Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 1973

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 1973

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1972.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

TRADING DEPARTMENTS, REGIONAL ELECTRIC AUTHORITIES

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

(1) With reference to his previous advice concerning the total net profit of all regional electric authorities for the year ended June 30, does a return of two per cent. on total assets of the trading departments indicate unfair trading against private enterprise firms which must show a return of about 20 per cent. on total net assets, before income tax, to give a reasonable return of eight to nine per cent. to shareholders?

(2) Should not the trading departments of electric authorities be required to maintain reasonable minimum mark-ups in order to stop unfair trading against private enterprise firms, which is definitely being practised at present?

Answers:—

(1) "No, when all factors are taken into consideration."

(2) "See Answer to (1)."

COMMISSION AND OFFICES, GOVERNMENT TOURIST BUREAU

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

(1) Are separate figures kept by the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau on its earnings for bookings for tourists travelling inside Queensland compared with its bookings for tourists travelling outside the State and, if so, what are the figures on this basis for its earnings of $499,333 for 1972-73?

(2) How much of the earnings was collected by bureau offices outside Queensland?

(3) If separate figures are not kept, will he give estimates?

(4) How many bureau offices are situated (*a*) in Queensland, and where, and (*b*) outside Queensland, and where?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "Separate figures are not kept."

(3) "Commission rates vary. Some are at the rate of 5 per cent. and others at 7½ per cent. and 10 per cent. The collections of the interstate branches of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau in the financial year 1972-73 were $3,232,021. On the assumption that the average rate was 7½ per cent., the commission earnings would be $242,401. It is not possible to determine the amount of commission earned on bookings to points outside Queensland."

(4) "There are nine branches of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau established within Queensland at Coolangatta, Surfers Paradise, Brisbane, Alexandra Headland, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns. Five branches are located interstate at Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Canberra and Newcastle."

EFFECT OF PRICE CONTROL ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS' FEES

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

(1) Is he aware of reports that the Commonwealth Government intends to control fees charged by the professions, including public accountants, if it is given control over prices in the forthcoming referendum?

(2) In the policing of such a centralised fee-rate control, will it be necessary for a regular return to be sent to Canberra by each public accountant, with the resultant disruption to office routine?

(3) Will the Commonwealth Government be able to enforce its threat of heavy penalties on those businesses which do not "toe the line" with what Canberra thinks is a fair price or rate?

Answers:—

(1) "Judging by the attitude of the present Federal Government towards the professions, it is more than probable that it would use any additional power gained at the referendum to control fees charged by professional groups. The 'yes' case prepared by the Prime Minister clearly indicates that such fees would be controlled by the Federal Government, even though there has not yet been any positive statement by the Federal Government as to what prices and incomes would be controlled. The existing right of professional groups to fix fee scales and rates for service would undoubtedly be removed."

(2) "I have no doubt that the effective supervision of such controls would require the creation of a massive bureaucracy in

Canberra and would involve professional people in time-consuming and costly paper work. I also have no doubt that individuals would be encouraged by the Federal Government to act as pimps and informers in relation to the observance by others of rigid, bureaucratic controls."

(3) "Again judging by the current attitude of Canberra towards business and the professions, no doubt heavy penalties would be imposed on any individual who tries to resist bureaucratic dictates as far as fees are concerned."

LISTING OF STATE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS IN REGIONAL TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES

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

In view of the difficulty which many people in provincial city areas have in finding the correct State Government departments' listings in regional telephone directories, will he approach the Postmaster-General to see if it is possible to have all State Government departments listed together at the head of the provincial city listings, in a manner similar to that in the Brisbane telephone directory?

Answer:—

"The format of regional telephone directories is something coming entirely within the authority of the Postmaster-General. However, and without my knowing the Postmaster-General's policy in the matter, the Honourable Member's proposal would appear to have some merit and I am quite willing to forward it on through the appropriate channels."

FORGAN BRIDGE, MACKAY

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

(1) What was the total cost of the recent alteration and repairs to the Forgan Bridge at Mackay?

(2) Is he aware that the concrete road surface of the bridge is still in such a poor condition that the Mackay people are referring to it as the roughest half-mile on the whole Bruce Highway?

(3) As a matter of urgency, will he have the Main Roads Department investigate the possibility of laying a three-inch hot-mix bitumen surface on top of the concrete deck in order to provide a wearing surface on this important thoroughfare in Mackay equivalent to that being provided on the freeways in Brisbane?

Answers:—

(1) "New footwalk, $180,400. Underpinning and strengthening, $362,800."

(2) "Maintenance funds are made available to Mackay City Council but the very heavy traffic does cause maintenance problems. This is why the planning for the new bridge at Rocklea is being given high priority."

(3) "I will refer the matter to the District Engineer, Mackay, for a report and estimate of cost."

COOLITE WATER BOTTLES FOR RAILWAY FETTLING GANGS

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

(1) With reference to my representations to him concerning a request from fettling gangs that they be supplied with coolite water bottles in lieu of water bags and his reply on July 3 that arrangements would be made to provide coolite water bottles and to withdraw the water bags at present on issue if the gangs concerned submitted applications through their Permanent Way Inspector to the General Manager, Townsville, is he aware that the water bottles have not been made available for issue?

(2) When will they be made available?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Sixty applications were received from gangs in the lower Burdekin area for the supply of 'Coolite' water bottles in lieu of water bags and of these, 34 were sent forward from Brisbane on November 19, 1973. The remainder will be despatched immediately they are received from the supplier."

COTTON-GROWING AREAS ADJACENT TO RIVER SYSTEMS; ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT OF PESTICIDES

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

(1) Will he detail the areas in which significant amounts of cotton are grown?

(2) Are any of these areas adjacent to river systems and, if so, what are the details?

(3) What pesticides are normally used on cotton crops and is there any restriction on the quantities used and when they are used?

(4) Are there continuing surveys and research to ascertain what effect such pesticides have on the environment, particularly to streams and waterways and the birds and animals dependent on them?

Answers:—

(1) "The areas of the State in which significant areas of cotton are grown are:—Biloela–Thangool–Wowan, 1,000 ha irrigated, 400 ha dry land; Theodore–Moura, 920 ha irrigated, 40 ha dry land;

Emerald, 50 ha irrigated; Rockhampton, 140 ha dry land; Darling Downs, 1,650 ha irrigated; Forest Hills–Gatton, 300 ha irrigated; St. George, 2,700 ha irrigated, 120 ratoon irrigated. Total, 7,320 ha."

(2) "Cotton areas at Theodore and Moura are adjacent to the Dawson River. Crops at Biloela and Thangool are adjacent to streams but growers use mainly underground water for irrigation and drainage tends to be away from the streams. The major area at St. George is located some miles from the Balonne River."

(3) "Heliothis is the key pest and control for other pests is not general. D.D.T. is used but is being phased out when the resistance by Heliothis armigera is apparent. This resistance is confined to the Darling Downs and Lockyer Valleys. Endosulfan can be used in place of D.D.T. Monocrotophos may be used to control mites and aphids. Dicofol may be used against mites. Endrin is recommended for rough boll worm. For Loopers we do not recommend specific control but should it be needed, endrin is recommended. The restriction on use is primarily a financial one. Pesticides are expensive and there is a natural tendency not to over use for economic reasons as well as agronomic reasons."

(4) "No. There is no continuing research by my Department to ascertain what effect such pesticides have on the environment. There are world wide investigations on this subject and our research scientists are well aware of developments in this area and their implications. The research emphasis in my Department has been, and continues to be, aimed at reducing pesticide use to a minimum. It is also aimed at investigating methods of biological control as opposed to chemical control. The Fauna Conservation and Biochemical Branches of my Department are aware of the potential problem and investigate any reported or possible harmful side effects of pesticide use."

SENTENCES FOR RAPE, GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM AND ASSAULT OCCASIONING BODILY HARM

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

(1) What are the maximum penalties currently provided for (*a*) rape, (*b*) grievous bodily harm and (*c*) assault occasioning bodily harm?

(2) What were the penalties imposed for the last five instances of these crimes in the Supreme and District Courts in Brisbane?

Answers:—

(1) "(*a*) Imprisonment with hard labour for life; (*b*) Imprisonment with hard labour for 7 years; (*c*) Imprisonment with hard labour for 3 years."

(2) "(*a*) 5 years, 5 years, 7 years, 4 years and 5 years imprisonment. (*b*) Section 19 (9) recognizance of $200 for 2 years; 6 years' imprisonment with hard labour; 5 years' imprisonment with hard labour; 2½ years' imprisonment with hard labour; No others recorded in last 12 months. (*c*) 4 months' imprisonment with hard labour; 12 months' imprisonment with hard labour; fine $50 in default 2 months' imprisonment with hard labour and recognizance of $200 for 2 years; 16 months' imprisonment with hard labour; recognizance of $200 for 3 years."

MISSING YACHT, "SOUTHERN MAID"

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

In view of the acute distress being caused to the relatives and friends by the outrageous stories, rumours and conjectures being publicly circulated by the news media concerning the ship "Southern Maid", owned by Mr. Ramsay, which was reported missing *en route* from Australia to Hong Kong, can he give the House any reliable information about the missing ship?

Answer:—

"Responsibility for search and rescue operations on the high seas is at the International level and in Australia comes within the area of responsibility of the Commonwealth Department of Transport."

POLLUTION OF HERBERT RIVER BY TIN-DREDGING OPERATIONS

(*a*) **Mr. Row,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

Is he aware that mining sludges from tin-dredging operations in the watershed areas have reappeared in the Herbert River and are presently polluting that stream and as these acts are frequently perpetrated by the mining companies in spite of warnings and certain provisions laid down in the terms of their leases, will he take immediate action to have the monetary penalties provided for applied, so as to deter the companies from flagrantly defying the law, public opinion and decent democratic principles?

Answer:—

"I am aware that sludge from some mining operations has recently entered the Herbert River due to heavy rain in the Ravenshoe area. The companies have

taken all reasonable measures to comply with the conditions on their leases and to prevent pollution, but due to the impossibility of settling the slimes suspended in the effluent from the mining operations, the escape of sludge is inevitable when the spillways to the slimes areas overflow. I do not propose to require the companies to cease their mining operations, nor do I propose action with a view to forfeiture of their leases."

(*b*) **Mr. Row,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

Will he take immediate action to investigate pollution of the Herbert River by tin-mining operations in the watershed and apply the provisions of the Clean Waters Act to deter the irresponsible and arrogant disregard for the public welfare which is so openly displayed by the companies?

Answer:—

"The pollution of the Herbert River has been investigated on a number of occasions. A conference was held recently attended by representatives of the two mining companies which operate in the area, the Mines Department and the Department of Local Government. Following this conference one of the mining companies has applied for a licence under the *Clean Waters Act* 1971 and the application is currently being investigated. The other mining company is confident that it can contain its wastes on its mining lease and thus create no water pollution. Both companies have been advised that the provisions of the Act will be enforced in respect of their operations."

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON INCOMES REFERENDUM AND EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

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

(1) Is he aware of a statement by the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, on November 18, and reported in *The Townsville Daily Bulletin* of November 19, that equal pay for women was likely if the Government received a "yes" vote for incomes at the referendum?

(2) As the purpose of the referendum is supposed to be to control inflation, what are the implications of the statement?

Answers:—

(1) "I am aware of the statement attributed to the Prime Minister."

(2) "Most Governments have accepted the principle of equal pay for women doing equal work. However, control over incomes is an extremely wide power and I share the Honourable Member's fear that if by some mischance it is given to the present Commonwealth Government it will be used for far more sinister purposes than the ostensible one being put before the people of controlling inflation."

INCONSISTENCY IN PENALTIES IMPOSED BY ACTING STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE, BUNDABERG

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

(1) In view of the variation in the penalties imposed by the Acting S.M. in the Bundaberg Court on September 11 in four cases of driving without due care and attention, what are the reasons for the difference in penalties imposed on Mrs. J. E. Howard, Mrs. E. M. McDonald, Mr. P. C. Hitchcock, and Mr. M. T. Dunn?

(2) Do the judgments indicate discrimination against women drivers?

(3) Does the suspension of licence necessitate the person starting again from the beginning, having a driving test and carrying a "P" plate on the car?

Answers:—

(1) "Each case depends on the circumstances and the penalty is in the discretion of the magistrate."

(2) "No."

(3) "Yes."

REORGANISATION OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION, WIDE BAY–BURNETT REGION

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

(1) In view of the Government's expressed policy on decentralisation, will the Wide Bay-Burnett Regional Electricity Board continue to operate in the best interests of consumers or will the proposed reorganisation of the electricity supply administration, to operate from 1975, mean the elimination of the existing authority and its absorption into one or more of the new authorities?

(2) Has consideration been given to the personal and financial hardship which will be inflicted on employees adversely affected by transfer or retrenchment of staff?

(3) As the number of families involved will represent a direct setback to the prosperity and advancement of Bundaberg, Maryborough and district, will he review the position if there is a possibility of the elimination of the Wide Bay-Burnett Regional Electricity Board?

