go to hoodwink the people and camouflage their own administrative failures.

A week or so ago, according to "The Australian", Queensland "celebrated" the fifth anniversary of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's term as Premier. The newspaper could have used a more accurate or expressive word

than "celebrated". Perhaps the appropriate headline would have been "Five Years of Hard Labour under Mr. Bjelke-Petersen".

What has happened in the last five years under the present Premier's leadership? So little that the question is hardly worth answering, but I will answer it in a minute. First, let us take a long look at what has not happened in Queensland over that period. The State Government is always complaining that the national Labor Government is not honouring its electoral promises, but while it is so arguing it is failing miserably to honour its own promises in Queensland. Fifteen months ago the Queensland Government solemnly promised us an ombudsman.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** And we will get one. What are you moaning about?

**Mr. TUCKER:** It will probably be the honourable member. The Government always picks the most ineffective people to put in responsible positions.

Fifteen months ago the State Government solemnly promised us an ombudsman, but nothing has happened in that direction except the old, familiar "get out from under" which is now beginning to shape up.

Fifteen months ago the State Government promised a Brisbane Municipal Transport Authority. As I mentioned before, it now tries to blame the Federal Government for its failure to honour that promise. Fifteen months ago it promised the electrification of the Brisbane suburban railway system. The votes from the gerrymandered electorates were barely counted when the Premier stated that that project was one of low priority.

Fifteen months ago the State Government promised pre-school education, but only a handful of children have received it up to this time.

Despite Brisbane's growth, not an inch of new railway line has been constructed in the capital city. Not one new hospital has been constructed in the capital city.

A few minutes ago I said I would refer to what has happened in the last five years under the Premier's leadership. First on the list is the Government's interference some 12 months ago in the affairs of the city of Brisbane, even though it had not mentioned its evil intentions during the election campaign a few months earlier. It said nothing about its intention prior to the election, but the moment it regained office it began to interfere in the affairs of the city of Brisbane. The new Minister for Local Government (Mr. McKechnie) justified his intrusion into the civil administration of Brisbane by saying that he had spoken to a few taxi-drivers.

In March of this year the people of Brisbane showed their contempt for those Government members who had consistently attacked the Jones Brisbane City Council administration. All of us can remember the

continual hymn of hate—to use the Treasurer's expression—against the Jones administration. For years Government members had attacked it, but in March of this year the people of Brisbane showed their contempt for the actions of those Government members.

They also showed their contempt for the snide and deceitful attempt to inject this type of politics into the local government arena.

Predictably, since that debacle—it was a debacle for the Government and the Opposition party in the Brisbane City Council was annihilated—we do not hear any more of that hymn of hate. There is no doubt about what caused that debacle. It was this Government's interference, and, as a result, Government members have dropped the Brisbane local government issue like a hot coal. Now they are in full cry after the Federal Government. They have shifted their attack. They know it is no use attacking the Jones administration in the City Council because they saw what the people of Brisbane did. As I say, they are now in full cry against the Federal Government, and their present utterances in this House are just as hypocritical as they were in days gone by.

**Mr. R. Jones:** One would think they would learn a lesson from what has happened.

**Mr. TUCKER:** They never learn anything.

The second matter on the list is the new set of gerrymandered electoral boundaries which have been foisted upon us, with the result that I mentioned earlier in this speech. The coalition Government, with a 42 per cent vote, won 47 seats, while the A.L.P., with a 48 per cent vote, secured only 33 seats. This Government is propped up in office by distorted, warped and undemocratic electoral boundaries. We hear talk about five years of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen. I speak with statistical authority in saying that but for this gerrymander of electoral boundaries the people of Queensland would have banished him into permanent exile long before this.

The third matter I have listed relates to new standards in ministerial behavior, standards that allow a Cabinet Minister to accumulate shares, willy-nilly, without divulging his holdings to the people of Queensland. This is something new and has been introduced in the last five years under Mr. Bjelke-Petersen.

My fourth point relates to secret freight concessions, which still militate against northern industry, northern citizens and northern development—in fact, development anywhere in this great State.

Fifthly, we find royalty rates on our coal, sold to foreign mining interests, continuing at 5c a ton until the year 2010. Nothing has

been done about this, yet the Premier complains bitterly when the Federal Government declares that we should get a better deal from our overseas exploiters. The moment the Federal Government points that out, the Premier complains bitterly. It is worth mentioning in this context that, while Queensland coal is equal to the best in the world—it possibly is the best in the world—the price we receive for it is \$9 a ton below the ruling world price. So it is no wonder that the Government and its leaders put up this smoke-screen whenever we talk about poor royalties and selling our coal overseas.

Now let us look at the sixth point on the list. The Great Barrier Reef and beautiful Cooloolo have been threatened for the first time in our history. Who would ever have believed that these priceless assets could be threatened by any Government that had the good of Queensland at heart? But it has happened, and it has only been by the continued efforts of those who wanted these things retained for future generations that drilling on the Barrier Reef was stopped.

Coming now to the seventh item on the list, Queensland has vitrually become isolated from the rest of Australia because its coalition Government pursues a party-political vendetta against the Federal Labor Government. Logic and plain common sense have been thrown overboard to the detriment of Queensland, and where there should be State Government in co-operation and co-ordination with the Commonwealth Government there is in its place State Government in isolation from the Commonwealth. I could cite ad infinitum the things that have happened, but I do not intend to. I shall content myself by saying that when, in the future, the history of Queensland is written, the past five years under the leadership of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen will be the ones that dedicated Queenslanders will prefer to forget. The kindest comment I can make in relation to that period of time is that all that the Premier deserves is an epilogue. I do not believe that any Opposition member has the slightest praise for the Premier's administration of this State.

I shall remind honourable members of some of the paradoxical statements that have been uttered by the Premier since last December. They have brought—

**An Opposition Member:** Ridicule.

**Mr. TUCKER:** They have brought ridicule, but I was about to say that they have also brought Queensland very close to being regarded throughout Australia as a political joke.

**Mr. Newbery:** Where have you heard that?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I think the honourable member should travel around a little more than he does. No-one to whom I have spoken has voted for Mr. Bjelke-Petersen or even wants to vote for him. However, in

spite of that, he manages to be returned to office. Of course, we know the method he uses to gain re-election.

Recently I visited the southern States, and I heard local residents pass comments like this: "Queensland is led by a reactionary political antique, who wishes to sentence his State to a future of his own convenient concoction." That is the kind of comment that can be heard not only in many parts of Queensland but all over Australia as well.

**Mr. Blake:** They believe he will secede from the Commonwealth.

**Mr. TUCKER:** That is so. After the Premier had addressed the National Press Club in Canberra, which was the venue for his infamous threat that Queensland would secede from the Commonwealth of Australia, certain members of the club openly claimed that when it came to comedy the Premier left the Right Honourable Billy McMahon for dead. On the one hand the Premier threatened secession; on the other hand he urged the retention of our present National Anthem. This is the paradox of the man! One moment he talks about secession; in the next breath he wants to save the National Anthem. Let him make up his mind. But, of course, he cannot.

On 20 February this year, the Premier suddenly became defence conscious and called on the Federal Government to prevent war between the Torres Strait islands and Papua New Guinea. I ask: What war? It was just a figment of the Premier's political imagination. He implied that Gough Whitlam would give away part of Australia. There is no need for me to remind the House that, like many other Australians, Gough Whitlam spent some years of his youth in the skies, fighting to defend these shores.

*(Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.)*

**Mr. TUCKER:** Neither I nor any other member of the Australian Labor Party could visualise such an outstanding man, with so excellent a war record, being prepared to give away any part of Australia. I ask whether the Premier could equal such a record.

While referring to the Torres Strait issue, I should draw attention to a statement by the Premier in recent weeks about the illegal entry of Papuans to Thursday Island and other islands in the Torres Strait, and perhaps Cape York, and his concern that they might spread malaria. I believe the Minister for Health suffered a bad fall in rushing to tell the Premier that malaria was spread by mosquitoes, not by Papuans.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** You'd be a galah, wouldn't you? The mosquitoes have to bite somebody with the disease to spread it.

**Mr. TUCKER:** In that case, all Australians who served in New Guinea and Bougainville during the war should not have been allowed to return to Australia. They all suffered from malaria.

That statement by the Premier was typical of the wild outbursts we have come to expect from him.

When Federal Labor Ministers visited China, the Premier declared that Australia was drifting into the Communist camp. That remark was also typical of statements made by him time and again. But what does he say when President Nixon, Billy Snedden and business leaders such as Sir Ian McLennan make similar trips? He remains silent and back-bench Liberals follow his line.

The Premier spoke about restoring the supposedly deteriorating relations with the United States. He said, "I am going overseas to restore these deteriorating relations." However, when he ultimately visited Washington he could not gain entry to the White House to see President Nixon, even through the scullery door.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** He went through the front door, that's why.

**Mr. TUCKER:** It is news to me if he got through the front door. I can only say that he certainly was not able to gain entry through the back door of the White House, or the scullery door, nor would he disclose the names of any of the minor officials he spoke to in America—if, in fact, he spoke to anyone more important than Mickey Mouse in Disneyland. This is another paradox. One moment he is going overseas to mend everything, or so he claims, and the next, when he arrives overseas, he is completely ignored by everybody who counts in the country he is visiting.

Not long ago the Premier claimed he had won his battle in Britain to prevent the Australian Government from eliminating the right of appeal to the Privy Council. On his return he said, "When we got over there, we won the battle to prevent the Commonwealth from taking away the right of appeal to the Privy Council."

**Mr. Newbery:** The A.L.P. is anti-Britain.

**Mr. TUCKER:** If that is so, what about the spectacle two weeks ago, as I pointed out earlier in my speech, of the Premier rushing worthless legislation through this Parliament because he discovered what everyone else knew, that is, that the Commonwealth was likely to be successful in this regard anyway. That is another paradox. One moment he says, "We won. I was justified in going to Britain. We won our battle over there." Then, a couple of weeks later, he rushes legislation through this Parliament to again head off the Commonwealth. How can the Premier be believed when he says anything? What parts of his statements, if any, can be believed?

I should like to place on record a few gems from the leading article of "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" of 4 August 1973, because it is so unusual to be able to find any gems in that newspaper. The article reads—

"Theatrical—but Essential"

"In one sense, the Queensland Government put on a theatrical performance this week with its shock legislation on Privy Council appeals.

"The legislation was introduced without warning, and without an opportunity for members to study it. With constant applications of the gag, it was rushed through with indecent haste.

"The Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, was almost melodramatic in his speech of concern for the retention of the right of Queenslanders to appeal to the Privy Council.

"On this specific issue, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen is pleading a barren cause. The self-respect of nationhood demands that the final court of appeal for Australians should be an Australian court—specifically, the High Court of Australia. It is a negation of Australia's independence that either the nation or any of the States should any longer have recourse to a British institution, the Privy Council, as the final court of appeal."

I suppose I could leave it at that, but in fairness I shall read a little further. It continues—

"But in another sense, the legislation is crucially important not only to the future status of Queensland but also to the preservation of the Australian nation as a genuine federation, as against a citadel of centralism.

"What is wrong about the Privy Council issue, as far as the Whitlam Government is concerned, is that they went about it the wrong way. By all means, let appeals to the Privy Council be abandoned. But Mr. Whitlam, in arrogant fashion, showed contempt for the States by presuming to ask the British Government for blanket legislation to end Privy Council appeals. The right of each State to opt for or against Privy Council appeals was entirely disregarded."

That is the opinion of a northern newspaper which said that in this regard the Premier was pleading a barren cause.

The Premier continually demands a Commonwealth cure for inflation. Yet he steadfastly refuses to assist in any way at all by using the State power of price control. In "The Courier-Mail" today the following article appears—

"Price controls scheme clash"

"The Premier (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) indicated yesterday that he was opposed to any handing over of State price control powers to the Federal Government."

He will not give the Commonwealth Government anything. He criticises it, yet he will not use his own powers. He sits like the proverbial dog with a bone and does nothing about the problem, yet it is claimed that he is a great leader of this State. I fail to see it.

The Premier demands cuts in Commonwealth spending. He criticised the Prime Minister for obtaining a new vehicle, but then used taxpayers' money to buy a more sophisticated V.I.P. aircraft for use by himself and some lucky Ministers. There is the paradox again—one moment he deprecates the fact that the Commonwealth does not cut expenditure, and the next moment he obtains a new V.I.P. aircraft in which to jaunt around the State. Of course, he has his Jaguar car, too.

Queensland has a Premier who, to use his own words, is against all forms of gambling, but lately it has been reported, apparently not without some authority because it has not been denied, that he wishes to be Premier and Minister in charge of racing, trotting and coursing. I wonder what he would do with \$4 if he took those portfolios, because he did pretty well on a similar stake previously.

Last year he was the first Premier to reject a Commonwealth-State system of prices justification, and he was the last Premier to concede voting rights to 18-year-olds. Twice since becoming Premier he has been forced to correct information that he gave earlier to the House in replies to questions, and on each occasion he was embarrassed into making those admissions by the replies of other Ministers. I say that whilst this man presides politically over this State the good name and reputation of Queensland and Queenslanders is in danger nationally.

I now wish to direct my remarks to the queer logic behind adjourning Parliament for the Brisbane Exhibition. Although I enjoy the Show as much as the next person, I do not believe that Parliament should adjourn for a week because of it. After all, the general public receives only one public holiday during the Show period, and interested members would have many opportunities to visit the Show without embarrassing or inconveniencing others. The A.L.P. Opposition wants Parliament to get down to work; to consider worth-while legislation; and to debate issues of importance to the State of Queensland. Yet shortly after the House has resumed after being in recess for months, we adjourn to allow a few Cabinet Ministers and members to visit the R.N.A. Show. The fact is that the show is just another excuse used by the Government to prevent Parliament from getting down to business.

What is needed in Queensland is a Parliament that meets and is allowed to consider and discuss matters of importance to the State. Queensland needs a Government that works and a Premier who commands respect. When Queensland has those things, it will

go ahead. To my way of thinking, they will not be obtained till 1975, when the person who was denigrated here this morning by the Minister for Justice will take over the reins of Government as Premier and lead this State into a future loaded with the prosperity that the State should now be enjoying.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. GUNN** (Somerset) (2.29 p.m.): I should like to express loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, and at the same time, on behalf of the people of Somerset, extend congratulations to His Excellency the Governor (Sir Colin Hannah) and his gracious lady on the manner in which they have conducted themselves during His Excellency's term of office. As they travel over this vast State of Queensland, no doubt they will see how it is developing under a free-enterprise Government. Recently, I travelled over much of Queensland, as far north as Thursday Island, and I was amazed to see the development that is taking place throughout the State. No matter where we look, we see this State advancing.