Answers:—

(1) "Details of the proposed reorganisation of the electricity supply industry in Queensland will be released on December 6 and 7, but I can say without hesitation that I should expect any person appointed to the Board of an electric authority to operate that Board in the best interests of electricity consumers regardless of how that Board may be constituted."

(2) "I have already stated in this House on November 1, 1973 in answer to a question by the Honourable Member for Cairns, Mr. R. Jones, M.L.A., that there will be no retrenchments because of the reorganisation and that no present employee will be disadvantaged thereby. In fact there will be certain advantages for employees."

(3) "I do not accept the Honourable Member's supposition."

INSPECTION OF INTERSTATE RAIL CONSIGNMENTS OF CRABS

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

(1) Has a fisheries inspector the authority, with or without a warrant, to enter a railway station and open packages of crabs consigned interstate?

(2) When packages are opened and the repacking causes death to some crabs owing to inexperience in packaging, has the owner any right to compensation from the Fisheries Branch?

Answers:—

(1) "In the general course of his duties, a fisheries inspector has certain powers of entry and search, and I would refer the Honourable Member to Section 13 of *'The Fisheries Acts,* 1957 *to* 1962'."

(2) "To answer the Honourable Member's Question, I would need a full knowledge of all the circumstances of the particular case. I should not expect to find, however, that inexperience would be a factor in any such situation."

CROWN APPEALS AGAINST COURT SENTENCES

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

What powers are given to the Attorney-General to lodge appeals against the inadequacy of sentences imposed by courts, how many have been lodged in relation to Supreme Court and District Court sentences during 1973 and how many have been upheld?

Answer:—

"(*a*) The Attorney-General may appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal against any sentence pronounced by the Court of trial. (*b*) 24 appeals lodged. (*c*) 13 appeals upheld."

USE IN HOSPITALS OF CARDIOPHONE ELECTROCARDIOGRAPH TELEPHONE TRANSMISSION SYSTEM

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

Has he read the article in *The Australian* of November 20, which stated that heart patients will dial their diagnosis? If so, what part will public hospitals play in the scheme?

Answer:—

"Advances in electronics have recently made available a method for transmitting electrocardiograms over routine telephone lines. The equipment required, in addition to an electrocardiograph machine, consists of transmitting and receiving sets. The Director of the National Heart Foundation, Queensland Branch; the cardiologist at Chermside Hospital; and the Director-General of Health and Medical Services have discussed the possible use of such equipment in Queensland hospitals. With such equipment a doctor in the country could transmit an electro-cardiogram to a base hospital where it could be interpreted by a specialist physician who would then advise the country practitioner by telephone regarding the management of the patient. I am advised that the Queensland Country Women's Association has agreed to adopt the role of mother association for the scheme for the installation of cardiophones in country hospitals and I welcome the proposed participation by that organisation. Approval has been given for a pilot scheme to test out the system. It is proposed to install transmitters in a number of hospitals in the Burnett and near North Coast areas. The Chermside Hospitals Board has been given approval to purchase the necessary equipment. It is not anticipated that the scheme will be used for routine electrocardiograms but if successful it should prove a boon to country doctors faced with cardiac emergencies who will be able to obtain specialist advice almost immediately."

JETTIES AND WHARFAGE FACILITIES, TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS

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

As the loading and unloading of supplies and passengers at all Torres Strait islands necessitates the use of dinghies, which apart from the extra time and handling is hazardous and dangerous, will he consider building jetties and wharfage facilities for all islands?

Answer:—

"The matter of wharf facilities at the Torres Strait islands is under regular consideration but to the present has not been found to be a practical economic proposition. The Honourable Member is assured

that every possible precaution is taken by the experienced masters of Departmental vessels operating in the area to avoid any foreseeable hazards."

STONE CRUSHER, DAUAN ISLAND

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

(1) Has any finality been reached in connection with the proposed stone crusher at Dauan Island?

(2) Have negotiations continued with Papua New Guinea concerning possible orders and, if so, to what extent?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "No firm commitment to accept gravel has yet been made and until firm orders are received it is not possible to determine the type of equipment most suitable. Estimates received vary from an initial order of one thousand yards and annual commitments of fifty yards which do not justify major capital commitments. The matter is being actively followed up."

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY FOR CROYDON AND EDWARD RIVER AND LOCKHART RIVER ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

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

When will electricity be available for (*a*) Croydon, (*b*) Edward River and (*c*) Lockhart River?

Answer:—

"(*a*) Before the end of 1974. (*b* and *c*) The Cairns Regional Electricity Board is acting as consultants for the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs in providing electricity supply to these centres. Work on the generating plant and reticulation is continuing at both centres but with the advent of the wet season it is impossible to say when the work will be completed. Should the Honourable Member require any further information I suggest he direct a question to my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs."

EFFECT OF PRICE CONTROL ON LOCAL AUTHORITY RATES AND CHARGES

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

(1) Is the word "Prices" in the forthcoming referendum interpreted to include local authority rates and charges?

(2) What effect will this have on the autonomy at present enjoyed by local authorities throughout Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) "It could be interpreted that the forthcoming referendum which seeks an expression of opinion on empowering the Commonwealth Government to control prices includes the control of rates and charges imposed by a Local Authority."

(2) "Under the *Local Government Act* 1936–1973, a Local Authority has complete autonomy as to the amount of rates and charges it levies each financial year, such rates and charges being founded on the budget framed and adopted by the Local Authority. The present autonomy of the Local Authority to frame and adopt its budget and determine the rates and charges to be levied would be seriously affected if control of prices were a function of the Commonwealth and such control extended to the matters mentioned. I am sure that any usurpation of powers by the Commonwealth in this direction would be strenuously opposed by Local Authorities, however if the applicable referendum is carried the matter would be beyond Local Government control."

EFFECT OF ROAD PLAN REVIEW ON GAZETTED ROAD MILEAGE

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

(1) Was the road plan for Queensland reviewed in 1970 and did the review reduce the number of gazetted miles of roads in Brisbane from 90 to 85?

(2) Were certain roads within the Greater Brisbane area, which were previously gazetted under the Main Roads Act, demained as a direct result of the road-plan review?

(3) Was the Boundary Road–McCullough Road bypass from Ipswich Road to the Pacific Highway, for traffic from south and west Queensland to northern New South Wales, demained and was the Albany Creek Road, which serves as a bypass for the Bruce Highway at flood time, also demained?

(4) Have requests been made for the roads to be regazetted and, if so, with what result?

(5) Was the number of miles of gazetted roads in country areas increased or decreased in the 1970 review?

(6) What does gazettal mean in relation to construction, maintenance, road safety, costs and responsibilities?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes, during the year 1969-70. The length of gazetted miles was reduced to 86 miles approximately, but the gazetted road system included the most heavily trafficked roads and ones involving costly construction such as freeways and expressways."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "Yes, a length of 7·2 miles was demained in the Coopers Plains–Rochedale area and a length of 2·5 miles demained in the Aspley area."

(4) "No formal request has been received from the Brisbane City Council although the deadline for such requests was March 30, 1973. The review has not yet been finalised."

(5) "Gazetted roads in country areas were increased by about 170 miles in the 1969-70 review."

(6) "Gazettal means that roads so declared are eligible for Commonwealth and State funds specifically allocated to the declared road system. It also means that the ratepayer in any local authority is relieved of all costs in relation to roads declared as State highways and urban arterials and the local authority is responsible for only part of the cost involved for roads declared with the status of developmental, main, urban, sub-arterial or secondary. Apart from highways, urban arterials and developmental roads, where work is largely controlled by the Department of Main Roads, local authorities, by agreement, willingly bear responsibilities as the constructing authority for most of the permanent works and maintenance carried out on the other types of road."

PUBLIC HOSPITAL COSTS, TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

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

(1) Has an estimate been made by his Department or any of our State hospitals of the annual cost of road accidents to the hospital system?

(2) Are figures available from the Royal Brisbane or the Princess Alexandra Hospitals on the yearly percentages of hospital beds occupied by road-accident victims?

(3) Are figures or estimates available on the percentages of theatre time and medical, nursing, ambulance and other staff committed to the care of road-accident victims?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "No."

(3) "No. The information requested in respect of the Royal Brisbane and Princess Alexandra Hospitals in relation to treatment of road accident victims is not maintained by either Hospitals Board. Road accident victims are but one of many categories of patients admitted to our hospitals. The keeping of records for the innumerable different categories of patients could not be justified."

ROAD SAFETY COUNCIL; REVIEW OF PENALTIES FOR TRAFFIC BREACHES

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

(1) Who are the members of the Road Safety Council?

(2) How many community road-safety organisations exist in country and provincial cities and towns?

(3) Does the road-safety section of his Department review the results of penalties and the types of penalties provided for infringements of traffic laws and, if so, when was the last review undertaken and what were the recommendations?

Answers:—

(1)—

"Member	Representing
Mr. A. Bevis	Transport Workers' Union
Mr. B. C. Dickenson ..	Fire & Accident Underwriters' Association
Mr. C. H. Dwyer ..	Taxi Council of Queensland
Mr. G. A. Edmiston ..	Optometry
Mr. R. K. Elsworth ..	17–25 age group
Mr. A. V. Goodridge ..	Division of Occupational Safety and Weights and Measures
Mr. W. B. Kaus, D.F.C., M.L.A.	Member of the Legislative Assembly
Mr. A. Jackson ..	Chamber of Automotive Industries
Mr. A. F. Luya, C.B.E.	Master Carriers Association
Mr. R. McCafferty ..	R.A.C.Q.
Mr. A. O. Morris ..	Main Roads Department
Mr. M. Muller	Queensland Motor Cycle Importers and Traders
Mr. B. Olsen	Electronics
Mr. R. D. Penfold ..	Bus Proprietors Association of Queensland
Mr. C. R. Roberts ..	Department of Education
Superintendent F. A. Thrupp	Police Department
Mr. G. B. Tutt	Service Clubs
Mr. T. J. Van Fleet ..	Commercial Vehicle Industry Association of Queensland

As the Honourable Member will be aware, I am Chairman of the Council. The Deputy Commissioner for Transport, Mr. T. P. Andersen, is Executive Vice-Chairman and Mr. N. F. Kent is the Secretary."

(2) "Four directly associated with the Queensland Road Safety Council. However, the emphasis now is on achieving a close liaison and co-operation through the various service clubs throughout the State and I am pleased to say, they have co-operated magnificently and it will be noted are formally represented on the Council."

(3) "This is not a function of the Road Safety Council but rather of the Traffic Advisory Committee constituted under Section 7A of the *Traffic Act* 1949–1971, which receives reports from many sources including the Road Safety Council on matters related to the use of the roads. This committee reports regularly to me on the operation of the Act and its Regulations in all its varied aspects and where necessary, appropriate action is taken."

DR. M. A. COLSTON, A.L.P. SENATE CANDIDATE

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

(1) Is Mr. Colston, the A.L.P. candidate for the forthcoming Senate election, the same person who welcomed Tariq Ali, the Pakistani revolutionary, when he visited Queensland earlier this year?

(2) Does he have any knowledge of Mr. Colston's membership of the Communist Party of Australia or the Socialist Workers' League?

Answers:—

(1) "My information is that Dr. Colston was not present at the arrival in Queensland of Tariq Ali."

(2) "To date, I have no knowledge or information which would substantiate the Honourable Member's suggestion. He is however, a member of the A.L.P., which has left and right wings and is a socialist party."

Mr. F. P. MOORE: Before asking the first question standing in my name, I point out that the word "brutality", which I used when giving notice of the question, has been changed to "irresponsibility". I believe that the whole situation at Weipa was brutal and that the word "brutality" should have remained in the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The clerks at the table have the right to edit questions and they do so—and they have my complete backing.

DAMAGE CAUSED BY ABORIGINES AT HOTEL, WEIPA

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

(1) As the Aboriginal community of Weipa South settlement virtually destroyed all plate glass at the Albatross Hotel at Weipa and caused serious damage in the beer garden, does he consider that the sentence of only one man, with a $20 fine and $200 restitution, is adequate for such behaviour and irresponsibility?

(2) Is he aware that a man who went to the hotel to pick up his wife, who was finishing work there, had his skull fractured either from a rock or a full beer can and was flown out of Weipa on the Sunday morning?

(3) Is he aware that the settlement canteen has incurred a substantial loss and has been closed?

(4) Will he assure the people of Weipa that the Aborigines concerned will face the same legal penalties as does the white community and will he ban camping by Aborigines on what has been appropriately known as "Stubby Beach"?

Answers:—

(1) "The decision of the court on the charge is a matter for appeal by the appropriate authority if so determined in the light of the evidence presented."

(2) "I have heard these allegations."

(3) "The beer canteen at Weipa South has not been closed and in fact has recorded favourable trading results."

(4) "Incidents such as occurred at Weipa are to be deplored. Regardless of race those involved are subject, if guilty, to all of the usual penalties. The area referred to as 'Stubby Beach' is within the Special Bauxite Mining Lease and therefore is under the control of Comalco Limited."

BEACH FRONTAGE REGULATIONS, NORTH QUEENSLAND

Mr. F. P. Moore, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) What are the regulations of the Beach Protection Authority concerning buildings on beach frontages?

(2) As it has been reported that buildings have to be 500 metres from the shore, will the authority reconsider this and examine North Queensland beach frontages which are protected by the Great Barrier Reef?

Answers:—

(1) "There are no Regulations under the Beach Protection Act relating to building requirements on beach frontages. Section 44 of the Act provides that a person shall not erect or alter a structure on any land in a beach erosion control district without a permit from the Beach Protection Authority. The Authority may grant or refuse to grant a permit or may grant it subject to such terms and conditions as the Authority deems fit."

(2) "The Beach Protection Act relates the conditions it applies to land use and buildings in a beach erosion control district to its assessment of the beach erosion potential in that district. The Chairman of the Authority has informed me that he is not aware of any building permit granted conditional upon provision of a buffer zone of 500 metres in width. If the Honourable Member can be more specific, I will have the matter further investigated."

CLOSURE OF EL ARISH POLICE STATION

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

Does his Department have any intention of closing the El Arish Police Station and, if so, is the Department aware of the large area which the resident policeman has to cover and the importance of a policeman to that area?

Answer:—

"No consideration has been given to the closure of the El Arish Police Station."

CONVICTIONS AND SENTENCES FOR MANSLAUGHTER

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

(1) How many persons have been convicted of manslaughter in the Supreme Court, Brisbane, during 1973?

(2) What sentences were imposed in respect of each conviction?

(3) What is the maximum penalty provided in The Criminal Code for manslaughter?

Answers:—

(1) "3. (*a*) Charge of murder, verdict guilty of manslaughter; (*b*) Charge of manslaughter, verdict guilty of manslaughter (motor car case); (*c*) Charge of murder, verdict guilty of manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility."

(2) "(*a*) Imprisonment with hard labour for 14 years; (*b*) Imprisonment with hard labour for 5 years; (*c*) Four years probation. In the case of (*c*), my appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal against the sentence was dismissed."

(3) "Imprisonment with hard labour for life."

DECEASED PRISONER, THOMAS ROBINSON

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

(1) With reference to my Question of November 1 concerning the death of prisoner Thomas Robinson, what was the name and address of the sister reported to have been notified, as contained in the records?

(2) Was the prisoner's brother, Angus Robinson, presently believed to be at H.M. Prison, Wacol, notified of the death of Thomas Robinson and, if so, when?

(3) Was the sister requested to (*a*) identify the body as that of her brother, (*b*) claim the body and dispose of it and (*c*) claim any personal belongings of the deceased, and what other requests were made of her?

(4) In which particular section of the Mount Gravatt cemetery was the body buried and with whose permission?

(5) Why and where was the body kept from October 6 to October 22?

(6) Were any parts or organs removed from the body and, if so, which, who gave permission for their removal and to whom were they sent?

Answers:—

(1) "When Thomas Robinson was received into prison, he gave his next of kin as a sister, Mrs. Gertie Skinner, Corindi Clarence, New South Wales. He did not give any particulars of other relatives."

(2) "Yes. On October 15, 1973. However, prison authorities were not aware of the relationship but advice was conveyed immediately such relationship was brought to notice."

(3) "Details of requests made to Mrs. Skinner by the New South Wales Police after she was located by them at Coffs Harbour, are not known. She was not asked to identify the body as that of her brother as such procedure is not required unless the Police who conduct the investigation deem it necessary. She advised the New South Wales Police that she did not wish to claim her brother's body for burial and that she did not have any means to assist in the burial. Personal belongings are held at the prison awaiting claimant."

(4) "Portion 2c Section 1 Allotment 3. Arrangements were made for burial by the Government Undertaker in accordance with the provisions of Section 28 of the Prisons Act which empowers the Comptroller-General of Prisons to arrange burial if the body of a deceased prisoner is not claimed."

(5) "The body was kept from October 6 to October 22 at the City Morgue pending investigations by the police as to the whereabouts and the intentions of the sister quoted by the prisoner as his next of kin and also awaiting the decision of the prisoner Angus Robinson as to whether he desired to claim the body and bury it privately. He eventually decided that he did not wish to take that action."

(6) "As indicated in my Answer of November 1, 1973, the death was reported to the Coroner and it would have been a matter for his decision as to whether a post mortem examination was held. Any organs which may have been removed would have been removed in accordance with the provisions of the Coroner's Act."

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS

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

(1) With reference to the delineation of boundaries of eleven areas defined for regional development, have objections been lodged with his Department and, if so, how many have been received and how many have come from local authorities and which were the local authorities?

(2) What was the reason for increasing the number from ten, as set in 1971-72, to eleven in **1973-74?**

Answers:—

(1) "The Northern Region was declared on June 28, and no objections relating to regional boundaries were received. The remaining nine regions were declared on October 4. Nine objections relating to the delineation of regional boundaries were received from Local Authorities namely, Boulia Shire Council, Caboolture Shire Council, Croydon Shire Council, Diamantina Shire Council, Douglas Shire Council, Duaringa Shire Council, Glengallan Shire Council, Jericho Shire Council and Warwick City Council. Five objections relating to other aspects of establishment of Regional Co-ordination Councils were received from Local Authorities namely, the Brisbane City Council, Booringa Shire Council, Gold Coast City Council, McKinlay Shire Council and Richmond Shire Council."

(2) "In 1972, eleven regions were tentatively defined and published in the 1972 Annual Report of the Co-ordinator-General's Department. Subsequently, comments on these tentative regions were sought from all local authorities and State Government departments. In 1973, ten regions were defined and declared. The number of regions was reduced from eleven to ten as a result of the aggregation of the two tentative regions based on Maryborough and Bundaberg following an examination of local authority comments."

CAMPING RESERVE, VICTORIA POINT

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

(1) How did the land at Victoria Point known as the camping reserve come to be used for that purpose?

(2) Was the land given to the council and, if so, when and what was the area?

(3) Has the Redland Shire Council full jurisdiction over the reserve?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The area of 10 acres in the Camping Reserve at Victoria Point was set aside as Reserve for Recreation, Victoria Point, and placed under the control and management of the Council of the Shire of Tingalpa as Trustees by proclamation of February 17, 1909 published in the *Government Gazette* of February 20, 1909. Prior to that, the land was vacant Crown land set apart for public purposes but had not been proclaimed as a reserve. In 1956, with the consent of the local authority at the time, the Redland Shire Council, the purpose of the reserve was amended to Reserve for Camping and Recreation, Victoria Point, and placed under the control of the Council of the Shire of Redland as Trustee by the Order in Council of January 25, 1956."

(3) "The powers, functions and duties of the Redland Shire Council as Trustee of the Camping and Recreation Reserve are as defined in the Land Act. In general terms, the Council may take such actions in respect of the land which are consistent with the purposes of the reservation. The Council may also, with the consent of the Governor in Council, make by-laws for the control and management of the reserve and may also, with my consent, grant leases over parts of the land for which it is the Trustee. It is mentioned that the Council has recently requested that consideration be given to amending the purpose of the reserve from Camping and Recreation to Recreation and this is presently being looked into."

VALUER-GENERAL'S REVALUATION, ALBERT SHIRE

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

(1) Has the Valuer-General's nominee observed all the requirements of the Act governing the valuation of lands for local government rating purposes in the Albert Shire?

(2) If on investigation he finds that the specific details embodied in the Act have not been complied with, will he set aside the revaluation and instruct his Department to conduct a new valuation?

Answers:—

(1) "The Valuer-General is bound to perform his valuations for rating and taxing under the provisions of the *Valuation of Land Act* 1944–1971 and I have no reason to believe that there have been any departures from those provisions. In any case, if any land-owner believes he has been unjustly treated, there is provision in the Act to object to his valuation."

(2) "The correct procedure to be adopted by a landowner who believes his valuation is not correct is for the landowner to lodge an objection against his valuation with the Valuer-General within sixty days of the date of issue of the notices of valuations. The notices of valuation in respect of Albert Shire having issued on October 31, 1973, the last day for lodging a valid objection will be December 31, 1973, the latter being the first day the office is open after the day (December 30, 1973) upon which the period of 60 days expires. An objection having been lodged, the Valuer-General,

under the provisions of Section 20 of the *Valuation of Land Act* 1944–1971, has the authority either to disallow the objection or allow it in such manner and to such extent as he deems proper. Furthermore the Valuer-General and the owner may, by mutual consent, confer before the Valuer-General makes a decision upon the objection. It is the Valuer-General's policy to confer with landowners where the latter have indicated upon their objection form that they desire a conference. These conferences are 'without prejudice' and confidential and I am perfectly confident that the Valuer-General will ensure that any objections lodged will be fully considered and investigated and, if necessary, the properties which were the subject of the valuations re-inspected before decisions upon the objections are given. It would not be proper for me to instruct the Valuer-General as to the decisions he should make. It is further mentioned that, after receipt of the Valuer-General's notice of decision upon the objection, the landowner has further recourse in law in that he can appeal to the Land Court against the decision of the Valuer-General but an appeal to be valid must be lodged within 60 days of the date of issue of the decision upon the objection. I must say generally that I am fully aware of the steep increase in the valuation of the Albert Shire but I am also aware that it has been the scene of great real estate activity for some years now as is evidenced by the fact that there were lodged, during the year ended June 30 1973, 18,079 notices of change of ownership in the Shire which presently contains 26,918 rateable valuations. In view of the fact that many landowners may be confused as to their rights of objection to the valuations and generally could not be expected to be completely *au fait* with the provisions of the *Valuation of Land Act* 1944–1971, I have arranged with the Valuer-General for two senior officers of the Department to be in attendance at the Department's office on the first floor of the Court House, Scarborough Street, Southport from 9 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. on Friday next, November 23, 1973 in order to furnish advice to enquirers."

ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC BRIDGE, FITZROY RIVER, ROCKHAMPTON

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

In view of the alarming increase in traffic congestion being caused by the limited access to the Fitzroy River traffic bridge at Rockhampton, will he examine the need for the construction, at an earlier date than planned, of a further traffic bridge?

Answer:—

"Present planning requires the design of a further traffic bridge across the Fitzroy River to be completed by June 1975. Planning for future construction is somewhat uncertain until details of the next Commonwealth Aid Roads Act are made known. Cross river traffic needs at Rockhampton will be given due consideration when allocations for future programmes are being prepared."

WATER SUPPLY FOR HOUSING COMMISSION THOZET ROAD ESTATE, NORTH ROCKHAMPTON

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

Is there a delay in providing water supplies to the present Housing Commission houses under construction in the Thozet Road–Horton Street area at North Rockhampton and, if so, what is the cause and when will it be rectified?

Answer:—

"Water reticulation is included in the contract let to the Rockhampton City Council for the engineering development of this estate and the Council has been requested to provide this service as a matter of urgency."

RENTAL HOUSES FOR ABORIGINES, NORTH ROCKHAMPTON

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

(1) How many houses are held by his Department for rental to Aboriginal families in North Rockhampton?

(2) How many houses are (*a*) occupied and (*b*) unoccupied?

(3) Is it envisaged that further houses will be purchased by his Department in North Rockhampton?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "My Department at present owns 34 homes in North Rockhampton, all of which are occupied. As applies generally, provided homes meet requirements, the Department is interested in acquiring suitable units until the needs have been satisfied."

EFFECT OF PRICE CONTROL, MEAT INDUSTRY

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

(1) Is there any likelihood of price control on meat being introduced in the near future?

(2) If so, will this lead to (*a*) some type of control being extended to public auctions of cattle, sheep and pigs as well as to the private sales of these animals, (*b*) cheaper meat being available on the domestic market for home consumption and (*c*) some type of control being extended to the export market for meat?

Answers:—

(1) "No. Not whilst price fixing remains a function of this State. It is accepted by my Department that there are major seasonal fluctuations in the production of all primary produce and that prices are responsive to supply/demand situations which tend to average out over the years. However, in the event that absolute powers to control prices and incomes are passed to the Commonwealth following the forthcoming referendum it seems clear that price controls would be introduced—otherwise there is no point in the Commonwealth seeking such powers. Staple diet items such as meat must be an obvious target for price control."

(2) "(*a*) If price controls were introduced for meat, it could well mean the end of the present system of sale of stock by public auction. Private sales must also be inhibited. It seems obvious that once prices of meat are fixed, the element of competition disappears and, it must be added, the incentive for production of a quality product also disappears. (*b*) Meat on the home market may be cheaper for a short period, if its price is depressed or increases in prices are limited under price control. But, once again, it is obvious that unless a producer can recover his costs, including a fair return for his labour and investment, he simply will not be financially able to produce meat. It is a simple truth that costs and demand determine selling prices despite any assurances or attempts at control to the contrary. If costs are not covered, an article is simply not produced or else a black market is generated—which usually means that the household consumer has the choice of supporting it or going without. (*c*) If the price of meat is fixed at a level which gives a fair return to the producer little need or purpose can be seen in controlling exports. On the contrary, if the price of meat for home consumption were to be fixed at a level which does not cover costs of production, attempts may well be made to alter this situation by controls over exports. Any depression of prices which may thus result from an over-supply on the local market would again only be temporary as it must inevitably lead to the financial inability of the producer to produce at below cost."