It was very interesting to hear the honourable member for Townsville West. Since I entered this House I have heard the word "gerrymander" used very often. During the 25 years in which the A.L.P. was in power in this State, I can remember my father, who was a good Country Party supporter, often mentioning the same word. In that regard I have some very interesting figures. During the 25 years that Labor was in government in this State, there were shearer electorates—and this gets back to the question of one vote, one value—the average enrolment in which was 4,000 to 6,000 electors. During that time the seat of Mt. Gravatt had 26,307 electors, and other seats around Brisbane had between 18,000 and 20,000 electors.

**Mr. Armstrong:** Held by Labor, though.

**Mr. GUNN:** That is true. In the 1947 election Labor polled 43 per cent of the votes and won 35 seats. The United Australia Party and Country Party combined polled 44.26 per cent of the votes and won only 23 seats. In 1950 the A.L.P. polled 46.3 per cent of the votes and won 42 seats, while the Liberal-Country Party polled 48 per cent of the votes and won 31 seats. So you can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who the architects of gerrymandering were.

I should like now to pay a tribute to the Minister for Education. It was pleasing to see that, other than in the very remote areas, children in every part of Queensland have access to secondary education. In my own area, which, of course, I do not class as remote, a new high school is to be opened at Kilcoy in the near future and a pre-school will be opened at Toogoolawah. School bus services are well organised throughout the State, and there is an excellent road system to carry school buses throughout the seven shires in the Somerset electorate. I well

remember that, when Labor was in power, if a child did not have a pony he did not get to school.

Hospital services, too, are excellent, and it is pleasing to see that the Minister for Health is now extending dental services into country areas. In my own electorate of Somerset, a new dental clinic has been established at Laidley and plans are in hand for the completion of one at Esk.

We have an excellent health scheme in Queensland, and I think it would be a pity if the Commonwealth Government mangled that scheme. Today, anybody can get free service if he wishes; but it will be an entirely different kettle of fish under the Hayden scheme.

If we want people to remain in country areas, it is absolutely essential to provide amenities for them. I am pleased to see that the Government of Queensland is deeply conscious of these requirements and is doing everything in its power to make life in the country equal to life in any suburb of any of the cities of Queensland.

It is important that no division should be developed between city and country people. We depend on each other for so much that it is important that we understand each other's point of view and each other's problems. However, inflation has an adverse effect on all people, not only those in the city but also those in the country. Whether he is a wage-earner in a town or a farmer in a country area, anyone who has to earn a livelihood and try to raise a family finds the task fairly arduous in time of inflation such as that now being experienced.

No-one engaged in primary production can ever be certain of an assured income from his labour. Any capital that he puts into his property is risk capital. Personally, I have seen people with little or no experience come from the town and try to make a fortune in a country area, and then strike drought or flood and have to sell out at a loss. It is very important to have a thorough knowledge of primary production before undertaking any enterprise involving animals or agriculture. I think that banks and other lending authorities should discourage people with insufficient capital and knowledge from becoming involved in any of the occupations I have mentioned.

In my opinion, the Federal Government's regrettable handling of primary industries in this country springs from a lack of knowledge of these very important industries. A classic example is the dairy industry.

**Mr. Marginson:** Is it inefficient?

**Mr. GUNN:** No, it is not. On the contrary, it is a very efficient industry.

Recently a group of dairymen in my district of Toogoolawah invited the Federal Government to send up one of its members to address district dairymen on the future of their industry. I do not know why, but

it was decided to send Senator Georges. We might as well have invited the honourable member for Brisbane! At least Senator Georges was honest. He wrote to the dairy committee, admitting that he knew nothing whatever about the subject, and invited them to send questions to him. He said he would refer the questions to the Department of Primary Industry and, in due course, pass on the answers to the questioners on the night of the meeting. Naturally the whole meeting was a flop because Senator Georges knew nothing about the subject.

**Mr. Davis:** Why didn't they invite me?

**Mr. GUNN:** For obvious reasons, although there is a possibility that the honourable member could not have done worse.

As I say, the whole meeting was a flop. It was soon realised that Senator Georges knew nothing about the dairy industry. He knew little enough about anything else, but he knew a lot less about dairying.

**An Opposition Member** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** That is not being unkind. If you put your head on the block, you will get it chopped off.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Lickiss): Order! The honourable member will please address the Chair.

**Mr. GUNN:** Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was provoked.

The phasing out of the butter subsidy will kill the dairy industry in my electorate. Butter is not the only commodity that is produced by those people. They produce pig meats, vealers and calves. Over the years they have produced culled cows from their herds. When the American market first commenced, it was that type of animal that was in demand. For the hamburger trade, the Americans wanted animals that did not carry a lot of fat. Many millions of dollars have come to Queensland as a result of the sale of culled cows.

**Mr. Marginson:** Why did you close down Ryan's slaughterery?

**Mr. GUNN:** I did not close down any slaughterery. After all, slaughterhouses have to comply with certain conditions. The honourable member for Lytton has not had much praise for country slaughteryards. Mr. Ryan of Laidley has certainly been very unfortunate. In the near future I will be introducing a deputation to the Minister for Primary Industries on that matter. Mr. Ryan has a good article, and I will do everything in my power to help him.

The loss of export earnings will be far greater than was at first realised. As I have already said, not only butter production is involved. The loss of export earnings will amount to millions of dollars. Those farmers who have to go out of dairy production are being advised to take up vealer

production. However, most of these farms are small and carry, say, only a 40-cow herd. Many in my electorate would carry fewer head than that.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** It is absolutely essential for the Federal A.L.P. Government to know about this, as it is of immense importance to Queensland and Australia. All that Senator Wriedt knows about primary production could be written on the back of a postage stamp, although I believe he will come on side very quickly when he realises the extent of our export earnings from this source.

I shall now deal with the small farms that are to produce vealers, soybeans and so on. Many of these properties are not of great consequence from the point of view of agriculture; they are specifically dairy farms and nothing more. Assuming that such a farm obtained a 100 per cent calving and produced 50 calves a year, the farmer could not rely on probably more than \$80 a calf—I think that is a fair average—which would bring him in about \$4,000. But out of that he would have to pay rates and meet other expenses. A farm of that size could only be expected to keep one family going, and that family would probably have to find other work. Fortunately, in the Somerset area work of a contract nature amongst vegetables would be very easy to obtain and there is no doubt that such families would get through. But it would mean that the son of the family might have to leave the property and come to live in the city.

Although only a small percentage of Australia's population is engaged in primary production, it is still one of our greatest income-earners. As I said, it is to be hoped that the Federal Government soon realises the importance of primary industry.

**Mr. Davis:** I got out of it.

**Mr. GUNN:** Thank God the honourable member has never been in it!

One of the greatest problems on the land today lies in obtaining suitable labour for properties. Most farmers are themselves coming to town and taking jobs.

**Mr. Wright:** You would get enough labour if you paid decent wages.

**Mr. GUNN:** They get decent wages.

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** It is obvious that the honourable member for Rockhampton has no knowledge whatever of my district. Anybody on contract work in the Lockyer Valley can earn \$30 a day. If he does not, he is not working. Very few people in the Lockyer Valley have a permanent job, and very few would want one.

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** They are paid on contract and they prefer it that way. I do not blame them for that. A good man can quite easily pick 20 or 30 bags of potatoes a day.

As I say, it is hard to get labour. As a matter of fact, many people who live in caravan parks are drawing social service and it is very hard to entice them away from it. It must be a pretty good "lure". Farming today requires quite a degree of skill and, of course, there is nothing like practical experience. That is why I am disturbed about young people leaving country areas and coming to the city, where they work shorter hours and get more pay.

In my area, farmers are very fortunate in that they have an agricultural college in the district. They appreciate this, and their appreciation will be seen at the next election—although I did pretty well in the previous one.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** It was a gerrymandered result.

**Mr. GUNN:** Gerrymandered, my foot!

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Lickiss): Order! I hope the honourable member will address the Chair.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am being continually provoked, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I keep forgetting. I apologise.

The extension services of the Department of Primary Industries have played a very important part in advising farmers on planting and spraying methods and the selection of seed varieties for a particular area. A new industry in my area that I should like to mention briefly is the soybean industry. This crop has proved very lucrative for the area, which has the advantage of irrigation. The average production last year was about one ton per acre, and the price paid was about \$105 a ton. This year it is expected to be about \$180.

I presume that everyone knows that my electorate contains one of the most outstanding coal seams in Queensland. Coal is available in large quantities and can be mined by the open-cut method. The average depth of the overburden is only 70 feet. The area to which I refer, namely, Tarong, is 1,580 feet above sea level and is situated only 120 miles from Brisbane.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Sir Gordon Chalk said you don't know what you are talking about.

**Mr. GUNN:** If the honourable member for Archerfield listens, I will show him that I do know what I am talking about. Our local coal is of excellent quality for power generation. Tarong is, of course, the area that has been recommended by the State Electricity Commission as the site for the proposed new powerhouse. As the Minister for Local Government and Electricity has pointed out, the location of the new

powerhouse at Tarong would save Queensland's electricity consumers the huge sum of \$8,000,000 a year. During the past few weeks of the controversy that has arisen over the siting of the new powerhouse, a great deal has been said and written. I, too, have had my say, and I do not intend now to enlarge upon my comments to any great extent. However, I should like to see the report of the State Electricity Commission made public. I should also like to be informed as to the performance of the Ipswich mines in their supply of coal to Swanbank Powerhouse. I do not believe that they have filled the orders for coal that they have received from the powerhouse.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** You are saying that the industry in Ipswich is inefficient?

**Mr. GUNN:** I have a great deal of respect for the miners of Ipswich, but I am saying that Ipswich coal is probably pricing itself out of the market. It simply cannot compete with the clean and safe open-cut method of coal production. I am not quite certain of the price at which coal can be produced in Ipswich, but it is certainly nowhere near as low as the cost of open-cut coal. I would also be interested to know the extent to which Ipswich industry pollutes the Brisbane-Ipswich air corridor and affects the local environment.

A matter of great importance, and one to which even the Opposition refers in election campaigns, is decentralisation. On Tuesday, 14 August, while in Perth, Professor Eric Underwood said—

"The development of means of stopping or slowing down the growth of cities, with their increasing problems of congestion, transportation, noise, pollution and waste disposal, looms as one of the greatest challenges we have to face and have to meet. The need for greater decentralisation of population has long been recognised in Australia."

I would suggest that none of us has played our part fully in this very important game of decentralisation. Instead we have only paid it lip-service. Economic consideration has always been the overriding factor, but the day is fast approaching when we will have to give due consideration to this very important factor.

It seems ridiculous that in Queensland, with its vast natural resources, half the population is located in the small south-eastern corner of the State. In my own electorate—I am sure the same situation obtains in other electorates—95 per cent of young people are forced to leave their homes upon completion of their secondary education and seek employment in the cities. This situation cannot be allowed to continue. The only way in which it can be stopped is by encouraging industries to country areas. Industry would certainly be encouraged to

my electorate by the construction of a powerhouse at the site recommended by the State Electricity Commission.

I have heard some objection raised, I think by the honourable member for Lytton, to the construction of a dam on Cooyar Creek. I cannot understand why anyone in Brisbane should object to a dam on any creek feeding the Brisbane River or, in fact, on the Brisbane River itself. I realise that an adequate water supply for the city of Brisbane is important, but flood mitigation is also of great importance to Brisbane. We are inclined to forget the major floods that have occurred in Brisbane. People do not realise the value of dams as a means of flood mitigation. That may be because in the last decade or so there has not been major flooding in or around Brisbane, but a major flood could occur at any time.

In 1893 a large volume of water flowed down the Brisbane River with disastrous results for this city. While it is true that Somerset Dam assists in flood mitigation, I should like to recall what happened during the last flood. Somerset Dam was supposed to be held to a maximum height of 325 feet before water had to be released, but because of heavy local rain around Brisbane it was thought that serious flooding could occur in Brisbane and water was retained in Somerset Dam at a height of 340 feet for four days. That caused quite a lot of concern in the Kilcoy area where some roads were cut during that period.

Even with Somerset Dam, if we had heavy rain similar to that in 1893, there would be very serious flooding because of the conditions now prevailing. A lot of country surrounding the upper reaches of the river has been cleared and extensive cultivation has taken place. Many streams have silted up. Owing to bad town planning, many houses are built virtually in stream beds and thousands of houses in Brisbane do not have rainwater tanks, which means that the rainwater flows into the local streams. In addition, very little water absorption takes place in areas where thousands of houses have been built. I certainly would not like to see a major flood.

**Mr. P. Wood:** Do you know you have twice as many A.L.P. members listening to you as there are Government members?

**Mr. GUNN:** I am not very concerned about that. My main concern is to have my remarks recorded in "Hansard", as I am sure my Country Party supporters will read it there.

This is an important matter because we could have a serious flood. I am trying to explain that the city of Brisbane will be very vulnerable to flooding until the Wivenhoe Dam is built.

**Mr. Davis:** It will not make any difference.

**Mr. GUNN:** It will make a lot of difference. A dam on Cooyar Creek would also make a lot of difference. The more dams there are, the more water will be held back to allow local floodwater to get away.

**Mr. Harvey:** Brisbane was vulnerable until the Somerset Dam was built.

**Mr. GUNN:** That may be so, but Brisbane is still vulnerable. Somerset Dam is doing a good job, but the Brisbane River carries a great volume of water from the Linville and Nanango areas.

**Mr. Davis:** With 1893 conditions, the same thing could apply.

**Mr. GUNN:** It is all conjectural, but it could happen. Even with Somerset Dam, which, I grant, is very important in affording flood mitigation, if there was major rainfall of 25 or 30 inches in the Linville area, the water would bypass Somerset Dam. That is why I believe that a dam at Wivenhoe is very important to give effective flood mitigation. A dam on Cooyar Creek would be another means of flood mitigation and as well, a source of water for a powerhouse. If a dam is constructed on Cooyar Creek—and I hope that it will be—it will impound about 150,000 acre-feet of water. Leslie Dam contains approximately 38,000 acre-feet and Moogerah Dam, which supplies Swanbank Power Station, holds about 75,000 acre-feet. That gives some idea of the volume of water that flows down these creeks, and indicates that Brisbane, in a major flood, will continue to be vulnerable until all dams are completed.

I shall now deal with beef, which is one of Queensland's greatest export commodities. It has meant a great deal to the State over the past few years. I have spent most of my life not only in the breeding and fattening of cattle but also in the retailing of them. It is sad that, when a commodity such as beef attracts high prices on both the local and overseas markets, those prices should attract a great deal of attention. It must be remembered that not too long ago beef producers suffered the ravages of drought and had quite a battle to exist. As a matter of fact, they requested drought relief. No-one knows this better than I do.

**Mr. Davis** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** If the honourable member for Brisbane listens intently, I will tell him—and I am sure he will agree with me—why there has been such an upsurge in meat prices in Queensland. The shortage of cattle on the Queensland market has been brought about by a number of conditions beyond the control of the producer. This year, we experienced one of the mildest

and best winters I can remember. I have watched the meat market over the past 30 years or so.

**Mr. Jensen:** A year ago you were squealing about synthetic meat coming into Queensland.

**Mr. GUNN:** I have never squealed about synthetic meat—in fact I have never mentioned it—because we are not frightened of it.

**Mr. Jensen:** Then the organisation squealed.

**Mr. GUNN:** The organisation can speak for itself. I claim that synthetic meat will have little or no impact on the Queensland meat market.

There is no shortage of cattle in Queensland. As a producer, I hold as many cattle off the market as I can because pasture conditions are good. In fact, I would breed more if I could. Naturally beef producers are in the industry to make dollars, and they cannot be blamed for that.

**Mr. Jensen:** You are keeping cattle off the market to keep the price up.

**Mr. GUNN:** Not at all. From a producer's point of view, it is not good to have abnormal prices for any commodity. If the present conditions altered tomorrow and the weather was dry for three or four months, cattle would be rushed onto the market. It is a stop-go business, one of supply and demand. We have experienced this before.

**Mr. Jensen** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** No cattle would be rail freighted from my area; they are carted by road transport. If conditions altered, a thousand cattle would be put onto the market.

A claim has been made that a large amount of money can be made out of cattle. There is not as much money in this industry as might be thought unless a person is breeding and fattening cattle. A fatterer has to buy store cattle, which are up in value and compare in price with fat cattle. In fact, per pound, they cost more. A fatterer could not buy anything on the store market today under \$120 or \$130. And he would have to keep them for two years and meet all the expense and have all the worry over that period. I hope that the Federal Government does not meddle in this very important industry. The best course it can take is to give this and other primary industries as much consideration as possible. In the matter of prices, this period is probably unique in the history of this State.

Much the same situation is found in the vegetable industry. This is the first occasion I can remember when much of the potato crop in the Lockyer Valley is being ravaged by wilt. Some farmers whom I have known

for quite a long time did not harvest any of their crop, and for some the harvest was as low as six bags an acre. As a result, there has been a shortage of potatoes. There has also been a shortage of onions. Wet weather does not suit onions, and there was a good deal of blight in the onion crop. This has meant considerable losses to producers in my area. Growers would prefer to have reasonably good crops sold at reasonable prices. This is better than very high prices for potatoes and onions, with only a few people benefiting from them.

**Mr. Davis:** There would not be a poor potato farmer in the Lockyer Valley.

**Mr. GUNN:** The honourable member for Brisbane says that there would not be a poor potato farmer in the Lockyer Valley. I have seen people go to the Lockyer Valley and attempt to grow crops there, and I can assure the honourable member that only the lucky survive. A grower must have considerable knowledge of this industry to be successful. The Lockyer Valley producers have for many years supplied the Brisbane market with cheap vegetables. I have seen producers in this area grow potatoes and onions when it would scarcely pay to buy bags to put them in.

I now wish to refer to another very important industry of which honourable members opposite may have greater knowledge. I shall try to make what I have to say as clear as possible for their benefit. They should take some interest in this very important industry, because Queensland is a primary-producing State. I refer to the racing industry. Thoroughbred breeding is very important. This industry has come a long way, and today it is carried on all over Queensland. I am particularly interested in the racing and breeding of horses. The industry is very important, and a great deal of money has been invested in it. Champions bred in Queensland, such as Gunsynd, Tails and Mr. Hush could take their places on any racetrack in the State.

**An Opposition Member:** Gunsynd didn't come from Queensland.

**Mr. GUNN:** He did; he came from Goondiwindi. I do not want to argue this point with the honourable member, because it has been answered.

There is still a considerable amount of dissention over the racing industry in Queensland. I ask honourable members to cast their minds back 12 months. The racing know-alls of the news media, and trainers, told the people in South-east Queensland that if the small race clubs were knocked out there would be more T.A.B. profits for distribution to Brisbane clubs, more race days, etc. But what did we see? The club at Laidley was "killed" altogether.

The Bundamba club received quite a number of Thursday race days, and it is unhappy about it. What do we now see?

In the columns of the Press, the same racing writers are not satisfied with the prize money being offered in Queensland, and they are asking that it be increased.

I should like to make a few comments on the doping of racehorses. I think it was the honourable member for Baroona who asked a question in the House this morning on this subject. If anyone wants to "kill" the racing industry quickly, this is one way of doing it. I know that the Treasurer, as the Minister in charge of racing, is conscious of this situation, and has got onto it immediately. I have seen all kinds of Dick Tracy stories about shooting dope into horses with a gun, and recently two horses were doped with morphine. An owner must do his best to ensure that his horses are well protected by the trainer at all times. On race days, it would be quite easy to lock all members of the public away from the horses.

**Mr. O'Donnell** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** I cannot imagine any leading trainer in Queensland doping his horses. He knows that drugs can be detected fairly easily, and he knows the consequences if traces of drugs are discovered. I know both of the trainers who were sent out recently, and I doubt very much whether they would do such a thing. Horses must be protected from the public because of the actions of those who would stoop to doping for monetary gain.

If racing is to survive, the problem of doping must be cleaned up as quickly as possible.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** As I said earlier, both those trainers were big trainers, and I cannot imagine any trainer, no matter who he is, doping his own horses. It is not hard to pick up dope in sweat, urine and saliva tests. I have known the two trainers concerned for many years. They have been great supporters of country racing, and I repeat that I cannot imagine them or any other top trainer doing such a thing.

I believe that the betting public are well catered for in Queensland, and that is why I would oppose the establishment of a casino in Queensland at present. Although it might attract a few visitors, I do not want a casino in my electorate or anywhere else in Queensland. Only a certain amount of money is available in the community for betting, and I reiterate that I think the betting public are well catered for. I am not a wouser and I do not mind having a bet, but it would be found that, whether it goes into betting or into a casino, only a certain amount of money would be available because the public of Queensland cannot afford any more. They can already bet on dog-racing, trotting and the gallops.

Getting away from racing, I congratulate the Minister for Justice on the job he is doing. He is always willing to amend Acts to bring them into line with modern thinking. In my opinion, one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before honourable members last session was that which established the Small Claims Tribunal. It filled a long-felt want. People who could not afford to employ a solicitor and thus were denied their rights can now put their case before a court.

There are quite a few holes that need to be plugged, but, as I said, the Minister is always willing to listen. I should like him to have a look at the 12/12 warranty that car dealers are using in Queensland. I have received many complaints about this practice. People find that the warranty covers only parts and they end up with a bill as long as their arm for work done.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton) (3.9 p.m.): From the very outset of this, the second session of the 40th Parliament, it became clearly apparent to me that one of the major issues of debate in this Chamber during the session would be what I have categorised as the "traditional breakdown".

Even during the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor, a serious break in tradition occurred when reference was made to problems which Sir Colin said could be encountered in the mineral industry because of what he described as the attitudes of the Commonwealth Government. I hope that the people of Queensland will excuse His Excellency for being political, knowing that the offending aspect of his speech was really written by someone in the Liberal-Country Party Government. But, regardless of who the author was or who is to blame, the fact is that political inferences were made by the Queen's representative in this State, a man who traditionally is supposed to be non-political.

Judging from subsequent comments, some Government members apparently thought it was smart to quip at the new Australian Government through His Excellency the Governor. As time passes, they will remember that day with regret. By their actions they have undermined the very strength and the foundations of this high and honourable position. No longer will people be able to say, without reservation, that the Governor of this State is free of party politics. There will always be the suspicion that he is simply the tool of the Government of the day to do and, more specifically, to say as he is directed. However, the use of the Governor in this way does not really come as a surprise, as recent events have demonstrated that this Government adheres to tradition only if and when it suits its narrow political purpose.

The hilarious incident in May of this year, when the Premier threatened to secede from the Commonwealth, is a typical example of the truth of what I am saying. On that occasion tradition was thrown to the wind, as apparently was all common sense, when the Premier of this State, Mr. Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, announced to the world that because he did not like the new team in Canberra he was "taking his bat home". The worst feature of this ridiculous outburst was that the Premier was serious in what he said.

No doubt honourable members will recall the headlines of those dark and dreadful days—

"Secession? Premier Joh insists he's not joking."

"Queensland secede threat arouses scorn."

"What will he call it—'Bananaland'?"

This was all because of an irresponsible statement by the Premier at the National Press Club in Canberra. Let me record in "Hansard" this famous quotation—

"The Premier said, 'Secession is an issue which is at the end of the road if the Prime Minister pushes things to the ultimate.'"

Let us look at the editorials that came after this. They were far from flattering.

"Premier-grade nonsense", said "The Courier-Mail". It went on to say—

"It's time for the Premier (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) to stop talking arrant nonsense."

I think we will all agree that when "The Courier-Mail" says something like that, it is worth listening to.

"The Australian" proclaimed—

"We are Australians, Mr. Premier."

Even the famous Mr. Killen, Liberal M.P., chimed in with his article entitled, "When the laughter has to stop."

Overnight the Premier of this State became a cartoonist's delight, and a completely new series of "Jo jokes" spread over the length and breadth of the country. The whole situation was rather hilarious and humorous until people started to realise that not only was the Premier a laughing-stock but, unfortunately, because of his nonsensical assertion, the whole State was held up to ridicule and scorn. It is not surprising that the Premier wants to forget the whole sordid mess and is now trying to deny that he ever said such a thing. Unfortunately for him, the complete episode is too well recorded and it is one blunder he will not be allowed to forget.

From the parliamentary point of view, a far more serious break in tradition occurred in this Assembly on Thursday, 2 August. That day will long be remembered by all who believe in democracy, for it was the day when this pseudo-democratic Government dictatorially rammed the Appeals and Special Reference Bill through this Chamber.

The method used was unwarranted and unnecessary, but it was indicative of the depths to which this Government will stoop to frustrate the democratic process and to make a sham of a responsible Legislature. It was the sort of thing one would expect to see occur under a dictator or in some military junta regime, but surely not in a Parliament which is supposed to be founded on the British principle of democratic, responsible government.

Most Queenslanders still have not realised the significance of what took place on that occasion. Those who have are stunned and amazed and have asked, "Why?" They ask "If the legislation was so important, why was it rushed through in that way? Why was no mention of it made in the Governor's Opening Speech? Why was the introduction of the legislation kept a secret? Why did only the Premier, one Minister, a backbencher and an Independent speak on the Government side? Why was the gag used on Opposition speakers? Why didn't the Premier allow the Bill to be closely scrutinised and debated in detail? Why would any Government stoop to such a low, foul and snide tactic unless it had something to hide?"

I, too, have asked, "Why?" I have wondered whether the Premier acted as he did because he realised just how weak was his argument in support of retaining the right of appeal to the Privy Council, and he did not dare allow this issue to be fully debated. Or, I have asked, was it just another instance of this Government desperately trying to develop an election issue out of State rights?

It is now too late to debate the Bill in question but it is not too late to record in the "Hansard" of this Assembly what one might call the other side of the Privy Council story. During the debate, limited though it was, repeated reference was made by Government speakers to the merits of retaining our traditional judicial ties with the Privy Council. They did not even bother to explain what these merits were, but instead generalised and endeavoured to make out that it is only since the Labor Party came to power in the Federal sphere that any challenge has been made to the existing appeal set-up of the British Judicial Committee.

**Mr. Bird:** It was not necessary before.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I am happy to hear the honourable member say that. It demonstrates the ignorance of Government members who interject, and especially of the mysterious faceless men who write most of their speeches.

History shows that as early as 1871, more than 100 years ago, requests were made for limitations on the Privy Council appeals system. Even when the original Constitution Bill was brought before the House of Commons, in 1900, it was desired, and stated,

that the High Court of Australia should be the final court of appeal in all cases other than those involving public interest. Unfortunately for Australia, this recommendation was opposed by the U.K. Government and the Bill was amended.

Our founding fathers were not playing politics on the Privy Council question, which the Premier is doing. They, like the Whitlam Government, based their case on sound arguments. The efforts to remove the right of appeal to the Privy Council grew out of the accumulated dissatisfaction of many years' experience with the appellate system as it had applied in the federating colonies. They were sick of the delays that occurred between the submission of appeals and the subsequent handing down of judgments, and they were also fed up with the exorbitant expense of appeals, realising that it was a legal redress available only to the wealthy. They were concerned too, with the Judicial Committee's lack of understanding of this country's local laws and conditions. Their views were well summed up by Sir Josiah Symon, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the National Federal Convention, when he said—

"If Australia is fit to enact her own laws, she is fit to interpret them."

And he added—

"The first duty of a nation is to administer final justice to its people."

Regardless of the Bjelke-Petersens, the Privy Council has undergone a deflation of its former jurisdiction to the extent that today it is recognised by fewer than half of the members of the Commonwealth of Nations. And I believe its days are numbered so far as appeals from other nations are concerned.

The Privy Council appeal system is archaic, unnecessary and antiquated, and was only appropriate while a country remained a British colony. The monarchy and the Privy Council are the only imperial institutions to outlive the eclipse of the British Empire, and the latter has no place in modern nationalism. Other countries, such as Canada and South Africa, severed the British legal tie because, as the Australian Law Journal, volume 33, records, "Instances were found in which the Committee had acted inconsistently", and because, as lawyers in Canada have stated, it made a mockery of their Federal Constitution.

The same journal also records a description by Lord Brougham, who said—

"That awful Privy Council which sits at Westminster making up for its distance from the suitors by the regularity of its sittings, and for its ignorance of local laws and usages by the extent and variety of its general law learning."

This comment substantiates the criticism that the Judicial Committee is composed of English-trained lawyers who frequently fulfil the dual function of deliberating upon English and overseas appeals but who are not really

competent to decide cases that require first-hand knowledge of local laws and conditions. Other writings during the last 70 years have built up a strong case for removing appeals from this council.

It has been contended that it is inconsistent with dominion status to permit an external tribunal to determine finally on domestic issues. In other words, if we are a sovereign nation we should determine our own destiny, not only legislatively but, moreover, judicially. As soon as a nation attains political maturity it should have sufficient respect for, and faith in, its own judiciary's ability and integrity to do justice in disputes between its own citizens. The Premier's argument for retaining appeals to the British Privy Council is really another way of saying that he believes the Australian High Court judges to be incompetent and biased, and not to be trusted. What surprises me is that his Government's members are prepared to go along with his view.

If anyone is open to question, surely it should be not the judges of the Australian High Court but the members of the British Judicial Committee. Why is it, one may ask, that no dissenting opinions are given in the formal speech that outlines a decision of the Judicial Committee? Why does not the Judicial Committee adhere to the sacred principle of English law under which precedents are authoritative and binding, and must be followed? Why is it that, as the booklet that has been prepared on English legal systems by the British Government states, the decisions of the Judicial Committee are not binding on English courts?