NEW HOSPITAL BLOCK, MAREEBA

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

(1) Have sketch plans been approved for a new hospital block at Mareeba? If so, are the plans based on submissions by the board's architects?

(2) What facilities will be incorporated in the building?

(3) When will the final plans be approved and finance allocated for the construction of the new block?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "Approval in principle has been given for the redevelopment of the Mareeba Hospital. The number of beds and the facilities to be provided are still under consideration. The provision of finance will be considered at a later stage of planning."

IRRESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOUR OF PASSENGERS ON WEEK-END AND LATE-NIGHT TRAINS, BRISBANE AREA

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

(1) Have recent incidents been reported concerning irresponsible passenger behaviour on week-end and late-night trains within the Brisbane area?

(2) Are lad porters solely responsible for the issue and collection of tickets and cash security on these after-hour services and, if so, has at least one of these employees been exposed to danger to his person, threatened and pursued through a corridor train by a person brandishing a sharp instrument?

(3) Will he undertake an urgent investigation into these matters with a view to eliminating any risk to life and limb of employees, particularly juniors, and reintroduce station staffs for passenger-carrying trains?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2 and 3) "Ticket sellers on the suburban trains are responsible for accounting for tickets sold and the revenue received. The conduct of certain passengers on suburban trains, particularly at night, has been and still is a matter of concern to the Railway Department which works in close liaison with the Police Department in these matters."

PARCEL-DESPATCHING FACILITIES, BOWEN HILLS RAILWAY STATION

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

Does the newly established station at Bowen Hills cater for the receipt and despatch of small goods and parcels traffic and, if not, will he provide such a service for business houses and citizens in the adjacent area?

Answer:—

"Bowen Hills is not suitable for this traffic because of its inaccessibility by road transport. However, facilities for the receipt and despatch of small consignments of goods and parcels exist at Albion, at Newstead for consignments of goods and at Brunswick Street for parcels."

COVERED WAYS, TRINITY BAY HIGH SCHOOL, CAIRNS

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

(1) When will approval be given for work to commence on the covered ways connecting Block "F" at the Trinity Bay High School, Cairns?

(2) Will the work be completed before the commencement of the 1974 school year and the oncoming wet season?

Answers:—

(1) "Consideration will be given to this project when classroom needs for 1974 have been met."

(2) "No."

SUBSIDY FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF AFTER-SCHOOL CARE CENTRES

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

(1) Is he aware that the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have combined to provide after-school care centres?

(2) In view of the need for the centres, particularly for 'latch-key' children, will the Government make finance available, either by grant or subsidy, for the establishment of such centres?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "While the Department of Education is not making finance available for the after-school care of children, it is co-operating fully in schemes to care for 'latch-key' children. School facilities have been made available at Inala Opportunity School for a trial scheme of morning and afternoon care of children out of school hours. The Parents Without Partners organisation and Parents and Citizens Associations in two other areas of Brisbane have also been in touch with the Department of Education and are now formulating plans for the use of school facilities in similar programmes of after-school care."

CLOSURE TO FISHING, HERVEY BAY ARTIFICIAL REEF

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

As the artificial reef at Hervey Bay was established by community contributions of labour, money and materials for the purpose of creating a fish-breeding ground for the Hervey Bay area and in view of Queensland Tourist Bureau literature inviting anglers to come and fish the artificial reef at the caravan capital of Australia, will he agree to requests to have the artificial reef closed to angling to preserve its intended function as a fish-breeding facility?

Answer:—

"As the prime purpose for constructing an artificial reef is to provide a fishing facility, there would seem little purpose in imposing a total ban on angling over the Hervey Bay reef. Investigations by Fisheries Branch officers, however, have indicated that there may be a need to control fishing effort, and several alternative measures are being explored with a view to choosing the most appropriate way to achieve such control in this locality."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PRESS REPORT ON DISCIPLINARY MEASURES, BRISBANE PRISON

Mr. FRAWLEY: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services: Is it correct, as appears on the front page of today's "Courier-Mail", that 60 prisoners were locked up in punishment cells in the Brisbane Prison on Monday last because they booed the arrival of the visiting magistrate? If so, what are the facts surrounding the report?

Mr. HERBERT: The anonymous prison correspondent to the morning Press obviously has a very colourful imagination. This is the second consecutive day on which he has had a story published on the front page, and I suppose we will eventually see a retraction on about page 20. The facts are that on Monday last there was a minor disturbance in the remand section of the Brisbane Prison, and 17 prisoners were dealt with by the superintendent for very minor breaches of the rules. The noise was so slight that executive officers of the Prisons Department who were present at the time did not even hear it. It is also very doubtful whether the visiting justice heard it. If he did, he made no comment on it.

As to the further allegation that prisoners have to sleep on coir mats on cell floors, anyone who has been to the remand section of the prison knows that all the furniture there is a fixture. That part of the story

is quite obviously a lie. I suggest that the newspaper concerned should have a very close look at its correspondent. While he is apparently providing some interesting stories, they are not factual.

ALLEGATIONS OF DISTURBANCES, BRISBANE PRISON

Mr. FRAWLEY: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services: As I have been reliably informed that the honourable member for Brisbane is fostering the stories of unrest at the Brisbane Prison, and in view of his unfounded criticism of the Westbrook Training Centre last year when he said that all inmates used the same toothbrush and were subjected to unnecessary violence by warders, will he have a thorough investigation made to determine if there is any political motive behind these alleged prison disturbances?

Mr. HERBERT: I doubt very much whether the honourable member for Brisbane would have a sufficiently bright imagination to think up such allegations.

PRESERVATION OF TRADES HALL

Mr. FRAWLEY: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services: Can he inform the House if, in his capacity as chairman of the National Trust, he has been approached by any member of the A.L.P., or by any union, with a request to prevent the destruction of the Trades Hall and preserve this fine historic building?

Mr. HERBERT: I should not answer this question as it does not come within my ministerial responsibility. It is a private matter. However, the answer is "No."

WOONGOOLBA FLOOD MITIGATION SCHEME

Mr. D'ARCY: I ask the Premier: In the light of the advantageous sugar agreement reached by the Australian Government with China and the necessity to increase production to meet this sale, has he considered placing priority on the Woongoolba flood mitigation scheme as the Prime Minister has informed me that he has referred the matter of a priority rating to him? Is he aware that a decision on this matter is urgent as the wet season is imminent?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: In the first place, of course, there is no sugar agreement with China. On the second part of the honourable member's question about the Woongoolba flood mitigation scheme, I have asked the Prime Minister to advance funds towards it. To date we have not been successful in our approach. The matter is now in his corner. We have made all possible representations and supplied all necessary details. We have also advised the local authority that if it cannot interest the Commonwealth in the scheme—and, judging by what has happened to date, I do not think there is much hope of that—we will play a larger role in the whole undertaking. To date, we are still waiting to hear from the Commonwealth Government.

VALUER-GENERAL'S REVALUATION, ALBERT SHIRE

Mr. D'ARCY: I ask the Minister for Local Government and Electricity: In view of his answer to a question by the honourable member for South Coast this morning, is he aware that last night over 400 ratepayers in the Beenleigh area attended a meeting on revaluations and would he make arrangements similar to those he outlined this morning for the Southport Court House and have two officers allocated to the Beenleigh area?

Mr. McKECHNIE: Last night I was returning from Canberra. I knew that a meeting was being held at Beenleigh, but at this stage I have received no report on it. As I said to the honourable member for South Coast, we are arranging for officers of the Valuer-General's Department to visit Southport next Friday and answer questions. If the honourable member for Albert submits a written request along those lines, I will endeavour to see if officers can be sent to Beenleigh.

REINTRODUCTION OF UPPER HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister for Justice: In view of his statement reported in "The Courier-Mail" of yesterday's date that he supports the reintroduction of an Upper House in Queensland because he has always been a great believer in the check-and-balance system and, as there is little community or political support for the reintroduction of the Legislative Council, will he use his office to press for the re-establishment of a committee system in this Assembly? Will he give specific support to the formation of joint parliamentary committees on public accounts, public works, legislation and general purposes, and so on, as instruments for achieving the check-and-balance system which he says he supports?

Mr. KNOX: I think the honourable member is drawing the long bow. The question I was asked was whether I would object if there was support for the reintroduction of an Upper House in this State. Of course I would not, as I believe in the check-and-balance system of government. But as I also pointed out—and as the honourable member, quite conveniently, did not quote—there is no public support for the reintroduction of an Upper House in this State. Therefore, it is a non-issue.

The Labor Government of the day conducted a referendum in Queensland on the continuance of the Upper House, and the people voted overwhelmingly in favour of retaining it. In spite of that decision by the people of this State, the Labor Government of the day legislated to abolish the Upper House.

EFFECT ON FISHERMEN OF HYACINTH IN FITZROY RIVER, ROCKHAMPTON

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs—

1. Is he aware of the financial difficulties being experienced by fishermen in the Rockhampton area who cannot use their boats because they have been trapped in the city reaches of the Fitzroy River by the hyacinth that has choked this water-course?

2. Will he make representations to the appropriate authority in an endeavour to obtain some financial assistance or compensation for the fishermen involved whilst they are unable to pursue their livelihood?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I have every sympathy for these fishermen, of course, because I have seen the problem that faces them. The honourable member for Rockhampton realises, as I do, that this is a major problem. I have made representations on the matter to the Treasurer, and the Rockhampton City Council is at present receiving a subsidy of 33⅓ per cent of the cost of work directed to clearing the river. Only last Saturday morning, in company with Police Inspector Lloyd Ingram, I made a further inspection of the river at the request of the Minister for Primary Industries in connection with the possibility of the Rockhampton City Council spraying the river above the barrage. The barrage gates were again open on Saturday or Sunday, and hyacinth was carried further down the river.

I think it would be agreed that the construction of the barrage has interrupted the natural flow of water that used to carry hyacinth down to the ocean. That natural flow does not take place now, and all I can say is that there will be major problems of this nature from year to year in the foreseeable future. I feel that it would be a considerable task for a Government to finance any industry that is faced with such a problem.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Gas Act 1965-1971 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

INITIATION

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Factories and Shops Act 1960-1973 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

INITIATION

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Fire Brigades Act 1964-1973 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SESSIONAL ORDER

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.4 p.m.), by leave: I move—

"That the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 2 August relating to the discussion of matters of public interest on each sitting Wednesday be suspended for this day, Wednesday, 21 November 1973."

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! When I am on my feet there will be no interjections. The question is—

"That the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 2 August relating to the discussion of matters of public interest on each sitting Wednesday be suspended for this day, Wednesday, 21 November 1973."

Mr. HOUSTON: Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat.

Mr. HOUSTON: Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Unless he resumes his seat, I will warn the honourable gentleman under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. HOUSTON: Debate is allowed on this. It was debated in 1971.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have not finished putting the question. As many of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No". I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HOUSTON: I was right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman was not right at all because I had not finished putting the motion.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.6 p.m.): I do not know exactly why the Premier——

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

"That the question be now put."

Mr. HOUSTON: What are you coming at? Don't "bung" that one on. You say you want democracy, but you don't know what it is all about.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I appeal to honourable members. This unruly behaviour is not going to achieve anything.

Mr. HOUSTON: Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: Mr. Speaker, surely we are entitled to some rights in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the House divided—

In division—

Honourable Members interjecting—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Before I again state the question, I point out that while the bells were ringing the honourable member for Wolston accused me of having discussed and arranged this with the Premier. I want the House to know that I arranged nothing with the Premier. I ask the honourable member for Wolston to withdraw that statement. I give an assurance that I made no arrangement.

Mr. MARGINSON: Even though I think it is true, I withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw the statement without qualification.

Mr. MARGINSON: Seeing I am compelled to withdraw it, I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will accept that. The honourable member is compelled to withdraw it. He would either do that or go out. The question is, "That the question be now put."

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, would you mind informing the House of the Standing Order which allows the Premier or anyone else in this House to interrupt a member's speech once he has started?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Leader of the Opposition that he is one of the worst offenders. He frequently interjects while I am on my feet. The question is, "That the question be now put."

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. What is your authority, Mr. Speaker? We have a right to know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Rockhampton under Standing Order 123A. If he interjects again, I will send him out.

Mr. R. Jones: You knew I was going to speak on a matter of public interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Cairns under Standing Order 123A. There will be no second warning.

AYES, 40

Ahern	Lee
Alison	Lickiss
Armstrong	Low
Bird	McKechnie
Bjelke-Petersen	Miller
Camm	Muller
Campbell	Murray
Chinchen	Neal
Cory	Porter
Crawford	Rae
Edwards	Row
Fletcher	Scott-Young
Frawley	Small
Hartwig	Sullivan
Herbert	Tomkins
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Wharton
Hewitt, W. D.	
Hinze	
Hooper, K. W.	*Tellers:*
Kaus	
Knox	Gunn
Lane	Moore, R. E.

NOES, 32

Aiken	Jordan
Baldwin	Marginson
Blake	Melloy
Bousen	Moore, F. P.
Bromley	Newton
Burns	O'Donnell
D'Arcy	Tucker
Davis	Wallis-Smith
Dean	Wood, B.
Hanlon	Wood, P.
Hanson	Wright
Harris	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	
Inch	*Tellers:*
Jensen	
Jones, N. F.	Harvey
Jones, R.	Leese

PAIRS:

Hodges	Sherrington

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) be agreed to—put; and the House divided.

AYES, 40

Ahern	Lickiss
Alison	Low
Armstrong	McKechnie
Bird	Miller
Bjelke-Petersen	Moore, R. E.
Camm	Muller
Campbell	Murray
Chinchen	Neal
Cory	Porter
Crawford	Rae
Edwards	Row
Fletcher	Scott-Young
Gunn	Small
Hartwig	Sullivan
Herbert	Tomkins
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Wharton
Hewitt, W. D.	
Hinze	
Hooper, K. W.	*Tellers:*
Knox	
Lane	Frawley
Lee	Kaus

NOES, 32

Aiken	Jordan
Baldwin	Leese
Blake	Marginson
Bousen	Melloy
Bromley	Newton
Burns	O'Donnell
D'Arcy	Tucker
Davis	Wallis-Smith
Dean	Wood, B.
Hanlon	Wood, P.
Harris	Wright
Harvey	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	
Inch	*Tellers:*
Jensen	
Jones, N. F.	Hanson
Jones, R.	Moore, F. P.

PAIRS:

Hodges	Sherrington

Resolved in the affirmative.

REFERENDUMS ON COMMONWEALTH CONTROL OF PRICES AND INCOMES

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah —Premier): I ask leave of the House to move a motion without notice.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 41

Ahern	Lane
Alison	Lee
Armstrong	Lickiss
Bird	Low
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Camm	Moore, R. E.
Campbell	Murray
Chinchen	Neal
Cory	Porter
Crawford	Rae
Edwards	Row
Fletcher	Scott-Young
Frawley	Small
Gunn	Sullivan
Hartwig	Tomkins
Herbert	Wharton
Hewitt, N. T. E.	
Hewitt, W. D.	
Hinze	
Hooper, K. W.	*Tellers:*
Houghton	
Kaus	Muller
Knox	Miller

NOES, 32

Aiken	Jordan
Baldwin	Leese
Blake	Marginson
Bousen	Melloy
Bromley	Moore, F. P.
Burns	Newton
D'Arcy	O'Donnell
Davis	Tucker
Dean	Wallis-Smith
Hanlon	Wood, B.
Harris	Wood, P.
Harvey	Wright
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	
Inch	*Tellers:*
Jensen	
Jones, N. F.	Yewdale
Jones, R.	Hanson

PAIRS:

Hodges	Sherrington

Resolved in the affirmative.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah —Premier) (12.31 p.m.), by leave: I move—

"That the Legislative Assembly of Queensland in Parliament assembled, having regard to the fact that proposed laws for the alteration of the Constitution of the Commonwealth by conferring on the Parliament of the Commonwealth power to make laws with respect to prices, or prices and incomes, will be submitted to electors as required by section 128 of the Consitution, and recognising—

(1) that the proposed alterations of the Constitution have grave implications for the citizens of the State of Queensland:

(2) that the proposed alterations would seriously impair the powers of the Legislature of the State to legislate for the peace welfare and good government of the citizens of this State:

(3) that the acquisition of these powers by the Parliament of the Commonwealth would constitute a major step towards the achievement of the obvious objective of the present Federal Government—the eventual abolition of the States:

(4) that the acquisition of these powers by the Parliament of the Commonwealth by reason of the lack of definition as to their scope and use would be a source of confusion and uncertainty to, and could be a source of oppression against, the citizens of the State in the conduct of their affairs:

therefore doth agree and resolve—

that the conferring of powers on the Parliament of the Commonwealth as proposed is inimical to the welfare of the citizens of Queensland and that accordingly the Assembly is totally and irrevocably opposed to such conferral.

And further doth agree to authorise—

(a) the Honourable the Premier and Ministers of the State, on behalf of the citizens of the State of Queensland, to take whatever action they consider necessary or desirable to safeguard and protect the sovereign rights of the citizens of the State of Queensland from any unwarranted intrusion or invasion by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia

(b) the Speaker of this Assembly to advise the President of the Senate of this resolution."

Honourable members opposite will have an opportunity today to show their true colours in debating a matter that is of great concern and interest in this State.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is quite obvious that honourable members opposite do not desire a debate on a matter that greatly affects the people of Queensland.

I have moved this motion because on 8 December the people of Queensland and Australia have to make a choice, the consequences of which will determine the future course of Australian history. The people will have a simple choice. They can choose, on the one hand, a continuation of the policies that have made our State and nation great, and have raised living standards to such an extent that until more recent months they were among the highest in the world. These are the policies of free enterprise and the right to live, to work and to do the things that one usually wants to do in a free society.

The alternative is the new socialist policy of the Prime Minister of Australia; centralist control from Canberra; the ultimate elimination or gagging of the States; the setting up of a republic in Australia to be patterned on the Communist way of life, as Mr. Whitlam reiterated in China when he said that the Chinese way of life would be our symbol and the pattern for our future society.

Mr. Houston: He didn't say that.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: He did say it. These are matters of very great concern in the Commonwealth Government's moves.

Since his election last December, the Prime Minister has moved rapidly and with great determination to implement the change. In a matter of months he completely changed the course of Australia's foreign policy by sharp criticism of the United States of America and Britain. He said that Australia would stand on its own two feet.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn both the honourable member for Archerfield and the honourable member for South Brisbane under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Prime Minister is coming to Queensland to speak on the new foreign policy that this nation is supposed to have.

Then there were the rapid moves to foster links and associations with all the Communist nations around the world, and the welcoming of Communist delegates from North Vietnam even while active fighting continued in South Vietnam. Australia moved closer to North Korea and China, and we supported—to our eternal disgrace—the expulsion of Taiwan from the United Nations. The Commonwealth Government took that action, and it also expelled Taiwanese officials from Australia. Then there was the welcome of the Yugoslav Prime Minister, who arrived in Canberra with a planeload of storm-troopers armed with submachine guns, and Press representatives were told, "Don't run. If you do, you might be shot."

Mr. F. P. Moore interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mourilyan under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: There was the setting up of Australian embassies in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist countries, and now the establishment of close links with Castro and Cuba. Surely all this is a danger signal of the greatest magnitude and every citizen—man, woman and child—should take heed of it. Where there is smoke, there is certainly fire.

At the same time, contrary to election promises, the Commonwealth Government has reduced considerably the strength of defence forces, claiming that there would not be a war for 15 years. What an irresponsible Government it is! Again in the Press today we are reminded of that attitude of the Commonwealth Government, because it is stated that the various branches of the armed services of this nation, already depleted, are to be reduced still further.

We have also witnessed such actions as the withdrawal of Australian troops from Singapore and giving the unions control of American bases in Australia. There is absolutely no doubt that the Communist-controlled and dominated unions of New South Wales and Victoria have set the pattern. They have made the decisions, and Mr. Whitlam and his Government are following the centralist policy laid down by the unions, completely supported, of course, by all honourable members opposite. The cry of the Commonwealth Government is, "More power! We want more power." They do not seem to be able to get enough power to satisfy them.

At the beginning of this year, in Sydney, Melbourne, Canberra and Brisbane, on both radio and television, I repeatedly sounded the warning, loud and clear, to the Australian people that we are on a dangerous course. I repeat that warning today because now, and as it will again next year, the Commonwealth Government is making further determined moves to wrench power from the States and the people to minimise, and then destroy, the States for a complete take-over and adoption of the Labor policy of a republic in Australia, then complete dictatorship. Can anyone have any clearer warning or clearer evidence than we get, from time to time, from Canberra? Our own eyes tell us what is happening.

We have seen attempts to abolish the right of the States to appeal to the Privy Council, the seizure that is now being attempted of our territorial waters, which all the States are resisting, as they did in the historic journey to London when both Labor and non-Labor States made a united effort to counter the Commonwealth Government's move. There is also the control of Queensland's coal and the State's other resources,

which are areas of State Government responsibility. This is now a matter of great concern not only to Queensland but to Australia as a whole. Earlier this week a delegation of top Japanese businessmen pointed out how completely unsatisfactory is the attitude of the Commonwealth Government relative to certain of Queensland's exports. The Commonwealth Government has proved an arrogant and destructive centralist force which has divided, rather than united, Australia. It is certainly bent on destroying the States.

The dictatorial manner in which the Prime Minister and his Ministers sought, without reference to the people concerned, to take away from the Torres Strait Islanders their sovereign rights as citizens of this State, and as Australians, and relegate them to another nation will never be forgotten. This again demonstrated the Federal Labor Government's total disregard for individual rights and freedoms. And now the Federal Government is making this move in a sly, clever way to hold a referendum that will give the Commonwealth almost unlimited power, in every area of living, over the lives of the citizens of this State and this nation. It wants price control.

Mr. B. Wood interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lickiss): Order! If I were the honourable member for Barron River, I would watch my step.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Hilter sought the same thing. In the first instance he sought to gain control of the economy. Having achieved that, he then did away with the States. That is history. We are experiencing much the same attitude and activity in the Federal sphere today.

I cannot emphasise too strongly the far-reaching effects that the granting of such permanent power would have. It would cover almost every facet of everyday living. We have to remember that it is for all time that the Commonwealth will have this power if it is granted. If it is granted the Prime Minister will, in effect, have the people of this State and this nation in the palm of his hand.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Brisbane that persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I say, the Prime Minister will have the people of Australia in the palm of his hand to do with them just as he wishes. I say—and many other people throughout the nation say—that he cannot be trusted, as he has demonstrated in his attitude and behaviour in so many directions.

Other Prime Ministers down through the years have used existing powers to deal with inflation. And they dealt with it effectively. This Commonwealth Government, however, has demonstrated its irresponsibility, its unworthiness and its inability to deal with the problems of the nation. It has given Australia a bad image overseas and has driven the Japanese to other countries for trade. It has also given us a bad image on the home front. There is no investment in mining or general exploration work in this State or this nation. One only has to refer to stock-exchange reports in all States. Day after day we read the same headlines. Share values are down in every area.

The Federal Government has left behind it a record of broken promises. It promised a stable economy, but instead we have record inflation. It promised a 35-hour week and industrial peace. Instead there is record industrial strife and a serious shortage of a whole range of consumer goods. It changed Australia's foreign policy in record time, and fostered closer links with the Communists in record time. It made unprecedented manoeuvres to take away State rights. It destroyed the confidence of overseas investors in record time. It has completely demonstrated its inability to govern because it has also destroyed the confidence of free enterprise in the business arena of this nation.

Never before has there been such of lack of confidence in so many areas of industrial development. I say again, look at the stock exchange reports. Read the annual reports of some of the big companies. Listen to businessmen. Listen to what country people have to say. Their lack of confidence and their uncertainty is reflected throughout the nation.

Never before has there been such industrial turmoil and strife as we have in Australia at the present time. Never before in our history has there been anything like it. The incidence of strikes has increased by over 70 per cent. The terrible part of it is that more strikes are occurring with every encouragement by the Federal Government, particularly the Federal Minister for Labour (Mr. Cameron), who has given every incentive and encouragement to unions to strike and carry on in an irresponsible manner. How can the inflationary trend be stemmed under these circumstances?

Surely it is obvious to everyone that the present high inflationary trend is attributable to the inability of the inept Federal Government to deal with these issues. The Federal Treasurer brought down an inflationary Budget, the full and savage impact of which has still to hit the nation, instituting additional taxes and the withdrawal of subsidies in many areas. The revaluation of our money on two occasions has cost primary producers and secondary industries in this nation untold millions of dollars. Yet the Leader of the Opposition has on occasions said that it was a wonderful Budget.

When we are called upon to contribute more and more in taxation in so many areas; when we realise the impact the Budget has in the withdrawal of subsidies and

incentives; when we have to meet a 1.35 per cent hospital tax although we already have free hospitalisation; when we are faced with increased prices for petrol, increased telephone and postal charges and the withdrawal of air-travel subsidies to inland areas, how can it be said to be a wonderful Budget? Evidently the honourable member for Warrego has to support the Federal Government in these actions. I will remind the Charleville people of all these things when I visit that area shortly. And there are many other aspects of the Federal Budget that make it far from being wonderful.

Let us again draw attention to the many damaging and irresponsible actions of the Commonwealth Labor Government. Another damaging and irresponsible act by it is the demand for a 33⅓ per cent interest-free deposit by overseas investors with the Reserve Bank, and insistence on 51 per cent Australian participation in any industry that is established here. This, too, has wrecked the confidence and activity of the business world of this State.

In the past we were glad to get finance, job opportunities, and progress and development. But the Commonwealth Government has halted, and prevented in an unbelievable manner, the general march forward in the development of this nation. As I said, it has wrecked confidence in Australia as a place for investment. It is driving industry and investment out of Australia as well as stopping it from coming in. Mineral, oil and general exploration work on a broad front is at a complete standstill throughout the nation except in the North-west and in the Gippsland area. We know that there has been a general exodus of skilled workmen, and also of technical equipment and plant. Skilled men are leaving Australia. They have gone overseas in alarmingly large numbers, and will continue to do so.