It is held that the Statutes of Westminster have the effect of making the Dominions independent sovereign States. If this is so, surely sovereign powers include judicial as well as legislative independence. Why is it, then, that this Government wants to maintain the ridiculous situation in which final and ultimate judicial power is left in the hands of non-Australians?

During the speeches by the Minister for Justice and the Premier it was stated that all the States of Australia were against this move. Only this morning, as I was reading my copy of the papers relating to the petition that has been presented by the Minister for Justice to Her Majesty the Queen, I noticed this statement on page 42—

"The concern of the State Governments does not arise from the proposal to abolish such appeals, and indeed a number of State Governments have already indicated their desire to do so."

One is led to wonder, therefore, whether the Premier and the Minister for Justice misled the House.

**Mr. Burns:** He did not tell the truth.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I might say he was dealing loosely with the truth.

The Premier also said that the removal of appeals to the Privy Council would drastically affect the rights of the State. Yet, on page 43 of the same document, this appears—

"It will not interfere or even threaten to interfere with the rights of the States or of anyone else. It will merely contain a request and consent which, of their own force, will achieve nothing and affect nobody."

One would wonder what the case put forward by the Premier and the Minister for Justice was based on.

As long ago as 1823 our forefathers achieved the first victory in the fight for independence. At that time the Legislative Council was established. At the present time, 150 years later, the arch-conservatives in the Queensland Government have this State tied judicially to Britain's apron-strings. To make matters worse, they have put through legislation to cast Queensland back into the 19th century. The other unforgivable aspect of this whole matter is that a vital issue like appeals to the Privy Council should be used simply as another battering ram in the Premier's personal and bitter vendetta against Mr. Whitlam and the Australian Government.

If there are reservations about the neutrality of the Australian High Court, and if there is some concern about the appellate role of this court, which is also a court of original jurisdiction, surely the solution is not to lean more heavily on the British Privy Council but to completely sever our ties with that council and establish a special appellate division of the High Court. Such a division could be composed of justices who are engaged full time on appellate work, and it could be the final court of appeal in this country.

Our High Court judges are as competent as any in the world. Moreover, they know and appreciate local laws and conditions. The establishment of such an appellate division would mean that costs and delays would be considerably lessened. However, of greatest importance is the fact that we would be placing final judicial power over Australians in the hands of Australians.

The Premier's whole exercise was really nothing more than a flexing of his State-rights muscles. When we get down to tin-tacks, we see that the Premier is as interested in the rights of this State and its people as he is in declaring his financial interest in the mineral and real estate industries of Queensland. He simply thinks he is on a good political issue. However, I am sure that common sense will prevail, as it did on 2 December last year, and that Johannes Bjelke-Petersen will go down in history not as the longest-serving Country Party Premier of Queensland, but as the last Country Party Premier.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! When the honourable member refers to another honourable member he will use his correct title and will not refer to him by his surname. Furthermore, I draw the attention of the honourable member to Standing Order 120 and point out that he is referring to a matter that was discussed in a previous debate.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** It is all very well talking about State rights and endeavouring to develop an emotive political issue, but the Government's time would have been far better spent in honestly examining the existing governmental structure in this State with the aim of endeavouring to improve the benefits to the people it governs.

At a time when tradition is under challenge, we in this Assembly should throw away our parochialism and be prepared to scrutinise critically the present three-tier system of government in this country. We might well ask ourselves: Is the present structure the most suitable for good government? Is there a need for a reallocation of administrative functions? Should there be a change in the existing financial allocations? Should there be a readjustment of the fiscal avenues at the various levels of government? Is the three-tier system still appropriate for modern administrative responsibilities? Are the existing Commonwealth, State and local government relationships satisfactory, and, finally, what can be gained from a policy of centralism and regionalisation?

Over the last eight months in this State we have witnessed this Government, and in fact the State itself, being set on a collision course with the Whitlam Government by the Queensland Premier. He has made some irresponsible attacks and engaged in much uncalled-for criticism. We tend towards the idea that this is something that is only for 1973. We tend to think that conflict between State and Federal Government is something that has been with us only since 2 December 1972. But it is not simply a characteristic of the 1970's. Squabbles on myriad issues have been part of the political scene for 70 years. As Professor Sawyer, an author, eminent academic lawyer and political scientist has said, conflict between the Commonwealth and the States has been commonplace in the politics of Australian federalism.

Even the present disorder in the financial relationships between the Federal Government and its six State counterparts, which we have heard so much about, is not new. Instead, it is generally agreed to have its origin in World War II, when the balance of power shifted markedly in favour of the Commonwealth. I am sure that many honourable members here will recall the uniform tax case of 1942, in which the High Court held as valid the Commonwealth's authority to monopolise the income-tax field. I have heard this decision referred to as the Federal straw that broke the States' backs. That may be so, too, because it took

away the State's control of its own purse-strings. However, I do not think that was the real origin of the battle; rather it was the climax, because it climaxed the trend of giving more and more power to the Commonwealth.

I do not think the States had a chance, anyway. The decay of the States' power was not an unsuspected by-product of federalism as some would have us believe. Instead, it is clear that it was foreseen, and I believe even planned, by some of the founders of the Australian Commonwealth. My contention can be validated by the Australian Constitution itself, and by the proposition I put forward that whoever controls the finance controls all. Section 51 of Part V of the Constitution gave far-reaching financial powers to the new Commonwealth Government. In subsection 2 it was allowed to enter the taxation field; in subsection 3, to completely control customs and excise; in subsection 12, to control currency, coinage and legal tender, and, in subsection 13, to enter the banking field.

It is important that we should look back into some of these areas, because at the turn of the century customs and excise charges represented the main revenue of the States. While I admit that at that time it was agreed that three-quarters of all this revenue would be refunded to the States, it should not be forgotten that under section 87 of the Constitution that agreement was only to extend for 10 years. We therefore see that, from the very first, the States were potentially exposed to the Commonwealth's financial influence. Let us remember that it was not Mr. Whitlam but Alfred Deakin himself who predicted 70 years ago that the Commonwealth would acquire a prominent position because of the control of customs and excise duties alone.

I had intended spending some time on the subject of Commonwealth-State financial relationships and to comment on the accepted five financial periods, but time prevents me from doing so. However, I will list some of the results that have flowed during the past 70 years because of the conflict that has taken place. We see the loss of control by the States over customs and excise duties; the loss of the right to borrow independently overseas; the establishment of the Loan Council, and the responsibility for all future overseas debts and borrowings being taken over by the Commonwealth; the loss to the Commonwealth of power to raise and distribute public loans; the establishment of the Commonwealth Grants Commission; and the extension of the Commonwealth's financial tentacles into land tax, death duties, company tax and personal income tax. We see uniformity in taxation throughout Australia and we also see the complete takeover, lock, stock and barrel, of the property, staff and machinery of the various State income tax departments.

The erosion of State powers has coincided with the erosion of the financial independence of the States. Let us not forget that it was not the Whitlam Government that did this. For most of this period the Federal Government was in the hands of anti-Labor parties. Regardless of the political colour of the Government of the day, there are many sane and sensible reasons for giving the Commonwealth greater power at the expense of the States.

Prior to 1901 the States of Australia were independent British colonies, defined by borders which had no economic, political or geographical significance. They were products of 19th-century convenience. It is just luck that our map turned out the way it did. It has even been argued that, had federalism come 10 years later, there may have been States everywhere; at least one in the Northern Rivers district of New South Wales, one in North Queensland and another in Central Queensland. It is therefore not valid to argue that the lines on a map should decide the type of government that we have, and many Government members seem to say this. The prime purpose should be to obtain good government for all Australians. Regardless of our parochialism, we should realise that, first and foremost, we are not Queenslanders, New South Welshmen or Victorians, but Australians. We speak the same language, we have the same customs, and we look to the same heritage.

From the economic point of view, no State is an economic island. Irrespective of natural resources, no State is economically self-sufficient. All the States depend on one another for some of their needs. The trend has been for companies and industry to expand regardless of State borders. Interstate trade and commerce is an accepted part of our society. Even industrially, unions and other associations, as well as employment conditions, are becoming national in character. Transport systems generally, and air and road systems specifically, acknowledge no boundaries.

It is when all these factors are considered that one begins to wonder if we really need State Governments and questions whether it would not be better to adopt a policy of centralism and regionalisation. Under the present three-tier structure, unnecessary duplication and overlapping exist. In numerous instances this structure has brought about more costly and inefficient administration and a conflict of purpose. This has been a common characteristic at each level of government, while under other circumstances there has been a separation of power into three distinct spheres. This has created serious administrative gaps for which no level of government has been keen to accept responsibility.

Proof of my criticism can be found in the changes and activities that have already taken place. Because of the deficiencies, the problems that existed and the situation in which the Federal Government has the

money, the State Government has the power and the local government seems to do all the work, efforts have been made to change the various governmental functions and to co-operate in joint activities. This has been seen in the establishment of numerous commissions and councils, such as the Agricultural Commission, the Australian Tourist Commission, and the Australian Transport Advisory Council. There has also been the passing of parallel legislation on matters such as companies, bankruptcy, life assurance and hire-purchase.

Furthermore, we have seen the need for co-operation at both departmental and ministerial level, and we have heard reports of meetings of Attorneys-General, Comptrollers-General, and Ministers for Transport. Coupled with that has been the seconding of officers from Government to Government and from bureaucratic operation to bureaucratic operation. We have seen Crown Solicitors acting for one another. We have interstate railway agreements. There has been co-operation between departments of all types. In some instances there has even been the voluntary surrender of State power to the Commonwealth, as was demonstrated with respect to statistical services and the National Literature Board of Review.

All these instances stress that there has been joint activity and co-operation in the past between the various levels of government. More importantly, they stress that joint activity and co-operation have been warranted and are becoming more and more essential as administration becomes more complex and Governments are called upon to supply increased services to the people.

Administrators have come to realise that the existing separation of functions and the present allocation of financial resources are no longer suitable. While many are simply content to increase co-operation and joint activity, others see that the only real solution is to have a complete review of the functions of the various levels of government. This, in turn, would require a complete review of the means and the legal authority to carry out these functions. Many just do not want a patched-up job. Instead, they believe it is necessary to start all over again. I, too, believe this. We need to adopt a blank-map philosophy and establish in this country a two-tier system of government based on the regionalisation concept.

During the last couple of weeks we have heard the Premier talking about what is happening in England. It is obvious that he has not read the Mallaby Report or the Maud Report, or any of the reports associated with Scotland, because what is happening there is based on the regionalisation concept. I believe that the boundaries of so-called regions or States—call them what you will—need to be redrawn on the criteria of population and areas of interest. We need to establish functions, and to divide those functions into protective services, communal

services, personal services and trading services. Let us look at the functions and give to the regional groups grass-roots functions so that they might meet the needs of the community.

These regional areas would have regional assemblies, which would administer the areas involved. The Australian House of Representatives could then become the main Government in this country. It would become the Government totally responsible for all national and international matters. It would be the second and only other level of government. Under the present structure the Federal Government is getting richer, whilst the States and local authorities are going bankrupt. Much of the blame for this situation can be placed at the door of this State Government.

Only recently I asked the Minister for Local Government for some of the facts concerning the debts of local authorities, and he was happy enough to supply them to me. When the State Country-Liberal Government came to power in 1957, the capital debt owed by local authorities in Queensland was \$168,990,000. Ten years later, in 1967, this had increased by 126.8 per cent, to \$383,281,000. Last year, six months before the Labor Government came to power in the Federal sphere, it had risen further to a capital debt of \$532,200,000. I think honourable members will agree that for the last 16 years this State Government has been bleeding local authorities to death. And it will continue to do so unless local government can be made financially independent of the State.

The existing dependence by local government on rates for its revenue will also be changed only by removing the dominance of the State Government, and it will only be after a complete restructuring of these two levels of government that the everyday needs of the people will be met. I have heard honourable members opposite talk about this before, but I put one good question to all the dogged Federalists. I ask them "Which State Government function or service enjoyed by the people of Brisbane could not be handled by a regional assembly or an expanded concept of the existing local authority, as there is in Brisbane?" The same question applies to all areas or regions throughout Queensland.

**Mr. Miller:** You are coming out in the open now.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** That is all right.

It is understandable that this Country Party-dominated Government would oppose the concept of regionalisation. It is known throughout the world for its narrow, conservative, 19th-century views, but I would have thought that the Liberal Party would be more progressive. Recently I was given a Country Party document on federalism. It was prepared on 2 July 1973 by the Research Department of the Queensland branch of the

Country Party. After what the Minister for Justice said in the House today, I am glad that I received this document. The author did not put his name to it, but I am sure that no-one would want to own up to the tripe that it contains. The main argument put forward by the Country Party was that any structural change would concentrate power in the hands of a few in Canberra. This seems to be the attitude that was also adopted by the Minister for Justice. The document contained the statement that already Sydney and Melbourne elect nearly a majority in the House of Representatives, and that the majority of Cabinet Ministers come from one State, namely, New South Wales.

Fancy the Queensland Country Party talking in this fashion when it drew the electoral boundaries of this State in such a way that 40 of the 82 seats were in the south-eastern zone! As for talking about a concentration of Federal Cabinet Ministers in one area with 12 out of 27 coming from New South Wales, in Queensland nine out of 14 come from the south-eastern zone, and there are none from north of Proserpine. Whilst the Queensland Government says it opposes centralism, it has actually instituted its own centralised form of Government in this State.

Mention was also made in the Country Party document of the need for a referendum before any changes are made. I wonder what Clem Jones and the people of Brisbane think of that? The real crux of this argument is that the existing structure of government is no longer suitable to the needs of the people, either individually or as a nation.

No doubt changes will come very slowly; but they will come, whether this Government likes it or not, because eventually the people will realise that changes are to their benefit. No doubt there will be charges and countercharges during the change-over period; but I believe the forces for good government will be victorious and the day will come when this nation will boast of its new two-tier structure of government.

In the meantime, we in this Assembly have the responsibility to use the powers and resources of the State for the benefit of the people, and, looking back over the last 16 years of the present Government's record, this responsibility has not always been met. It is within the power of the State to control prices, but nothing has been done in this area. Instead, the Government has been content to sit back and let the wage-earners and those on fixed incomes to be exploited to the full. It is within the power of the State to make cheap housing and land available for Queensland families, but here only a token effort has been made and thousands of Queenslanders have been forced to pay ridiculous rentals, live in substandard areas, or borrow money from finance organisations which charge interest as if money is going out of print.

Last year a profit of more than \$1,000,000 was made by the Queensland Housing Commission—money which should have been made available to potential home-owners. I cast no aspersions on the employees of the Housing Commission, but I think that a Government policy that always gives private enterprise preference over individuals can only be criticised.