Mr. B. Wood: You don't sound very convincing.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It would be impossible to convince the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Barron River wishes to remain in the Chamber, I ask him to restrain himself.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Today we are going to test honourable members opposite as to whether they are Queenslanders or Canberra-ites. We will see where their loyalty lies.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I am an Australian first.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member says that he is an Australian first, yet he is going to support Canberra. He is not interested in Queensland. That is a very interesting point. Today we will get a very clear indication of where Opposition members stand.

Mr. Marginson: You only want to divide the nation.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Honourable members opposite, with the Commonwealth Government, will not face up to the energy crisis that could confront this nation, and, indeed, the whole world. The Prime Minister wants to ignore the issue, but it cannot and will not be ignored. The Commonwealth Government must once again instill confidence in the business community of this nation or we are in for a period of serious and grave unemployment.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Honourable members cannot see further than their socialist policies. They cannot see beyond Canberra, where they seek to live in thought, word and deed. I accuse the Federal Labor Government of deliberately fostering inflation to ensure a "Yes" vote at the referendum to give it price control and control over the lives of people throughout this nation—and it will then have it for all times. I repeat: the Federal Labor Government is fostering inflation in the hope that by 8 December it will reach such a peak that the people will be lulled out of sheer desperation into voting "Yes".

If the Federal Government was not keen to allow inflation to continue, why does it not try to control it? Why does the Prime Minister travel all round the world doing all sorts of things except coming to grips with inflation? Prime Ministers of other countries are attempting to do so.

Mr. Houston: What did you do?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I will answer that question in a few moments. Prime Ministers of other countries have dealt with the problem, so why cannot Mr. Whitlam follow their example?

I warn Queenslanders not to be hoodwinked by this negative, permissive, power-drunk Government in Canberra.

The most powerful man in Australia—the Prime Minister—says that he needs more power. The questions are, however: Does he need this power? Can he be trusted with more power? Would he use such power wisely? Of course, he would use it as directed by the A.C.T.U., the president of which is also Federal president of the Labor Party. I claim that Labor does not need more power and that it cannot be trusted with more power. If it were granted more power, it certainly would not use it in the interests of Australia or Australians.

Mr. Lane: What does "give-away Jack" say?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It will be interesting to hear what he has to say. I venture to suggest that, in line with his socialistic and centralistic policy, he will back Canberra. Later on we will see who is right.

Let me trace the sorry history of the Federal Labor Government as well as the inflation-ridden, strike-happy, shortage-prone mess that it has created in only 11 months of office. People who said, "Give Labor a go" are now saying loud and clear, "Make Labor go." And, because of the Federal Labor Government's irresponsible attitude, we should make it go.

Mr. Marginson: You told us that competition would keep down prices. You said that to me when I first entered this Parliament.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Wolston should be aware of the shortages that exist in all sections of the community. However, because he has been in hospital he probably is not aware of them. These tremendous shortages mean that there is no competition.

I am sure that the average voter never imagined that the Federal Labor Government would introduce its nationalistic and socialistic policies with such rapidity. Prior to the election, Mr. Whitlam promised prosperity and a soundly based economy. However, today we have the highest inflation rate of any advanced country, namely, 14.4 per cent. As a nation, we hold the record for inflation. Economists predict that by the end of the year the inflation rate will reach 20 per cent. In cold, hard terms this means that every dollar in Queenslanders' pockets is now worth only 80c. The new $50 note is worth $40 almost at the moment it comes into circulation. At this rate, and if the Commonwealth Government continues to do nothing to remedy the situation, we will soon need a $100 note to buy what can be purchased now for $50.

Naturally the Opposition will claim that inflation is a world-wide problem. And so it is. However, other countries gape in disbelief at the astronomical heights that inflation has reached in Australia. While I was in Europe, people simply did not believe my statement that inflation in Australia was running at 13 per cent. They said, "Surely that's not correct." Unfortunately, it is correct. The present rate of inflation in Great Britain and Europe is between 5 and 7 per cent, which means that in order to catch up to our rate of inflation Britain and Europe would need to double theirs.

I remind members of the Opposition that during his campaign speeches Mr. Whitlam claimed that the growth of the economy would pay for his promises. He said—

> "I am prepared to accept an inflation rate of up to 8 per cent in the interests of the growth of the economy."

He should be proud; in 11 months he has almost doubled his estimate.

Mr. Wright: It was running at about 7 per cent when he took over.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is completely incorrect.

The next grand promise made by the Prime Minister was a new era of industrial peace. He told his party and Australians about it, but the only trouble is that he did not tell the unions. In the first six months of this year strikes in this nation rose to a record, unbelievable figure.

Mr. Knox: Even Mr. Cameron and Mr. Jones complained about it.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is so.

The unions have run riot, but no Labor member, in either the Federal or State spheres, has raised a finger or made a single attempt to curb them. Honourable members can take my assurance that these strikes and unauthorised stoppages are doing more to lift prices and create shortages than probably any other single factor.

In this inflammatory situation, the Whitlam Government unveiled its master-stroke—an inflationary Budget to end all inflationary Budgets. Federal Government spending rose to record heights, with a 19 per cent increase.

Mr. Houston: Your Budget expenditure rose by a higher percentage than that of the Federal Government.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: In the current situation the Federal Government adopted reckless measures such as four weeks' annual leave; holiday-pay loadings; virtual orders to the Arbitration Commission to increase wages; and open encouragement to unions to demand even bigger wage rises—all of which have stoked the fires of inflation to an intensity which our nation has never before experienced. We have had inflation previously in Australia, but never before has a Federal Government made it a national goal. Prices have rocketed, and every day something new disappears from the supermarket shelves. People cannot get timber, nails, cement, wire or even a new refrigerator, and there is a three months' waiting list for a new car. Anyone who wants a new carpet has to wait six weeks. People living in Sydney have to sit in the dark because power workers are on strike. If they are not on strike, they are out on the streets trying to impose mob law on the community. The Labor Government turned 23 years of prosperity into 11 months of austerity.

We have had two currency revaluations, lost the $600,000,000 investment in the Weipa refinery and the 2,000 construction jobs and 1,000 permanent jobs that would have been created by the Weipa undertaking. It is useless for Opposition members to hotly defend Canberra as usual because everyone knows that the Federal Labor Government is the sole cause of our losing the tremendous Weipa undertaking.

Mr. Houston: What a lot of rubbish! I told you that the other day.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: By that statement the Leader of the Opposition shows he is not alert to cold, hard facts.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will have his opportunity shortly to put his case.

Mr. Houston: I put the Premier right last time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition need not worry about last time; he will have an opportunity to put his case.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: At no time has the Federal Government taken any co-ordinated, detailed action to combat inflation. It stands condemned completely by its inaction, and lack of sense of responsibility in its approach to this tremendously vital issue confronting the nation.

I should like to put to Queenslanders one simple truth about price control: if price control works, why is the cost of living higher in Adelaide, where it is in force, than it is in Brisbane? Why does Brisbane have the cheapest bread in Australia?

Mr. Wright: Because the Federal Government cannot control interstate trade, and you know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton has been warned previously.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The experience of price control in South Australia completely condemns that system. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to deny that fact. Price and wage controls do not work. They are temporary measures that merely put the lid on the volcano, which eventually causes it to erupt with greater force. Every housewife knows that, to get a saucepan of boiling water off the boil, she must take it off the fire, not put a lid on it. Yet the Prime Minister is suggesting that all he has to do to control inflation is to place a lid on it by imposing price control. He is not tackling the root cause of inflation. The way to handle inflation is through a range of measures, using powers already available to the Commonwealth. Other Prime Ministers and Treasurers have achieved success—only the present Commonwealth Government is a failure.

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

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Time and time again I have emphasised that the Prime Minister has the power but either will not use it or has not the ability to use it. He has the tools. He has the Reserve Bank, fiscal measures and restrictions, tariff controls and so on. He has made very little use, if any, of the powers available to him to fight inflation in this country.

He is seeking war-time controls and a war-time type of power in a time of peace in our nation. That, in itself, condemns the Prime Minister and the Federal Government. They are seeking war-time measures in peace-time. They are asking for a blank cheque without indicating the manner in which they will use it.

I have highlighted the type of power-drunk Government that exists in Canberra. I am sure that the nation as a whole knows what sort of Government exists in Canberra. The whole nation has been shaken to its very foundations by that Government. The Prime Minister is so unsure of himself that he threatened to resign. Within nine months of attaining power, he had to reshuffle his Cabinet because he was so unsure of himself and was going in so many different directions. Neither the Prime Minister nor his Ministers know where they are going. Anybody who doubts that should read Wallace Brown's article in today's "Courier-Mail", and see what he has to say about the happy party that is finished and has to get down to cold, hard facts.

There is ample evidence that the Federal Government cannot be trusted. Nor can the State Opposition when it comes to issues such as this one. Opposition members are prepared to run out on Queensland and let the people down. That is their real interest. We will discover that shortly when a vote is taken on this motion. We will see how many of them are loyal Queenslanders when it comes to the final showdown.

People are voicing deep concern at the actions of the Prime Minister and other Federal Ministers. At every function and everywhere else, people are talking about the Commonwealth Government. Never before in our history have people been so interested in or concerned about politics and where the Commonwealth Government is going. Opposition members know this as well as I do, and they are no doubt deeply concerned. That is why I urge every Queenslander to acquaint himself fully with what he is voting for on 8 December next, and to think seriously before he considers casting a "Yes" vote.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I say to the honourable member that giving permanent power is dangerous. I certainly would not trust the Prime Minister with any power at all.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Nor would I give any power to any socialist, and I know that most people of Australia share my view. It could affect the lives of every man, woman and child in our nation.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Salisbury continues to interject, I shall deal with him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Evidently Opposition members are not interested in the lives and well-being of future generations. They have had their day in politics and they do not care about the future. They are prepared to give complete control to the Commonwealth.

Other nations have tried price control and it has not worked. Very serious consequences would flow from giving absolute power to the Commonwealth Government. History is full of examples of what has happened when absolute power has been given to such people. This morning, I cited Germany and I warned Queenslanders not to support the referendum. I say to the people of Queensland, "Vote 'No' on 8 December to giving more power to Whitlam. Vote 'No' to giving more power to the socialists."

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable members for Wolston and Archerfield under Standing Order 123A. I shall deal with both of them if they continue to interject. This is my final warning.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I demand that Opposition members vote for Queensland, and not give their support to the centralist Government in Canberra.

Mr. Wright: You're sick!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Rockhampton is sick if he does not vote for Queensland.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton was warned before the luncheon recess. I advise him to remain silent.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member is not only sick in his outlook, but he is also disloyal to Queensland. He shows himself to be a disloyal Queenslander when he will not stand up for the people of his State. If honourable members opposite are loyal to Queensland and to the people whom they represent, I demand that they stand up and be counted.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Belmont. He, too, will go.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Today we will see who are for Queensland, and who are in favour of absolute power reposing in Canberra. Honourable members opposite hope that, through absolute power in Canberra, they will ultimately reap benefits in one way or another from certain positions.

I say that Australia is already in a big enough mess after the 11 short months in which the Federal Government has been in office. Let no more power be given to the Federal Government to allow it to make an even greater mess. I am sure that that is quite clear to every thinking man, woman and child in this State. Do not give the Prime Minister any more power with which to destroy our national way of life and our democratic freedoms. I say to the Leader of the Opposition and honourable members opposite, "Stand up for Queensland." Honourable members opposite are known as the "suicide squad".

Mr. Sherrington: What about doing something for those people——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I also warn the honourable member for Salisbury under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I cannot emphasise too strongly the deep responsibility that rests on every member of this House to stand up for Queensland. Today we will see if honourable members opposite are again going to live up to their reputation as a "suicide squad". Again we will see if there is one loyal Queenslander among them. As I look at honourable members opposite, I venture to say that not one of them will be loyal to Queensland. I know Jack Tonkin, of Western Australia. What is his attitude? He stands up for Western Australia. What does Jack Houston do? He has given away Queensland. He is known as "Give-away Jack". Take Dunstan, of South Australia. What does he do? He attacks the Prime Minister. What does Mr. Tucker do?

Mr. Tucker: I'll tell you in a minute when you sit down.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Of one thing I am quite sure: he will not be a loyal Queenslander, and he will not stand up for Queensland. When I get to Townsville, I will tell the people of that city where he stands.

Mr. Tucker interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! When the honourable member for Townsville West speaks, he will expect to be heard, and I am going to see that the Premier is heard. I ask the honourable member to cease interjecting, otherwise he might get the treatment that he is now giving the Premier.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It must be a matter of deep concern to the electors of Queensland to find that men who are supposed to represent them are obviously, from the way in which they are acting, going to be disloyal to this State.

I commend the motion to honourable members, and I challenge all to support a "no" vote for Queensland and Australia.