The same attitude has been adopted towards people receiving State assistance, and hundreds of instances can be quoted where the State Government's policy has led to serious hardship. Every time the Federal Government has increased its assistance, the State has decreased its contributions. In some circumstances this policy has actually meant a loss in income, which is doubly serious when the cost of living is for ever rising.

Whenever anyone criticises State Government policy, the excuse is given that it does not have enough money. If this is so, and if the amount of finance from the Commonwealth is limited, then surely the obvious answer is for the State Government to enter into areas which will give it a financial return.

The success of such a venture has already been proven in the field of insurance with the State Government Insurance Office, and I have already advocated in this Chamber on a couple of occasions the establishment of a State bank. One venture which I advocate finally today is in an area that is wide open for direct Government investment—the tourist industry. There is no reason why the Government should not enter this field.

The Queensland Government Tourist Bureau already makes a considerable contribution to the industry by attracting a greater flow of tourist traffic to the State. It carries out a vital function of collating and disseminating to travellers information on accommodation, transport services and the various attractions of this State. It has promoted student educational tours, local city festivals, and even bowls carnivals. I believe that last year its receipts were about \$7,300,000, and there is no reason why that amount cannot be increased tenfold by a greater physical and financial involvement in the tourist industry. Admittedly a service is given to the tourist, but it is quite obvious that the real beneficiaries of this Government-run bureau and the expenditure of State money are the private-enterprise interests in the industry.

I believe it is time that the Government, acting on behalf of the people, got some of the cake instead of a few crumbs in the industry. There is no reason why a chain of State-owned motels and caravan parks cannot be established along the Queensland coast. The advantages would be that it would provide an additional service, give much-needed competition, raise standards of service, and possibly, as in New Zealand, open

up new tourist areas. Consideration should also be given to the establishment of some tropical-island resorts. Investments could be made in the game-fishing industry, and there is a great deal of merit in the idea of developing ranch-type summer camps in inland parts of the State. South Australia has instituted a system of nature trails that is worthy of consideration, and there is no reason why the Government cannot promote its own system of bus trips to tourist attractions throughout the State.

I am sure most people would agree that the profits from the State Government Insurance Office would be put to good use if they were reinvested in a State tourist industry, and there also is no reason why local authorities could not be encouraged to enter this field, either in a managerial capacity for the State or in their own right. In fact, this has happened already. The Rockhampton City Council owns its own caravan park, which has been hailed as one of the finest in the State. I have also been told that the Council in the Theodore area owns its own hotel, and again the facilities there are of a high standard.

From the Government side, one hears the Minister for Tourism prophesying that tourism is the industry of the future. If this is so—and I have no reason to doubt it—surely the tourist industry is one avenue through which much could be done to solve some of the Government's money worries.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT** (Chatsworth) (3.45 p.m.): In one of the most significant papers that he ever delivered on the Australian Constitution, the Honourable E. G. Whitlam said that Labor members of State Parliaments should work avidly for their own political demise. In the political storm that presently gathers around his ears, his heart must be warmed to know that at least one disciple north of the border has embraced the simple philosophy and is espousing it with great enthusiasm. I am sure that the honourable member for Rockhampton will receive a congratulatory telegram from Canberra for his effort today.

The defence of this Government has probably never been tighter or more sure than it is today, and probably the ranks of the Government have never been more consolidated, firm or united than they are today. The Opposition recognises this, and it seems to think that the one chink in the armour is the Premier's comment about secession. And so it is that the three senior members from the front bench of the Opposition who have so far spoken have laboured this comment at great length. They overlook entirely the Premier's statement that such a step would be taken only as a last resort, and they choose to forget that a man of their own political ilk spoke in much stronger terms about this same issue. So it is that probably the name of Mr. Everett, the Labor Attorney-General from Tasmania, is one that is best forgotten relative to their arguments. Yet it

cannot be denied that, when the Premier made his one comment about secession, the Labor Attorney-General from Tasmania made the national headlines and the headlines in his own State at the same time. He was more outspoken; he was more vehement; he was more forthright in advocating secession than was the Premier of Queensland. It is timely to remind the Opposition of that.

The Leader of the Opposition said that Government party members to a man—

**Mr. Burns** interjected.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I do not support secession.

**Mr. Burns:** You voted for it.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The honourable member for Lytton said that I voted for it. I am delighted that he came in, boots and all. In the course of his speech, the Leader of the Opposition said that we in fact backed this attitude.

**Mr. Burns:** It was printed.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** It was not printed. On 16 May, in the joint party meeting a resolution supporting the Premier was carried unanimously, and that resolution was printed the next day in every newspaper in this State. It was in the following terms—

“That this joint meeting of Country Party and Liberal Government members commend the Premier for his untiring efforts and statesmanlike attitude in placing before Australians in the strongest possible terms Queensland's sovereign rights and privileges in any Commonwealth-State relation. We also appreciate the steps that the Premier has taken to initiate and safeguard our interests in London.”

Any distortion that the honourable member for Lytton or his leader may bring forth cannot negate the sentiments of that resolution, which we embraced with great enthusiasm.

**Mr. Burns** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** In response to the speech by the Attorney-General this morning, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition fulminated about it being a personal attack. I take some exception to that because I am one in this place with some sensitivity, and I happen to resent what I define as personal attacks. To me personal attacks occur when a person is accused of being a rogue, a crook, a thief, or a charlatan; or when there is some reflection upon his morality, his background or, indeed, upon his military service when it has no relationship at all to his parliamentary service. That is the type of speech I consider to be a personal attack, and I would deplore it as much as any other honourable member.

What the Minister for Justice did today was to comment properly and correctly upon the public activity of the Leader of the

Opposition, and there is a wealth of difference between the two types of criticism. Therefore, I repudiate completely the suggestion that the Attorney-General launched a personal attack. What did he do? He dwelt upon the most sensitive issue in contemporary politics today, namely, the relationship between the States and the Commonwealth, and the attempted erosion of the powers enjoyed by the States. In that context he put into the record the performance, the conduct and the utterances of the Leader of the Opposition. He spoke about the views of the Leader of the Opposition on sensitive issues, and it is right and proper that these things should be catalogued and that the people of Queensland should understand them.

The forms of this Parliament provide protection for the honourable member and, if he thinks he has been traduced in any way at all, he has the opportunity in this House of defending himself. But I emphasise that what took place today was not a personal attack; it was comment upon the conduct by the Leader of the Opposition of the responsibilities of his office and, instead of trying to reduce it to terms of a personal attack, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should have thought about what was said. On reflection, he might find that there was a wealth of truth in the comments of the Attorney-General.

The members of the Press, to whom we are constantly grateful for information on the proceedings of this House, have told us that 70 Bills will be introduced in this session. If this is so, we can anticipate a most impressive apologia pro vita sua at the end of the session, one equal to or surpassing the one produced in the Federal Parliament a few months ago. But our apologia will not be one relating merely to inquiries and commissions but rather to solid performance—a heavy legislative programme that will have been brought forward for the good of the people of Queensland.

I want now to talk about two notable inclusions in the Governor's Opening Speech and refer briefly to one notable exclusion. The first one, I comment briefly, is the promise to secure payments to subcontractors. This fills a seven-year void and I can see that honourable members are pleased that it is now being filled. I believe that subcontractors did not enjoy the protection they were entitled to when the Liens Act was repealed prior to the 1966 elections. Therefore, I am pleased that the Government is now taking action.

The point I want to labour at greater length is the promise to consolidate and amend the law relating to the conservation of fauna. This is one of the sensitive issues that this Parliament should certainly apply itself to. It is time that the House took stock of the situation and ascertained what species are in danger and what species are in need of protection. For some of the

species it is late in the day. One authority with whom I disagree was quoted recently as saying that we should, in fact, forget the endangered species, because it is too late to save them, and rather concentrate totally on those species that are presently plentiful. I believe that we should apply effort on all fronts.

I remind the House that for some two years now we have been saying that we would afford special protection to the freshwater crocodile. I hope that the Minister covers this aspect when the Bill is forthcoming. I know that in Cairns, for example, mounted crocodiles of quite small size are offered for sale in shops. One can only ponder upon the extent of the plunder that is taking place on this species when such small ones are offered for sale. It was a poor reflection upon our society when someone said to me that it would be a shame if they were protected, because the tourists loved to buy these mounted specimens.

It is also time that the House applied itself to the harvesting and protection of kangaroos. We should be interested more in the control of harvesting than in harvesting itself. There is little doubt that, with sensible control, harvesting can continue for ever. Those who become overzealous on this sensitive issue forget that kangaroos have been killed in Queensland at the rate of approximately 1,000,000 a year since the 1890's.

Notwithstanding Senator Murphy's ban on the export of kangaroo products, there is no unanimity even in Labor Party ranks on this question. To underline that contention, I refer to proceedings of the Labor Party Rural Conference held in Townsville in June this year. This was one of the decisions of the conference—

"Support for the controlled harvesting of kangaroos in areas where the kangaroo population is not in danger of extinction, and the resumption of the export of processed kangaroo products."

Senator Murphy does not act on behalf of all of the Labor Party when he imposes export bans and places a total prohibition.

One of the most responsible conservation organisations in Australia, namely, the Australian Conservation Foundation, has expressed itself in favour of sensible control of harvesting. In the July 1970 issue of an occasional publication it said—

"All who have expressed opinions on kangaroo conservation in public—at any rate, all who accept the inevitability of some professional killing—have stressed the importance of the industry operating on sound biological principles.

"This means in practice that the annual harvest should not exceed the equivalent of the natural increment—that is, the number of young produced that can be expected to reach maturity. An industry based on the cropping of a wild animal population which does not accept the restraint implicit

in this principle is doomed to self-destruction because it will eat into the living resource on which it depends, and usually at a progressively increased rate."

The pity of kangaroo harvesting in Queensland is, firstly, the fact that we have given a poor explanation and, secondly, our studies have probably been incomplete.

I suggest that one of the best studies that have come out is the one conducted by Mr. J. W. Winter of the Queensland University. After deep study he has established to his own satisfaction that if the killing ratio of 1:6.5 were maintained there would be little harm of extinction of any species. This ratio means, in effect, that for every kangaroo killed, there should be six or seven living ones at the end of the year. This is the type of study that we look for in determining how well the kangaroo should be protected. Certainly our public relations are faulty in the light of the fact that the American lady crusader who is presently among us was quoted as believing that each year 10,000,000 kangaroos were killed in Queensland.

At a recent policy-making convention my party expressed itself in very clear terms on the broad question of the environment. A resolution advocating the creation of an environment portfolio and a State fisheries and wildlife authority, together with 15 clauses in support of the argument, was unanimously accepted. I believe it is timely for the State to move into one portfolio for that administration. The present administration, spread as it is over six Acts and five Ministers, is too fragmented and detached. It is obvious that one Ministry could better embrace the existing authorities, invoke penalties, and set attainable targets as well as enter into new areas of responsibility.

Some of the targets that obviously would be within its sights would be beautification schemes, the removal of urban, rural and roadside ugliness and the cleaning-up of rivers. For the Brisbane River I think a target of five years rather than 20 years should be attainable. The new areas that a Ministry for the Environment could move into would include waste disposal on land, noise control and land use.

I digress to remind the House that the Environmental Control Council has applied itself to these three areas by way of select committees. I should be remiss if I did not compliment the council on the publications it is now making available.

Of those items I have nominated, I would award the highest priority to legislation for the control of noise, which is certainly one form of environmental pollution. It has been tackled in other countries and it must ultimately be recognised and controlled in this country. A person who is emerging as an authority in this field is Sir George Halliday, one of Australia's best known ear, nose and throat surgeons, who founded the Noise Abatement Society of Australia. Halliday isolates or identifies the nine major areas

of noise. He believes these to be traffic, aircraft, industry, construction and demolition, household appliances, agricultural machinery, railways, marine craft and leisure-time products. There is little doubt of the urgency for this control and I hope that the Government moves in this direction.

I have referred to the Australian Conservation Foundation, whose studies, publications and seminars are of immense value. There can be no argument that the foundation has been in the forefront on conservation issues in the last five years. The recognition and support that have flowed to it at Federal government level have been desirable and timely. It is in that context that I express very sincerely disapproval of the decision by the Federal Minister for the Environment and Conservation to reduce the subsidy to that body from \$150,000 to \$55,000 a year. But what is probably more regrettable than the reduction in the subsidy is the patronising attitude that Dr. Cass is now adopting to this foundation. He is quoted in one of the publications as embracing this sentiment—

"The broad or national role of the A.C.F. should now be taken over by Dr. Cass's department which either had the experts, or could hire the experts, to provide necessary data and analysis of all conservation problems. As a result, he and his colleagues now knew all the answers. Consequently, there was now no longer any need for the Foundation to press him on various conservation issues. Such efforts were better directed to other Ministers, other Government departments and to the general public."

I will hypothesise this situation if it were reversed: if a Minister of the Crown in Queensland said to an advisory committee, "I know all the answers", what a storm he would attract around his own head from the conservationists on both sides of the House. I think poor credit is being given to the Australian Conservation Foundation for the great work it has done by reducing the financial support and by the implied insult of it.

By way of preface, I said that I would refer to two things in the Governor's speech and one omission from it. The omission I touch upon relates to an ombudsman. We are not committed to legislate on an ombudsman in this session, but we are committed to legislate upon the matter in this Parliament. The Press speculation of a week ago that we were not to proceed in this matter caused distress and alarm among a good number of Government supporters. The Premier's denial in the Press a few days later was therefore welcomed with a sense of great relief. It would be inconceivable not to implement this promise. It would seriously impair the integrity and the good standing of the Government. We entered into a firm commitment with the community and certainly this legislation must proceed.

To accept the curious arguments that have been floated against it, namely, that members with offices and secretaries do an ombudsman's work, is to admit a poor understanding of what an ombudsman is all about. The anonymous Minister and back-bencher who said he would be one-armed and toothless were no help because there is a body of back-benchers determined that he will be well armed and will have the finest set of efficiently functioning dentures in public administration. I comment on that as an omission and am grateful to the Premier for so quickly stifling speculation that the legislation would not proceed.

In opening, I touched upon Commonwealth-State relationships. It is the big issue of the moment and I believe it will be the big issue for the next decade or so. An Australian Constitution Convention, which will be held in the next few weeks, will throw light on the Australian Constitution to which it has seldom been exposed since the 1890's. There is a sense of history and occasion attached to the convention and, as one honoured to be a delegate to it, I look forward to it with great anticipation.

In discussions on State-Commonwealth rights these days, there are a number of curious contentions. One of the strangest that I have been able to isolate is the one by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs that the 1967 referendum gave him a clear mandate to administer, in exclusion, the affairs of the Aborigines in this country. That sentiment was reported in the "Telegraph" of 6 August when he attacked the Queensland and Victorian Governments for wanting to retain control of Aboriginal Affairs and said that this was in defiance of the 1967 referendum which gave this control to the Commonwealth.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** He was talking discrimination.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** He was not only talking discrimination but was also misrepresenting a sentiment which was not expressed in those terms in the 1967 referendum.