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Justice) (2.24 p.m.): I rise to give my support—and, I believe, that of every member on this side of the House—to the motion proposed by the Premier. The terms of the motion merit the support of everyone who believes in the federal system and who opposes the growth of socialism in this country. This is also why the Opposition in this

Parliament will oppose the motion. It does not believe in federalism, and it is a stooge for the centralist-socialist regime in Canberra. I see in the southern Press that they are now being commonly called "Canberra crawlers".

The attitude of the A.L.P. will not be a surprise to anyone on this side of the House. It is completely consistent with the attitude of "surrender all" to Canberra and "toe the party line" for which the Opposition in this House has become infamous.

As the Premier has said, the Labor leader in every State other than Queensland has at one time or another seen fit to attack the present Federal Government when issues and decisions made by that Government have been against the interests of the particular State; not so the Labor Party leader in this State.

On 8 December the Australian electorate is to be asked to participate in a fraud—because that is just what the referendum is. The Federal Government is asking the people of Australia to vote "Yes" to help fight inflation. That is a fraud because it is dishonest, and it is designed deliberately to deceive the Australian people. In recent weeks we have heard much from the A.L.P. about alleged company frauds, yet honourable members opposite are active participants in the greatest fraud of all—the 8 December referendum.

The Opposition in this Parliament is also participating in an unprecedented move by the Federal Government to reduce the power and authority of State Governments. This is not surprising, either, in view of the total refusal of the A.L.P. in Queensland to make a stand for federalism and against the centralist policies now being pursued in Canberra.

It is time that the Parliament of Queensland expressed its attitude on an issue that is of great consequence, both to this Parliament and to the people of Queensland. The Labor Opposition will sell out both the Parliament and the people; yet there remains a vital need for the majority of the members of this House to have the opportunity to express their total opposition to the two referendum proposals. This we will do later when a vote is taken on the issue, and the records will show for all time that the members of the Country and Liberal parties voted solidly in defence of this Parliament and the fundamental rights of Queensland.

The referendum on 8 December is more than just a matter of a "Yes" vote or a "No" vote. It is the greatest test that the Federal system and a nation based upon free enterprise have yet been called upon to meet. In their great wisdom, the founders of federation ensured that the Australian Constitution guaranteed the maintenance of an effective federal system. They also ensured that the same Constitution guaranteed the existence and growth of a free-enterprise economy in which individual initiative and energy are encouraged and supported, and the Australian Constitution is the greatest bulwark against socialism that Australia has.

To a large degree, the growth, stability and prosperity of the Australian nation can be attributed to the favourable conditions which these factors create. Despite that, the Whitlam A.L.P. Government wishes to destroy for all time the basis of our foundation and growth, and to render the Australian Constitution inoperative as the great bulwark against both socialism and centralism.

The rights and safeguards contained in the Constitution as it now exists are under grave challenge from a Prime Minister who is both an avowed centralist and a determined socialist, and who also happens to be the most arrogant and petulant Prime Minister Australia has ever had.

The passage of either or both of the 8 December referendum proposals would greatly facilitate the forcing of both socialism and centralism on the people by the Whitlam socialist Government. Without any doubt at all, that is what the referendum really is about. It seeks to give unlimited, and undefined, power to Canberra, and to destroy the free-enterprise basis of our economy.

The referendum is not designed to cure the inflation crisis, which is merely being used to deceive and mislead the Australian people into conferring tremendous—and dangerous—power on the socialist Government in Canberra. What is more, these two proposals merely form the beginning of a programme of referendum proposals that are designed to achieve Labor's socialist and centralist goals.

We have already been told that, in conjunction with the Senate election next year, the people will be asked to vote on three more referendum proposals. That will mean a total of five referendums in 18 months, but it is not the end of the line as already two additional proposals have been foreshadowed for referral to the electorate at the next House of Representatives election. When we consider the current proposals, it is essential that those planned for the future be considered in that context.

One of the proposals to be submitted at the time of the Senate election would destroy completely the guaranteed position of smaller States under the Constitution. So that small States are not disadvantaged, the Constitution currently provides that a question shall not be carried unless it is approved by a majority of electors and a majority of States. The centralist, big-State-dominated, Whitlam Government will ask the people to provide that in future only a majority of electors, and not a majority of States, be required to vote "Yes" to effect a change in the Constitution. The less-populous States, and the citizens who populate them, will be seriously disadvantaged.

The Prime Minister's claim that he is not out to weaken or destroy State Governments simply cannot be believed. At the same time, the people are to be asked to

amend the Constitution to provide for equality of electorates in all Parliaments—State and Federal. This move is designed to perpetuate the Labor Party in office and to end the sovereignty and independence of the State Parliaments. If passed, this proposal would make the States little better than colonies of Canberra, and State Parliaments little more than impotent regional administrations.

At the time of the next House of Representatives election, the Whitlam Government is to seek wider powers over all working conditions, particularly over contractors, independent operators and the self-employed.

When we take the current referendum together with the proposed future referendums, one thing emerges with crystal clarity: they all form part of a deliberate and calculated plan to achieve both centralist domination and socialist control over every aspect of our society. The excuse of a referendum to control inflation is clearly seen to be the fraud and deceit it really is.

This is further evidenced when we think back to exactly how this referendum came into being. It is now a little bit of history. It was not promised in Mr. Whitlam's policy speech last year. After all, it would be dangerous for Labor to be honest with the people before an election. Of course, the A.L.P. in Government is committed to implementing the whole of its platform in the first three years of office. When you look through it, Mr. Speaker, you will see mentioned all the referendums that have to be proposed before the next Federal election. These are the "hush" policies of the A.L.P. which are now coming to light. In fact, the idea of this referendum did not see the light of day until 6 September this year. On that day, the Labor caucus in Canberra—Australia's 90-man Cabinet—was asked by a group of Left-wing members to approve the holding of a referendum to gain power over prices.

It is significant, and it deserves to be remembered, that the Prime Minister on that day —6 September—was the leading opponent of the call for a referendum. He said that a referendum was not justified, that other measures would be needed to cure inflation, and that he had the power he required. Yet just one week after that event he did a remarkable somersault. The same man who a week earlier had so strongly opposed any referendum called a hasty caucus meeting—again the 90-man Cabinet—to announce that a referendum would be held.

The major newspapers all reported the next day that the Labor caucus greeted his about-face announcement with laughter. One member said Mr. Whitlam was engaging in acrobatics. That would be the understatement of 1973. He would be the greatest acrobat of all time.

Once that remarkable feat was achieved, the next hurdle was to get the proposal through the Senate. Again the Prime Minister resorted to acrobatics. A deal was done with the D.L.P. senators so that a referendum would be held on incomes at the same time. To get this proposal through the caucus, the now-infamous threat to resign was used by the Prime Minister. With every Labor member fearful of an early election, Mr. Whitlam got his way. That is exactly how the multi-million dollar referendum was born—out of a combination of extraordinary political turnabouts and back-room deals.

When these facts are recalled, the manner in which the Whitlam Government is attempting to portray this referendum is to be utterly deplored. In the "Yes" case now being circulated to all electors, the Prime Minister asks for a "Yes" vote on both proposals because the Australian Government—I still prefer to call it the "Federal" Government—needed to use "fairness and balance in the fight against inflation". The simple fact is that the incomes proposal was initially included only to meet the demands of the minority parties in the Senate. To suggest that it was included for fairness and to help in the fight against inflation only demonstrates what little respect the present Federal Government has for truth and honesty.

Once he was forced to include incomes, the Prime Minister quickly realised how useful control over incomes would be in the pursuit of his socialist aims. He was able to sell this line to the majority of his colleagues, but not to the president of the A.C.T.U. (Mr. Hawke), who at least deserves some recognition for being more honest than the present Prime Minister. We now find the extraordinary situation in which the Labor Prime Minister claims that control over incomes is essential to fight inflation while the Federal president of the Labor Party claims that it is not.

We also find that the A.C.T.U., the State Trades and Labor Councils and the Victorian A.L.P. agree with Mr. Hawke, who has offered other cures for inflation, such as higher taxation, and, by so doing, has publicly dissociated himself from the Prime Minister's plea that he needs a "Yes" vote to control inflation.

This is the background to the referendum on 8 December. It is a sorry story of a Prime Minister and a Government unwilling to face up to their responsibilities in regard to the most serious inflation problem yet faced by Australia. It is a deplorable story of a Government that is deliberately deceiving the people—particularly those sections most adversely affected by inflation—into granting it unprecedented and dangerous powers under the guise of an attack on inflation.

It is also a story of a power-hungry centralist Government that deliberately seeks confrontation instead of co-operation with the States; and which is determined to use dishonest and fraudulent methods to destroy States and to force socialism on the Australian people.

These facts alone are more than sufficient to justify the passage of this motion today, But, when coupled with the lamentable record of the present Federal Government in controlling inflation, they provide irrefutable justification for the adoption of this motion and for the stand that the Queensland Government and the parties that form it have taken.

When the Federal Labor Government was elected to office on 2 December last year, Australia had an inflation rate of 5 per cent a year and, according to recent official estimates, it was 5 per cent declining. The then Opposition Leader—the present Prime Minister—said that 5 per cent was too high and that a Labor Government would see that it was reduced. Well, they have had their chance. Labor has had almost a year to reduce it yet the annual rate of inflation today is 15 per cent—three times what it was 12 months ago. And it is undeniable that the greatest contributor to the present alarming rate of inflation has been the policies of the A.L.P. Government.

Let us take a look at the last Federal Budget. The tax on fuel was increased by 5c a gallon—a move that was highly inflationary in that it increased costs and charges across the total transport spectrum of the Australian economy. The same Budget increased postal charges and various forms of company taxation, both moves that contributed to inflationary pressures. The same Budget provided for a 20 per cent increase in total Federal expenditure, the formation of new departments and the creation of thousands of additional Public Service positions—all inflation-boosting measures.

Soon after the Budget, the Whitlam Government deliberately forced an increase in the cost of money by raising interest rates to the highest level in Australia's history. This imposed an additional financial burden on home-buyers. It was an inflationary move to that extent, but one taken by a government that has demonstrated a callous disregard for the individual and a total refusal to help young people acquire their own homes. It looks upon people who own their own homes as "little capitalists".

How can any thinking person believe that the present Canberra Government is genuinely concerned to reduce the rate of inflation when its own policies have been highly inflationary? In my view, the Whitlam Government has a vested interest in inflation remaining at a high level. In fact, if there was a sudden decrease, Canberra would probably be bankrupt. It certainly would not be able to meet its social-welfare programme.

During the Federal election campaign, and in the Budget speech, great play was made of the fact that personal taxation would not be increased. Thanks to inflation, the Federal Treasury will take an extra $1,000 million this year from taxpayers without having to increase the basic tax rate. Every wage-earner will pay more tax this year than he did last year. I think it is obvious that the Federal socialist Government is feeding itself on inflation—and desperately hopes that a high rate will be maintained so that it can pay for its extravagant and economically irresponsible programme.

I believe that the Federal Government is guilty of gross irresponsibility in its deliberate use of inflation, and stands condemned for callously pursuing a programme that hits most of all, the working man and those on fixed incomes. It is indicative of the inhumanity of socialism that Canberra should appeal to the working man, and those on fixed incomes, for a "Yes" vote on 8 December. On the one hand, it exploits these people and their dependants; on the other, it appeals to them for more power.

The basic argument offered in support of the "Yes" case is totally discredited and demonstrably dishonest. This referendum is part of Canberra's power-grab. It has been related to inflation only to give it a semblance of respectability and responsibility. Between now and voting day, it must be exposed for the fraud that it really is so that the people of this nation will not be deceived by a government that uses a national tragedy to increase its own power and domination.

Anyone who doubts that the Federal Government is determined to render all State Governments impotent and ineffectual ignores overwhelming evidence that accumulated before the A.L.P. took office and has been confirmed and expanded since it took office. Few would deny the need for the Constitution to be reviewed. That is why the States called together the recent Constitutional Convention. But the undoubted need for constitutional review is no justification whatsoever for the transfer of the unlimited and undefined powers which Canberra seeks on 8 December.

The great obstacle to the socialist-centralist programme of the Federal Government is the Australian Constitution. For it to continue to be effective, it must be defended by those who believe in its basic principles—a federal system, and individual initiative. That is the challenge that faces this Parliament today.

The Government parties will unhesitatingly honour their obligation to the people of Queensland to uphold the fundamental basis of the Constitution and to preserve the position of State Governments in the federal system. The gravity of the threat that we face cannot be overstated. The very future of the traditional basis of our society is at the crossroads. Free enterprise, freedom of choice, and decentralisation of power and authority in Australia will be endangered if Canberra gains the additional powers it seeks. The Federal Government must be forced to face up to the problem of inflation positively and responsibly. It cannot be allowed to use the alibi of this problem for a dangerous power-grab on 8 December.