This sentiment that he is expressing, and which has been embraced by leading editorials in the national newspapers, is patently wrong. It is important to look at the precise questions and the supporting case put to the electorate. The precise questions were amendments to sections 51 and 127 of the Australian Constitution. Section 51 read—

"The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to:—

(xxvi) The people of any race (other than the aboriginal race in any State) for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws."

The amendment deleted the words "(other than the aboriginal race in any State)", and so gave the Commonwealth power to make laws—which is conceded—but not exclusive laws.

The amendment to section 127 merely made provision for Aborigines to be counted in a census. It provided that they were no longer regarded as nomadic, as once they were, and that, with improved communication, it was possible to count them and, therefore, they should not be excluded.

In the arguments that were propounded, an interesting booklet ran the length and breadth of this nation. Millions of them were around at that time, but they are now probably as scarce as hens' teeth. The booklet contained questions on the breaking of the nexus. On that argument, a "Yes" case and a "No" case were put forward. However, on the amendment to the sections dealing with Aborigines, it was apparently thought that on-one could put up a reasonable argument against the proposals because a "No" case was not presented. That was fair and reasonable, and it represented a great unanimity of thought throughout the Commonwealth. I have no argument with that, either. What I draw to the attention of the House is the precise case put forward in this booklet in support of the amendments. It reads—

"The proposed alteration of this section will do two things. First, it will remove words from our Constitution that many people think are discriminatory against the Aboriginal people.

"Second, it will make it possible for the Commonwealth Parliament to make special laws for the people of the Aboriginal race, wherever they may live, if the Parliament considers it necessary."

Here comes the "crunch"—

"This cannot be done at present because, as the Constitution stands, the Commonwealth Parliament has no power, except in the Territories, to make laws with respect to people of the Aboriginal race as such.

"This would not mean that the States would automatically lose their existing powers. What is intended is that the National Parliament could make laws, if it thought fit, relating to Aborigines—as it can about many other matters on which the States also have power to legislate. The Commonwealth's object will be to cooperate with the States to ensure that together we act in the best interests of the Aboriginal people of Australia."

**Mr. Wallis-Smith:** You are quite happy that the discrimination should remain?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Not at all. The honourable member for Cook does his own intelligence a poor compliment. I am not arguing against the carriage of the provisions; I said that I shared the sentiment that then flowed throughout the nation. However, I am pointing out that the case was sustained

on an argument put forward in a booklet which said quite clearly and succinctly that the powers would continue to be shared, and would not move automatically and totally to the central Government. It was on the basis of that proposition that the amendments were supported.

We would do well to look at the names of those who compiled the "Yes" case. The booklet states that the case has been authorised by the majority of those members of both Houses of the Parliament who voted for the proposed law, and was prepared by the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Harold Holt, Leader of the Federal Parliamentary Liberal Party; the Deputy Prime Minister, the Right Honourable John McEwen, Leader of the Australian Country Party; and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gough Whitlam, Leader of the Australian Labor Party.

My proposition is that there was nothing in the amendments to the Constitution in the 1967 referendum that said that the powers had to be surrendered to the central Government. What was said was that the Commonwealth could also make laws, and there would be a sharing in this field. In the light of the claims being made by Mr. Bryant, I think it is right and proper that this matter should be put in its correct context. I have tried to do that today.

I mentioned the Constitution Convention which will begin in a few weeks' time. There has been no gathering of greater significance in the life of the federation. Its charter to consider constitutional relevance in contemporary Australian society is a broad one. There have been great changes since the intellectual giants of the 1890's drafted the Australian Constitution and issues have arisen that, with all of their forethought, they could not have anticipated. One instances that with two examples—air navigation and nuclear power. Therefore it is right and proper that this document should be looked at again in the light of contemporary society.

It is interesting that two conflicting forces, some 50 years apart, have exerted great influence on the Constitution and moves to amend it. Those who wrote the Constitution were State-rightists, still experiencing the heady delight of separation and self-entirety. They were jealous of their rights, and reluctant to give away more than was necessary. We contrast this with the views of members of the constitutional review committee that was set up in 1958 to make recommendations. It comprised eight members of Parliament and four senators, all Commonwealth oriented, and all intent on giving more power to the Commonwealth.

Indeed, the Labor members at that conference, as an opening sortie, put on the record that they believed that all power should be exercised from the Commonwealth. The leopard has not changed its spots. After that opening sortie, the members of the committee

did try to get down to making some recommendations, but it was essentially Commonwealth oriented because of the political views of the members.

So it is, Mr. Speaker, that this convention takes place in a few weeks' time, and the overriding sentiment in this nation, which is sustained by Gallup polls, is that State rights must be entrenched and strengthened. Although the Prime Minister is perfectly entitled to espouse his centralist philosophies, he will find that he is swimming against the tide when he tries to implement them. Certainly the convention will be looking for a co-operative form of federalism, but I am certain that the overwhelming sentiment will be in favour of retention and strengthening of the powers that the States enjoy.

This really is little more than in keeping with a world trend in all of the federations. Wherever an experiment has taken place to centralise power it has been shown to be unsuccessful, and so it is that the great federations of today, in contrast to Australia, are actively seeking ways of filtering power back to the States. They have found that the central authorities collapse under the weight of the administrative functions that they take unto themselves. So I am certain that this will be the overriding sentiment when this convention is convened, and it is certainly on that charter that I look forward to participating in the convention.

I close my speech by complimenting the Governor on his opening speech to Parliament and wishing him well for the remainder of his term, and I also compliment those honourable members who initiated the debate.

**Mr. HARRIS** (Wynnum) (4.17 p.m.): Occasions such as this customarily give honourable members an opportunity of reiterating their loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and I again do so on behalf of my constituents.

However, I think that my friend and colleague from Rockhampton, Mr. Wright, summed up His Excellency's Opening Speech very fairly when he described it as a tool of the Government. Let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to one particular paragraph, of which I think most honourable members are already aware—

"Under normal conditions the mineral industry can be expected to continue its great expansion of recent years, but problems could be encountered because of the suggested changes in overseas marketing brought about by the attitudes of the Commonwealth Government."

Over the past eight months we have heard a great deal of bellowing from members of this Government about the Commonwealth Government. Never did we hear a word from them while the Menzies Government was in office and exploiting the workers right down the line. The only time they had anything to say was when members of the

Opposition in the Federal Parliament brought to their attention the anomalies that were being created in the industrial field.

**Mr. Row:** The trade unions are exploiting them now, aren't they?

**Mr. HARRIS:** It is all very well for honourable members opposite to criticise the Federal Government for what it is doing. Let me draw the honourable gentleman's attention to what has been done by the Premier of Queensland. Because he has the numbers in this House, he has endeavoured, in his caustic way, to humiliate Labor members on every possible occasion. Not only has he done that very successfully on many occasions, but he has also instructed his Ministers to do likewise.

How often have Ministers of this Government completely refused to give full and proper answers to questions in the House? How often has the Premier refused to make statements when Labor members have had something worth while to ask, particularly those who have had something to say about their own electorates? The same Premier and the same Ministers are now criticising the Prime Minister for not making certain statements that would be satisfactory to them. It is a system under which although they can dish it out, they can't "cop" it. Let us hope that Gough Whitlam really bores it into them from now on. I firmly believe that under his administration and the administration of his Ministers, Australia in particular and Queensland in general will really go ahead.

I return to the Governor's Opening Speech. It came as quite a shock to me to think that a Governor—the Queen's representative, who is supposed to be impartial—should adopt the attitude he did.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is speaking rather loosely when he says, "a Governor who is supposed to be impartial." I disagree with the use of such an expression, and I ask the honourable member to choose his words more carefully in future.

**Mr. HARRIS:** I will accede to your request, Mr. Speaker.

The Governor, Air Marshal Sir Colin Hannah, surprised not only me but most Queenslanders by his comments. If the Premier or certain officers of his department were instrumental in editing the Opening Speech, the responsibility will be on his or their shoulders. It is something that will haunt him or them for many years, because never in my political career have I seen a Governor of the State make political statements—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member continues in that strain he will be asked to resume his seat.

**Mr. HARRIS:** Continuing his Opening Speech, the Governor said—

"Depending on the availability of Federal funds, a start will be made on the first stage of the planned upgrading of the Brisbane suburban railway system which includes electrification."

What a shocking statement especially when we recall that in 1950 the Labor Government brought down legislation to implement this scheme. A total of \$16,000,000 had been spent on the project when the Country-Liberal coalition Government took office in Queensland. Had the Labor Government been still in power the electrification of the Brisbane railway system would have been completed, at an approximate cost of \$24,000,000.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** And the band played "Annie Laurie".

**Mr. HARRIS:** It is a pity it was not at the honourable member's funeral.

According to the Wilbur Smith Report, the present estimated cost of electrification is approximately \$730,000,000. This Government is now in the process of commencing electrification and, because it demolished the workshops at Northgate and various other places, new workshops will have to be constructed.

Why were all these subjects raised in the Governor's Opening Speech this year? They are all such stale news. The Government is simply endeavouring to make political capital out of them.

The Governor also said—

"Construction of homes for ownership and rental will continue. The special housing programme for aged pensioners in Brisbane and 29 other cities, which has already resulted in completion of 205 units, will be expanded."

On 2 September 1971, I asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

"Is he aware that the Housing Commission owns a large area of land in Sibley Road, Lindum?"

He admitted that he was. I also asked him—

"Is he also aware that this land is, and has been for some considerable time, in an overgrown state and is a harbour for snakes, rodents and other vermin?"

Again he admitted that he was. I also asked him—

"Will he take action to put this land to a more useful purpose by the construction of houses . . .?", and so on.

The Minister at that time—in September 1971—said he would give the matter consideration. Two years later I asked the same Minister—

"How many building sites are being held by the Department of Works and Housing for the construction of rental houses in the Wynnum electorate?"

His answer was "Nil." I also asked him—  
 "How many rental houses have been completed by the Housing Commission in Wynnum during 1971-72 and where were they situated?"

He replied that no houses were built. The land of which I am speaking is not now in my electorate but it was at that point of time. I suppose I should not be encroaching on another electorate, but I inspected the land in question this morning. It covers approximately 10 acres. It is still overgrown with lantana up to 15 feet high, and the neighbours adjacent to it informed me that it is still infested with rats and snakes. The Government apparently cannot provide funds through the Housing Commission to make accommodation available, yet in the Governor's Opening Speech it is claimed that the Government is to continue the progress it has made in the past three years. Let us hope that this claim is incorrect.

After representations by me the Minister decided to build six units in Wynnum, three for single people and three for married couples. These units were started three years ago and have been completed for some time. The grounds are overgrown with weeds and there are still no tenants in the units. People are screaming out for units—I refer particularly to elderly people—yet the Government has not made any effort to let these units to people, although in all probability many have applied for them.

The Minister for Works and Housing has informed me that the local building society in Wynnum has been given adequate funds to provide the necessary accommodation in the area. I have always been under the impression that it was the Government's responsibility to provide accommodation for the workers. Apparently the Government does not share that view. Does it believe that only private enterprise, with the assistance of overseas capital, should construct houses for the workers?

I appeal to the Minister to give earnest consideration to the provision of housing accommodation in the various suburbs of Brisbane. At the present time approximately 1,000 people in the Wynnum electorate alone are searching for accommodation. Each week on their behalf I submit at least four applications for housing.

I was greatly concerned when I read the article in this morning's Press about a new geriatric hospital that is to be opened in Wynnum at the end of the month. There is no need for me to remind honourable members that for quite a number of years the people of Wynnum have been asking for a hospital in their area. Both before and after this Government took office it promised on three separate occasions that it would construct a public hospital at Wynnum. Honourable members have often heard me say that both land and finance are available; the only thing that is lacking is consent to proceed with the project. I

have been told on numerous occasions that the area of land previously held by the Government, namely, 11 acres, was inadequate for a public hospital, and that may be so. But eventually the Government acquired another block, which gave it an area large enough for a 250-bed hospital. The geriatric hospital that is to be opened is only a very small unit, containing 80 beds. Nevertheless, I ask the Government to give earnest consideration to the conversion of a section of that hospital to a public hospital unit.

By failing to honour its promise to construct a public hospital, the Government has let down the 70,000 people who live in Wynnum and the adjacent areas.

The suburbs of Hemmant, Lytton and Bulimba are industrialised ones in which the incidence of industrial accidents is quite high. As well, owing to traffic congestion, particularly during peak periods, a journey from the bayside suburbs to any one of Brisbane's three public hospitals can take as long as three-quarters of an hour. It could be said it is most unlikely that a person would die in such a short time, but such a possibility exists, particularly in drowning cases. I am sure all honourable members know how treacherous Moreton Bay can be—and that is where our problem lies. Provision should be made for a public hospital section in the new geriatric hospital. Admittedly there is a medical clinic and a dental clinic at Wynnum, but these facilities are completely inadequate. I have frequently asked that they both give five-day coverage each week. The Government has refused to grant my request on the grounds that there are insufficient people attending the clinics, although there is a six-month waiting list for dentures, and also for the repair and replacement of dentures.

People requiring treatment at the medical clinic for other than a cold or a sore throat are referred to the Royal Brisbane Hospital or the Princess Alexandra Hospital. Why cannot a public hospital section be incorporated in the new geriatric hospital, and why won't the Government fulfil the promises it has made to the people over the last 15 or 18 years?

**Mr. Davis:** They make the same promise at every election.

**Mr. HARRIS:** Not only at election time, but at other times as well. The honourable member for Belmont made representations on this matter before I entered Parliament, and a promise was made to him that a hospital would be provided at Wynnum. I can only leave it to the Government to fulfil its promises.

It is pleasing to see the Minister in charge of police in the Chamber.

**Mr. Bromley:** That's a change.

**Mr. HARRIS:** It is not a change. He realises the very awkward situation in which he is placed and is doing all he can to

help the people. I firmly believe that he has been misled by his advisers so often that he does not know which way to turn. He is striking problems in all sections of the police administration, from the top right down to recruitment. I bitterly opposed the appointment of Mr. Whitrod in the first place, and I still do. When he was appointed I said there were many police officers in the Queensland Police Force with 30 or 40 years' experience who were quite capable of filling the position without importing someone. I still maintain that I was right.

At present the Commissioner has three Assistant Commissioners—Mr. Martens, Mr. Barlow and Mr. Duncan. If the Minister's advisers were of the proper calibre, why would he have a man like Mr. Duncan in the wrong position? No-one need ask me how I know he is in the wrong position. I know, and the Minister knows, that the only reason he is there is that Whitrod put him there. As honourable members know, Mr. Duncan is one of the finest detectives the Queensland Police Force has ever had, but he is not the Assistant Commissioner for Crime. I am led to believe that Martens has had very little police experience other than of a scientific nature in the photographic section, yet he is in charge of the administration side of the Queensland Police Force.

Then there is Mr. Barlow, who is a traffic man and a good policeman with 35 years' experience. I am talking about the qualifications of these men, not their personalities. They hold those three positions. This is not only my view. It is the general view of the Queensland Police Union and the police officers themselves. They are dissatisfied with the present situation.

We are all aware that the entire Police Force is dissatisfied about many matters. One of them is resignations. I realise that the Act prescribes that three months' notice must be given. The Minister and the chairman of the Opposition committee also know this. But what is the purpose of keeping a man on for three months after he has submitted his resignation? He then has no further interest in the job; he will not do his job, and will simply thumb his nose at authority. The Government should realise the situation and allow these people to resign in accordance with their wishes. To make them wait three months does not improve the department and lowers the morale of their colleagues.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It cuts both ways.

**Mr. HARRIS:** I thought that the honourable member for Windsor was asleep.

At present the retiring age for policemen is 60 years. I think we all agree that police officers—and in some cases public servants and parliamentarians—should be able to retire at 55 years of age. I am sure that both the Commissioner and the Minister will give due consideration to this request. There is

very little likelihood of police officers attaining senior rank after 55 years of age because of the present system of promotion and, if they had a reasonable superannuation scheme, they could retire at 55 years of age.

One matter that concerns me, and many others, is the great influx of women into the Queensland Police Force. It is all very well for the Commissioner to say they are doing the same job as policemen. This is poppycock. They cannot. Policewomen have the right to equal pay and conditions, but let us consider what has happened in my electorate during the past couple of months. One of our most efficient policemen—the traffic superintendent, who was issued with a motor-cycle—was transferred at his own request, on promotion. Of course, we cannot hold that against him. He did an extremely good job. However, his position was filled by a policewoman with eight months' service. No doubt she would be expected to do the same job as he did. However, the department took the motor-cycle away and has left the Wynnum district, with 60,000 people, without a traffic superintendent. Is it any wonder that louts come from other electorates to Wynnum to commit the crimes that are being perpetrated there at present?

**Mr. Hodges:** Did he tell you to say this?

**Mr. HARRIS:** It is all very well for the Minister to say, "Did he tell you to say this?" As a matter of fact, he did, and he has also advised me that the Wynnum electorate is at least five police officers short. The Minister is already familiar with this situation. It is a serious problem, and I ask him to give it due consideration. It is very difficult to police an area such as this one, particularly during the hours of darkness when no police officers are available between midnight and 8 a.m. It is a shocking state of affairs when business houses have no security except that for which they pay. In fact, I think it is the objective of the Government to create as many jobs as possible in security organisations in order to relieve the police of this type of work.

I am also concerned about the police house at Manly. I understood that it was for the commissioned officer who has been transferred there. I sincerely hope that this is so, and that the house will be maintained in good order for any senior officer who may be transferred to my area. The present occupant of the position already lives in the district. I ask the Minister to give consideration to that request, too.

There is another matter that has been of concern to me for 12 months. My attention was directed to it this morning when the Premier announced that the Minister for Primary Industries was going overseas. When a person is going overseas, it is customary for him to be given a send-off. I assure the Minister that I intend to give him a send-off, but I shall not be at the wharf or the airport to do it. On 14 September 1971 I

charged the Minister with engaging in fraudulent practices. I do not propose to do that again now, Mr. Speaker, because I see that you are bristling and are about to rise to your feet. I will say, however, that the Minister has not the capacity to use the phraseology contained in the report that I have in my hand. In one paragraph he gives me credit for possessing certain qualifications in my trade or calling. I doubt whether he has any qualifications whatever, even in dairy-farming. He certainly does not have any in matters dealt with by the Lands Department, otherwise he would not have been relieved of the Lands portfolio.

I might mention also that I do not give any credit, either, to the public servant who compiled this report for the phraseology or terminology it contains. He states that I was ignorant of this State's land laws when I drew to the attention of the House the fact that the lithographs used, and submitted to the people in the Land Court on the day of the sale, were such that had they been used by any private developer or real estate agent they would have been suspect.

The assertion that I was not aware of what a lithograph was and that I was assuming that these were roads is not correct. I am now, and I was then, fully conversant with lithographs. But the people who were buying the plots of land were not familiar with them. They were under the impression that they were buying land in an area on which roads were designated, and I pointed out to them at the time that that was not so. However, their present plight is shocking.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that only a fortnight ago, in answer to a question by me, the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs said that the Manly jetty was not to be demolished. He knows, I know and the great majority of the boating fraternity in Moreton Bay know that if it is not demolished it will at least become redundant.

Many of the people to whom I am referring have houses half constructed. Up till now they have been transporting, along the roadway adjacent to the Manly jetty, cement, hardwood, bricks and other building materials needed for the construction of wooden and brick buildings. However, the Government, in its wisdom, has now decided to lease that area of land to the Trailer Boating Association, of which I am patron. The people who are now prevented from using that roadway will have to manhandle the bricks, timber and other building materials over a distance of about 300 yards. That is a shocking situation!

When the land was sold, the Government made no reference to the action that has now been taken. People were told that provision would be made for the transportation by barge from Redland Bay of certain commodities and materials. Of course, that

particular system of transport is still available, but it is much farther away from Manly than the area to which I am referring today.

The Government is leasing about 40 acres of land to enable a runway to be built. I think everyone who intends living on Moreton Island is agreeable to such a runway being built. However, the parcel of land that is being leased is right in the middle of the existing road, which is known as Eager's track and has been there from time immemorial. I understand that the only alternative is to go round the bottom end of the runway, which is extremely dangerous, and I have been informed that the contractor has approached the Government for permission to build a roadway there. If the Government does not consider that such a proposal is practicable and refuses him that permission, the people living near Day's Gutter or on the other side of the island will have great difficulty in getting materials across.

These people are the pioneers of Moreton Island, and I ask that urgent consideration be given to this problem. I visualise that, if adequate roadways are provided, within five or 10 years Moreton Island will be one of the places to which many people will choose to retire. At the time I mention, the Minister said it was not the Government's responsibility to provide roads. He also pointed out that the island was not under the jurisdiction of any shire. Of course, it is now. I sincerely hope that the shire concerned will take steps to provide adequate roads so that these people can transport goods from their boats to their places of residence.

**Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (4.56 p.m.):** There are those in the community who are prepared to ridicule tradition as being something of a historical hangover from a bygone era. To me the tradition of a nation and its people is vital to attitudes to things present and things to come. It helps in times of adversity; it inspires in times of trouble; it humbles in times of success. It is an important ingredient in my way of life. No matter what changes are brought about by technology and science, I trust that things of value, such as tradition and the good influence of family life, will never change. Because of my belief, I am happy to once again associate the electors of Ithaca with my message of loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and extend to her representative, Sir Colin Hannah, our heartfelt thanks for his service to the State of Queensland and its people.

As we enter this, the second session of the Fortieth Parliament, we do so in an atmosphere of uncertainty and concern not only for the future of the State but for the future of Australia as a whole. This situation has been thrust upon Australia, and consequently upon the people of Queensland, by the

socialistic Left Wing-dominated A.L.P. Government presently occupying the Treasury benches in Canberra.

**Mr. Baldwin:** You can't cop it, either.

**Mr. MILLER:** I can cop it all right, and so can the people, but they will be able to show honourable members opposite their attitude to tradition and State rights at the appropriate time.

The tragedy is that the lessons of this life usually have to be learned through the hardship of cold experience.

Up till now the majority of the voting public in Australia has never had to witness or bear the agony of living under a dedicated, Left Wing, socialist Government in Canberra. The lessons are being delivered and the concern of our citizens is blatantly obvious. Already we have seen Prime Minister Whitlam attempting to drive nails into the coffins of the States. His secretive attempt to persuade the Parliament at Westminster to abolish the States' right of appeal to the Privy Council without reference to the States is an indication of the deceitful and underhanded methods which he and his Government colleagues will adopt to force this country and its States into submission. What a miserable, despicable action that was!

Where do A.L.P. members opposite stand in relation to State rights and sovereign ties? We heard this afternoon from the honourable member for Rockhampton, whom I thank for making his position quite clear in this regard. But when all the other States, including those of A.L.P. colour, were having their voices heard not only in Australia but throughout the world, where were the voices of the Queensland Opposition members? They were very silent indeed. Perhaps honourable members opposite were following the dictates of the Federal Government. Surely they stand condemned for their obvious willingness to betray the people of Queensland and the federal system.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Do you regard yourself as an Australian or what?

**Mr. MILLER:** I regard myself as a Queenslander and an Australian.

The one redeeming feature is that all States, irrespective of political colour, stood together to repel this attack on our freedoms. So united was this stand that the A.L.P. Conference had to direct those A.L.P. States to surrender such State powers as might be required by the Whitlam Government. Surely if anything does so, this shows that State A.L.P. Governments were prepared to stand united with the Liberal-Country Party Governments. But they have now been dictated to by the A.L.P. machine and told to hand over the rights which the Whitlam Government requires.

The Opposition stand in opposing the introduction of legislation in this House allowing Queensland's right of appeal to the Privy

Council is in keeping with this direction to the A.L.P. State Governments. Will we see these State A.L.P. Governments now continuing to take the united stand they took only a short time ago, or will we now see State rights slowly being handed over to the Federal Government?

Mr. Egerton is on record as saying, in effect, that members of Parliament are put there to do as they are told. It will be very interesting indeed to watch the political arena in the months to come to see if these words of Mr. Egerton's do, in fact, come true. There is every indication that, up to the present, what he said is completely true. The A.L.P. platform is clear; the States are to go. State Governors must go and one need not have much imagination to visualise the creation of a socialistic republic under the control of an all-powerful Left-wing, centralist government in Canberra with 50 or 60 regional councils obediently carrying out the directions handed down by the centralist government under the chairmanship of Chairman Gough or perhaps it might be Chairman Cairns or Chairman Hawke.

**A Government Member:** Or Chairman Mao.

**Mr. MILLER:** I am quite sure that they would invite Chairman Mao over here for their celebrations, should this come about. It is about time Australians sat up and took notice of the direction in which this country is heading. It is often too late for the fish to disgorge the juicy bait when it feels the sharp barbs of the vicious hook. We can clearly see that that analogy applies to us. It is later than we think. We have witnessed with sadness representatives from North Vietnam—Communist unionists—being embraced in public by trade-union bosses in this country—the same Viet Cong who were responsible for the killing of many young Australians. We have witnessed the indecent haste with which Dr. Cairns embraced Communist China and discarded Taiwan, a friend of many years' standing.

I congratulate the Premier on the introduction of the legislation that ensured Queensland's right of appeal to the Privy Council, which will continue to be a stumbling block to the socialistic Federal Government in the implementation of its aims.

Within the concept of federation it was provided that all the States had certain rights of appeal to the Privy Council. It might be argued that we can rely on the High Court of Australia as the final court of appeal and can discontinue appeals to the Privy Council. But the issue is clear. The States have the right of appeal to the Privy Council, and it is therefore their sole prerogative to determine whether or not the present situation should continue. I was extremely pleased at the introduction of legislation to ensure that Queensland retains the prerogative to decide if and when the High Court of Australia is to be used as the final court of appeal.

While I support the action of the Premier on State rights, at the same time I am bitterly disappointed that the Government did not see fit to initiate a top-level inquiry into the McAulay affair. Such an inquiry would inform the people of Queensland of the facts of the matter. Until now, they have been forced to speculate and rely on conflicting newspaper reports.

Three Press reports that I have with me disagree as to the amount that Mr. McAulay will receive. Not one newspaper is able to give the exact amount of the final settlement that will be arrived at or how it is to be made.

On 7 August this report appeared in the "Telegraph"—

"Sacked Brisbane Town Clerk, Mr. T. V. McAulay, was paid \$34,036 in full settlement of all claims by him against the Brisbane City Council."

On 8 August "The Australian" reported that Mr. McAulay was believed to have received \$77,616 as settlement from the Brisbane City Council after his dismissal. In that same newspaper the Brisbane Lord Mayor is reported to have said in a council meeting that the council had no objection to the terms of settlement being disclosed.

On the same date, 8 August, "The Courier-Mail" reported that Mr. McAulay would receive \$120,000. What does concern me in this report is the statement that the announcement caught most A.L.P. aldermen by surprise. They had been told nothing of the settlement terms. "The Courier-Mail" reported that on the previous day several had complained privately not only that the settlement terms had been kept secret but also that the aldermen had not been involved at any stage of the negotiations with Mr. McAulay and his solicitors.

Although the Lord Mayor is reported as saying that he is quite prepared to make the terms of settlement public, he has not done so. Furthermore, as I have said, the A.L.P. aldermen knew nothing whatever of the settlement. We still do not know the amount that will be paid to Mr. McAulay. Why did the Lord Mayor not inform the council as to the terms of settlement?

**Mr. Aikens:** He doesn't talk to a lot of the A.L.P. aldermen; he doesn't even know them.

**Mr. MILLER:** From the Press reports I gather that he does not talk to any of them.

I want to know the terms of settlement, and I believe I am entitled to know them.

**Mr. Houston:** Why are you entitled to know them?

**Mr. MILLER:** Because public money is involved. I am amazed that Labor aldermen were prepared to accept the bland statement that a satisfactory settlement had been reached.

**Mr. Aikens:** They are just puppets.

**Mr. MILLER:** They are the Lord Mayor's puppets. Why did not the aldermen want to know? Why did they not, like "Sunday Sun", ask what sort of settlement had been reached and how much money had been paid over to ensure that the facts surrounding Mr. McAulay's sudden sacking did not come into the open?

The "Sunday Sun" is certainly not a supporter of the political policies of members on this side of the House, yet it came out openly, for the second time since this issue started in 1971, demanding to know what was happening in the City Hall. Did we get any reply from the City Hall? None at all! What has happened is an insult to this House. Not one A.L.P. alderman supported Alderman Ord publicly in seeking information which electors are entitled to know. So much for the open government that we heard so much about prior to the Federal election and in Mr. Whitlam's policy speech.

**Mr. Aikens:** What a "rorr" the people would get if we had a Labor Government here.

**Mr. MILLER:** That is true.

We have seen what is happening in the federal sphere and now we see what is happening in the local government sphere.

On 11 July 1972 Mr. Whitlam made it quite clear that he was opposed to secrecy when he said—

"Time and time again, Parliaments, Federal and State, are asked to vote millions upon millions of your money to pay for Government decisions without the opportunity to hear or to debate the findings behind the decisions."

I am talking about the spending of public money, which the people are entitled to know about.

On 19 September, 1972, Mr. Cameron made some comments on secrecy. He promised that Labor would introduce open government and end Public Service anonymity. In a paper presented to the Institute of Personnel Management in Adelaide, he is reported as saying—

"The Federal Opposition Leader, Mr. Whitlam, had read the whole of the paper. Mr. Whitlam had asked that the institute be told he supported and endorsed the arguments and commitments it contained."

He made it quite clear that the A.L.P. was opposed to secrecy in any form. He undertook that a Labor Government would promptly introduce the present American legislation and would promote public discussions on further extensions on the Swedish model.

I shall now refer to the official policy of the Australian Labor Party on secrecy, as outlined during the Federal election campaign. It is in these terms—

“Restrictions on public servants will be reduced to the minimum necessary for the conduct of the affairs of government. Excessive secrecy in government is directly related to the fact that the Liberals have been in power too long: they have a lot to hide.”

**Opposition Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MILLER:** I could say the same about the Brisbane City Council. Perhaps the A.L.P. has been in power too long, and it has too much to hide.

The quotation continues—

“A Labor Government will introduce a Freedom of Information Act along the lines of the United States legislation.”

I believe I have made it quite plain to the Chamber that the A.L.P., supposedly, is opposed to secrecy. After the Lord Mayor made it quite plain that he was not opposed to making public the amount paid to Mr. McAulay, why has it not been made public?

Mr. Whitlam and other senior members of the A.L.P. have made it quite clear that they do not favour secrecy, yet since August 1971 we have witnessed a running battle conducted by the Lord Mayor in an endeavour to withhold from the people the real reasons behind the sacking of Mr. McAulay.

**Mr. Houston:** What was the real reason?

**Mr. MILLER:** I certainly hope that we in this Chamber will find it out.

**Mr. Houston:** Don't you know?

**Mr. MILLER:** I do not know. I hope we will find out the real reason and the total of all moneys paid to Mr. McAulay. One newspaper reported that the public was left with the impression that the Lord Mayor was almost frantic in trying to ensure that Tom McAulay's story did not get into the open.

I have quoted from these newspapers to emphasise the need for a top-level inquiry into the whole affair. We should not have to wait for the Auditor-General's report at the end of this financial year. It may not even then be able to provide the information I seek. For instance, is it possible, as stated in “The Courier-Mail”, that there may be more than one payment? Is it possible for these payments to be made out of the salary cheque for the next two years, under the guise of wages? There are too many question marks to the whole affair and as far as I am concerned these matters have to be made public.

Let us recall what has taken place since 1971 when this whole rotten affair started. The “Sunday Sun” headline at that time read, “Clem, this one smells.” That is a rather unusual headline for a paper that

supports the A.L.P. I agree with the “Sunday Sun”. The aroma has not improved with age. The House will recall that, immediately after the clash with Alderman Jones, Mr. McAulay went on long service leave and Mr. Hawes, the Deputy Town Clerk, became the Acting Town Clerk. On Friday, 13 August 1971, Mr. Hawes was informed that he was being replaced by Mr. Hackwood, one of the Assistant Town Clerks. This was not surprising, of course, as it was Mr. Hawes who refused to sack Mr. Goss for handing out how-to-vote cards for the C.M.O. on his week-ends off.

The whole matter then died down until the election, and in April 1973 Mr. McAulay was sacked with no reason being given, although the Lord Mayor made it clear that Mr. McAulay was not sacked for either incompetence or misconduct. The Lord Mayor then applied to the Supreme Court to stop Mr. McAulay getting his appeal off the ground. The Supreme Court refused to stop Mr. McAulay's appeal, and rightly so. The Lord Mayor gave notice of appeal to the High Court. He was quite determined to see that Mr. McAulay did not have that opportunity. Apparently the Lord Mayor likes the right of appeal, because he appealed to the High Court, but he does not like anybody else to have the same privilege. Then the Minister for Local Government and Electricity gave an assurance that retrospective legislation would be introduced to allow Mr. McAulay's case to be heard in public.

Now, after all of this, we are told that a settlement has been reached to the satisfaction of the Lord Mayor and Mr. McAulay. I should like to know what settlement is considered adequate by a man who was receiving in excess of \$19,000 a year, and knew that his appeal must be upheld as the Lord Mayor had made a public statement that he was not sacked for incompetence or misconduct.

**A Government Member:** I should say around \$200,000.

**Mr. MILLER:** I think \$200,000 might be near the figure. Knowing that his appeal must be upheld and knowing that the A.L.P. had to agree to reinstate him should the appeal be upheld, he would certainly want a large amount.

Why did not the Trades Hall take action in this case? The Trades Hall, which is the protector of the rights of the individual, was very silent. I can recall when one meatworker was sacked for a very good reason and the whole meatworks went on strike. The Trades Hall supported that action. It said that the man concerned must be reinstated even though he was sacked for a legitimate reason. Mr. McAulay was not sacked for misconduct. The reason for his dismissal was not given by the Lord Mayor. Yet the Trades Hall said nothing. I mention this matter to reveal the political overtones in it.

If I had to rely on newspaper reports, I would say that I am not happy with the City of Brisbane Act. When the Minister for Local Government brings down amendments necessary to allow a right of appeal under that Act, I should like to see other amendments made at the same time. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition in the Brisbane City Council should be given recognition under the City of Brisbane Act. At present, only the Lord Mayor and the Vice Mayor are recognised and paid accordingly. Never again should the Lord Mayor be able to inform the Leader of the Opposition in the council that he is only one of 21 aldermen and has no other status. If it is necessary for the Leader of the Opposition in the council to receive a higher salary, I suggest that he should receive that increase.

It is essential that the Leader of the Opposition in the council be able to speak with some authority, and be able to expect replies to questions that he considers to be of importance to the citizens of Brisbane.

**Mr. Newton:** Like the answers we get here—"No, no, no."

**Mr. MILLER:** Honourable members here, unlike Alderman Lex Ord in the Brisbane City Council, are given answers to their questions.

I also believe that questions asked in this House referring to council matters, or dealing with matters affecting the public or public money, should be answered within 24 hours. My question to the Minister for Local Government was not answered in a satisfactory way, and I think it is an insult to Parliament when a question is brushed off in such a manner. I trust the Minister for Local Government will take the necessary steps to ensure that in future the Lord Mayor will provide this House with information when answers are sought. For instance, an announcement last Friday informed the public of the settlement of the strike by garbage workers. Here was another flagrant withholding of information. A representative of the Transport Workers' Union informed "The Courier-Mail" that it was decided that the information would not be made public. I hope that information emanating from the council will be made public, and that the council will follow "more open government", as Mr. Whitlam has promised in Canberra, with more freedom of thought and detailed advice to the people so that they will know exactly what is going on in the community.

Like the honourable member for Belmont, I, too, wish to refer to home-ownership, as a home is still considered to be one of the most important investments that the average person will make. One must agree with the honourable member when he says that land is a vital part of home-ownership, and that land must be made available to home purchasers at reasonable cost. No-one in this House would disagree with that statement. Unfortunately, however, the A.L.P. Federal

Government does not believe in the freeholding of land, and at present we are witnessing the attempted revival of the policy of leaseholding of land that was so prevalent in the years immediately following World War I. Most of us can recall the flood of applications made by people who wished to freehold the land on which their workers' dwellings were built. I am quite sure that the honourable member for Belmont can recall people wishing to freehold their land.

This Government, in the early years of its administration, decided to give the people the opportunity to freehold their land, and it is this Government which at the present moment is fighting for the right of the people to freehold their land under the new Federal-State land agreement. I have no doubt that the honourable member for Belmont and his colleagues are aware that the A.L.P. Federal Government is endeavouring to force the Queensland Government into a socialistic leasehold policy.

I wish to make my position on this issue quite clear. I am totally opposed to any suggestion of forcing people to accept leasehold tenure under the new agreement. But where do honourable members opposite stand in this matter? I am hoping that during this debate the House will hear their views on the issue of freehold and leasehold land. It has already been made clear today where they stand on State rights. They are totally opposed to State rights. I would like to know where they stand relative to the freeholding of land.

**Mr. Aikens:** A.L.P. members are opposed to freeholding, except of land they hold themselves.

**Mr. MILLER:** I want them to make it quite clear where they stand on this matter.

One of the greatest problems in land development at present is the shortage of large tracts of land suitable for subdivision. This is helping to force up the price of land and is something at which the Brisbane City Council will have to look closely. There must be a quicker release of non-urban land so that competition will again force prices down to a reasonable level.

Opening up huge areas of leasehold land when people wish to own their own house and land will not help to overcome the problem. If this land is made available as freehold, it will help to create competition, but it certainly will not create competition if released as leasehold land.

I do not believe that freezing of prices will solve the problem. The new Wodonga development provides a typical example of the effect of freezing land prices. Prices there have been frozen at 1972 levels, yet residential blocks range between \$5,000 and \$7,000. The answer is to create competition.

I am not happy that overseas investors are buying land in Queensland, and I believe that the time has come when we must consider introducing legislation to prohibit the

buying of land by overseas investors for investment purposes. I wish to make my position quite clear in this regard. I am not opposed to overseas companies or individuals owning a block of land on which to build either a high-rise building or a factory. I am not opposed to investment in Australia by people from overseas, but I am opposed to overseas people tying up huge areas of land as an investment. This is creating a shortage of land and forcing up prices—exactly the opposite effect to that produced when an overseas company starts up in Australia in competition with another firm or firms.

Of course, the problem of investors forcing up land prices in Queensland is not restricted to overseas investors. I believe that our greatest problem at the moment is the inter-state investors, who, being unable to purchase sufficient land in Sydney and Melbourne, are now turning their attention to Queensland, and thus creating a problem.

This spiralling cost of land is certainly not restricted to Australia. It is world wide, and quite recently Italy and Great Britain had to act in an endeavour to contain land costs. The British Government has announced that a special tax will be created imposing a 30 per cent fine on land speculators who do not develop their lands within three years.

But what is the real value of land, Mr. Speaker? It depends on where it is situated and whether a person is prepared to pay the price asked. If the honourable member for Belmont owned a block of land and I, as a purchaser, was prepared to pay the price he asked, then that would be the value of the land to me.

**Mr. Newton:** That is not so. The Valuer-General's valuation would be different.

**Mr. MILLER:** If I pay that price, that is my value. If I pay more than the market value, I cannot blame the Government or anybody else, provided that other land is available to choose from. The important factor is that there must be other land to choose from. If I choose to pay more for the land than it is worth, that is the value I place on it.

For instance, the person who paid \$22,500 to the Brisbane City Council for a 38-perch block of land at Bardon must have thought that the land was worth \$22,500.

**Mr. Newton:** It was not an ordinary building block. It had an excellent view of the city. There is a big difference.

**Mr. MILLER:** There is a big difference. It is all right if it is paid to the Brisbane City Council. The point I am making is that the person believed that the block was worth \$22,500, otherwise he would have bought a block from the Brisbane City Council for \$10,000 in another area of Bardon, because the city council is selling land at Bardon.

**Mr. Newton:** The Government sold similar land at Tarragindi for the same price.

**Mr. MILLER:** The honourable member had the opportunity to bring that point forward.

At 5.30 p.m.,

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17 the sitting is extended to enable the honourable member for Ithaca to complete his speech.

**Mr. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask this question; should the Lord Mayor have sold his block of land in Spring Hill for \$10,000? I say "No", because the person who paid \$95,000 believes that the land is worth \$95,000. We see the A.L.P. Government coming out and saying, "We will force down prices of land in Brisbane." All we have to do here is to develop new areas of land. As I said when I spoke on the Estimates of the Lands Department before the Federal election, if we opened up areas of land outside the city of Brisbane, and provided fast commuter services to those areas, people would have an opportunity to choose between buying cheaper land outside of Brisbane and competing with others for expensive land in Brisbane. I am not opposed to a person paying Clem Jones \$95,000 for an 18-perch block in Spring Hill, because that person must believe the block of land is worth \$95,000.

**Mr. Newton:** What if it is at Tarragindi?

**Mr. MILLER:** I am not aware of any land in Tarragindi being sold for \$95,000.

I should prefer to see the Lands Department, rather than the Housing Commission, develop the land. I do not believe that Housing Commission money should be spent in buying tracts of land. It should be used for building houses and homes for the aged. If under the new proposal the Lands Department could buy land and supply it to the Housing Commission, the private buyer and the spec builder, I would have no complaint as long as the land was sold on freehold tenure.

I should like to see the spec builder being able to go into a new area, because today the package deal is a very popular one. People like to look at a house and land. When they see something that suits them they can say, "This is the house and land I want." If we can develop new areas of land outside the city of Brisbane, and if the Federal Government will supply the money for a fast commuter service, we can easily overcome the land-price problem in Brisbane.

Land costs are only one aspect of owning or renting a house. I believe that the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement will create many hardships for a big percentage of our citizens. Although the new scheme of the A.L.P. Federal Government has, on the one hand, reduced interest rates

by 1 per cent, for the first time in Queensland it has introduced a means test for those who want to buy or rent a Housing Commission house. It has also introduced a means test for anybody who wants to buy a house through a co-operative building society financed through the Home Builders' Account.

I am amazed that the Federal Government, which said it would help this State overcome its housing problem, is now creating huge hurdles that people will never be able to jump. A tradesman will not be able to buy or rent a Housing Commission home. Many people in Mt. Isa and Gladstone, for instance, will not be able to buy a home through a co-operative building society because they are earning too much money. In Brisbane, the garbage collector cannot now apply for a home through the Housing Commission.

**Mr. Davis:** You're mad!

**Mr. MILLER:** The honourable member for Brisbane says I have gone mad. I am giving facts. Throughout the State, many people will not now be able to buy or rent a Housing Commission house because they are earning too much money. And they include garbage collectors. This also applies to clerks and policemen. Until now, when a public servant has gone to a country area he has been provided with a Housing Commission home. Under the new agreement, unless there is a house available for him he will have to pitch a tent when he goes to a country area. He will be earning too much money to buy or rent a Housing Commission house.

Opposition members say that there are no hurdles to jump over. I am surprised to hear them talk like that. They must be well aware of what the Federal Government is doing in the housing field. Instead of making it easier for the people of Brisbane, it is making things harder for them. Why shouldn't the garbage collector be able to rent a home from the Housing Commission? Why shouldn't a carpenter, painter or policeman be able to?

**Mr. Newton:** He will.

**Mr. MILLER:** He will not, and the honourable member knows it.

I heard the honourable member for Logan on the television programme "P.M." the other night. He referred to the A.L.P. as a "class party". I am now quite clear in my mind as to the A.L.P. interpretation of the word "worker". These homes are only for workers, and a carpenter, a painter, a policeman, or a garbage collector is apparently not classified as a worker.

(Time expired.)

The House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.