This Parliament must unquestionably use the opportunity that the presentation of this motion affords it to express its irrevocable opposition to referendum proposals that endanger the future of all State Governments, and that seek to upturn the very basis of our economy. This referendum is a fraud. If it is allowed to succeed, both this State and its people will be the unfortunate victims. I therefore have pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.45 p.m.): First of all, to make our position clear, I say that the Opposition's answer to the motion is "No." Secondly, I wish to deal with the sneaky, miserable way in which this motion was introduced. Last night, when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier, as is the usual practice in this Parliament, about the business for tomorrow, the Premier indicated to him that we would be sitting for only half a day, which would normally mean that we would be dealing with the normal business of the day.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: He mentioned Matters of Public Interest.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is so.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN I rise to a point of order.

Mr. F. P. Moore: You're a snake.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mourilyan has been warned once already.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition said that I gave an assurance that we would sit for only half a day. That is completely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept the Premier's denial.

Mr. HOUSTON: As I was not here, I cannot——

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition said something which the Premier has denied. I ask him to accept that denial.

Mr. HOUSTON: I accept the denial. I prefer to let my colleagues be the judge.

Let me outline what happened.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There are more interjections from the Opposition side than the Government side. I should expect Opposition members to listen at least to their leader.

Mr. HOUSTON: I suppose that the Government Whip will deny that this morning, when the Opposition Whip asked him about today's business, he said, "I think we will be sitting this afternoon," and added, "But I can't tell you what we are going to talk about." We already knew, because the honourable member for Murrumba has a loud voice and we can hear what he is saying.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is a straight-out, downright liar. I did not give him that information, and his statement is offensive to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Before I deal with his point of order, I ask the honourable member for Murrumba to withdraw the statement that the Leader of the Opposition is a liar. That is an unparliamentary term and I will not tolerate it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I withdraw it and say that he is telling an untruth, and it is offensive to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his remark.

Mr. HOUSTON: I did not say that the honourable member told me. I said that he had a loud voice.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition said that——

Mr. HOUSTON: That is all I said and my remark can be checked in "Hansard".

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will not argue with the Chair. I ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. HOUSTON: I withdraw it.

To go a little further, the Premier moved that we forgo the Matters of Public Interest debate. I point out that many honourable members desired to raise matters of public interest.

A Government Member: This is a matter of public importance.

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not deny that. It is of great public importance.

Although I naturally accepted your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I know that you made it under Standing Order 142, I was quite surprised that you concluded, very shortly after I rose to speak, that I had said enough on the Matters of Public Interest motion, but that is what the records will show. However, the Premier proceeded with his motion and, by doing so, denied six honourable members an opportunity to raise subjects that they regarded as being of major importance to this House.

The time allotted to Matters of Public Interest would have expired at 1 p.m., and the Premier could have introduced his other motion at 2.15 p.m., the normal time for Government business on Wednesday. If the Premier were "fair dinkum" in wanting this House to operate according to our concept of democracy (which he claims prevails in Queensland), he could have delayed until 2.15 p.m. However, we know full well

that he moved it earlier in the thought that he would gain some mid-day Press coverage. He was also frightened that a member of the Opposition might enter the Matters of Public Interest debate and say something about the State Government's attitude on many matters.

The Premier considers the motion to be so important—and he is such a strong democrat—that he wants the Opposition to debate it fully and speak on behalf of the people it represents, yet he saw fit to move it without even giving a copy to any Opposition member. At this point of time, all that Opposition members know about the motion is what they gleaned from the Premier's garbled, stuttering version of it. On that ground alone I would naturally be opposed to voting blindly for the motion, which has not been backed by any——

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I said at the outset that I was against the motion and I will outline plenty of reasons.

Mr. Bird: Are you going to let us voice our opinions?

Mr. HOUSTON: No. I predict now that as soon as the debate gets too hot for the Government, the "gag" will be applied. And the Government is capable of doing that. I have 32 colleagues on this side of the House who are capable of handling Government members either singly or collectively. Let there be no doubt about that.

To say the least, the Premier's speech was a pathetic effort which amounted actually to political humbug. Both his speech and that of the Minister for Justice indicated their personal hatred of Mr. Gough Whitlam. Their statements, too—and I have read many of them—reflect their personal hatred of him. It shines through very clearly. No man in public life has been abused more by the Premier and others than Gough Whitlam.

Mr. Tooth: What about Dr. Forbes?

Mr. HOUSTON: Apparently, Dr. Forbes is more often drunk than not. If the Minister thinks differently he can rise and say so. The Federal Opposition's motion was lost so that, according to this Government's reasoning Mr. Whitlam must have been right. In any case, State Government members have colleagues in Canberra to take care of what goes on in the Federal Parliament.

Why was this motion introduced now? It is significant that, a few days ago, in Kingaroy, which is in the Premier's electorate, a very important meeting was held. There is no doubt that the motion moved today was framed at that meeting. There is also no doubt that the guest speaker at that meeting would have been responsible for framing the motion. I am referring, of course, to Mr. Eric Butler, Director of the Australian League of Rights.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I have here a Press advertisement which shows that the meeting was held in Kingaroy on Friday, 16 November. It is headed, "Support Joh. Petersen. . . . Save our State".

Mr. Bousen: He was the guest speaker.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes.

The subject was, "What must be done?" Mr. Butler said, "When you get into Parliament, call your Liberal Party and Country Party colleagues together, and take a united stand in moving for the adjournment of the House so that you can introduce this motion." I have no doubt that Mr. Butler was the man who framed it.

Sir Charles Adermann, who was a former Federal Cabinet Minister, was also a speaker at that meeting, as was Mr. Jim Adams. I do not think that there is any doubt that this motion was organised at that meeting.

What is the League of Rights? Let me outline what one of the Government's Liberal colleagues, Mr. Edward St. John, who was a Liberal member of the Federal Parliament, had to say. He was a very ardent supporter of the Liberal Party and the Country Party, and this is what he said—

> "The League of Rights is wrong—hopelessly, tragically, cruelly wrong. Wrong in its leadership, wrong in its policies, wrong in the panaceas it proposes, wrong in its fallacious economics, most wrong in the pernicious doctrines of racism and anti-Semitism of international plots of conspiracies . . . Despite all its pious protestations about the rights of the individual the League is by no means a democratic body itself. Its self-styled leader-prophet, priest and king is . . . Mr. Eric D. Butler, National Director of the Australian League of Rights."

This is the organisation that has now heavily infiltrated the Country Party. Of course, it is well known that the Country Party has dominated the Liberal Party, and so well has it done that today that the time of the House is being wasted so that the Government can foster a resolution put forward by the League of Rights. It is a shocking state of affairs when Parliament is used for such a purpose. Although I do not usually recommend books written by Liberals, I recommend a reading of this one to honourable members opposite. It sets out the situation very clearly. I emphasise that what it contains was said not under the protection of Parliamentary privilege, but on a public platform. What is printed in this book was said on a public platform, and it is now available in book form. Of course, Mr. St. John questioned the moral conduct of a Liberal member, and he, of course, was "turfed" out.

I think we all know that Mr. Eric Butler has quite a reputation. When racist South Africa and the Smith regime in Rhodesia open their arms and say that he is a wonderful Australian, it is unnecessary for me to

say any more about him. However, it is important that this House, and the people of Queensland, know exactly what Country Party members are talking about at present. Of course, the change of name of the Country Party was brought about by those who infiltrated the Country Party from the League of Rights. League of Rights members over the years spoke about a national party when the League of Rights was first coming into Queensland.

Mr. Bird: They have you worried.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, they do have me worried. Any Fascist organisation worries me, and it is Fascism that we are seeing here today. What is taking place now is a clear example of Fascism in operation if ever I saw such a thing.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections from the Government benches.

Mr. HOUSTON: The League of Rights said at its earlier meetings, "What we need in Australia is a national party." What does the Country Party now call itself? It calls itself the National Party. The Minister for Local Government and Electricity and others were advocates of the policies of the League of Rights, and virtually every word that the Premier said today about Communism and the like was taken from the doctrines of the League of Rights.

Now, what is the referendum all about?

Government Members: Hooray!

Mr. HOUSTON: We have not heard from the Premier what it is all about. He did not tell us. Of course, the referendum is to give the public of Australia an opportunity to express their views. That is what honourable members opposite are objecting to.

Mr. Knox: Not at all.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, you are. The Liberal and Country Parties in the Federal Parliament voted against the other three referendums that the Labor Party wanted. In this House, the Minister for Justice said, "I agree with what the Liberal and Country Parties did in the Federal Parliament to deny the people of Australia the opportunity to vote at a referendum." Surely referendums are what democracy is all about. The real objection of the Liberal and Country Parties is that at a referendum every person has one vote and one value. In Parliamentary elections, under the gerrymander of the Government, one vote for a Country Party member is worth about three votes for a member on this side of the House. That is one of the reasons why Government members do not like referendums. Honourable members opposite mouth support for democracy, but they deny it to the people of Australia at every opportunity.

It is obvious that this debate was instigated by the League of Rights, because the State Liberal and Country Parties have no faith in Mr. Snedden's "No" case. Every citizen will be receiving the "Yes" case prepared by Mr. Whitlam and the "No" case prepared by Mr. Snedden. Surely if the Liberal and Country Parties in Government in Queensland believe that Mr. Snedden could present a worth-while, documented and accurate case, there would not be any need to waste the time of the Queensland State Parliament on Federal matters. But they have no case, and it should not be forgotten that the Liberal Party in Queensland is renowned for bucking its Federal leaders. We know how they sacked John Gorton and put up Billy McMahon. When he did not do the job properly, they tried to undermine him; but, luckily, the people of Australia realised that Billy had to go.

I think we all realise, Mr. Speaker, that the vehicle of a referendum was borrowed originally from the Swiss system, and one of the major purposes of providing for a referendum was to enable constitutional change.

The Constitution was not meant to be a rigid document, although it is restrictive by nature. It was the intention of our forefathers who drew up the Constitution that it should be a living document, with in-built provisions for change to meet contemporary needs. Surely no-one will argue that the circumstances and conditions that prevailed in the late 1890's, when the Constitution was accepted, are identical with those of today. Modern means of transport and communications that, respectively, make it possible to circle the world in a matter of hours and a few minutes, the way of life and the breakdown in the international situation must all bring a need for a change to the Constitution. What were previously definite State responsibilities must now surely be national responsibilities.

However, tragically, the vehicle of change —the referendum—has become a conservative device and is not being used for the purpose for which it was originally intended. Indeed, the example of the Swiss has not been reflected in changes in the Australian Constitution.

Australia could have been heading for an inflation rate of 20 per cent if the dollar had not been revalued by the Labor Government in December 1972. That was the opinion of Dr. Porter, an economist attached to the International Monetary Fund. He suggested that the real legacy of Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra was the perverse effect of combined monetary and exchange-rate policies, which in all probability generated a significantly higher rate of inflation than might have prevailed using different policy instruments.

Dr. Porter—no relation to Charles Porter —has demonstrated that the Reserve Bank's aggressive bond-selling operations over 1970-72, which were designed to mop up excess

liquidity, did nothing of the sort; instead, they generated greater capital inflow, substantially increasing the base money supply—a fundamental contribution to the current rate of inflation.

The implications of Dr. Porter's study are that, with no significant policy changes, Australia's current rate of inflation would have been well in excess of world rates. Further, it can be demonstrated that a more enlightened and less entrenched view of the fixed-exchange-rate regime, which only finally emerged under the Labor Government, might have permitted Australia to avoid, or at least diminish, the disastrously high level of inflation it is now suffering.

There is no doubt in the minds of the nation's leading economists that the stay-put policies of the former Liberal Country Party Government in Canberra, the market operations of the Reserve Bank and the rigidity of exchange-rate changes of the Treasury could not have more perfectly combined to induce extreme inflation. Honourable members will recall that, early this year, the Federal Opposition leader, Mr. Sneddon, called for a prices-wages freeze over 90 days. Clearly he has now dropped the call, following the experiences of the Heath Government in Great Britain. It will be remembered that Mr. Heath imposed a 90-day prices and wages freeze, but at the end of his experiment found his Government still confronted with an inflation rate of 11.9 per cent. At the time, Mr. Heath refused to touch the interest rates and refused to consider revaluation of sterling. The result of his intransigence has been rampant inflation and the prospect of having to raise interest rates as high as 13 per cent.

Mr. Snedden has not offered any alternative solution except the prospect of high unemployment and a return to the methods which the economists and the experts of the Reserve Bank have already soundly denounced.

The Premier does not know what he is talking about when he says that Australia has one of the highest inflation rates in the world. He forgets that in Israel inflation is running at 18 per cent, in West Germany at 14 per cent, in Great Britain at nearly 12 per cent, and that in fact most Western European countries have an inflation rate comparable with, if not higher than, Australia's. He forgets that Japan could be faced with the prospect of an inflation rate approaching 20 per cent.

Mr. R. E. Moore: It shows what a good Government we had in the federal sphere before your lot got there.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member is the great advocate for Japan. I have just said that that country is facing an inflation rate of 20 per cent.

Obviously the Premier does not understand inflation; nor does he advance any contributions which his Government might make to attack the problem. He speaks about the examples of past Prime Ministers, but he cannot name the Prime Ministers, or tell the House what measures they employed.

The other day in this House we heard him say that the high price of land was being brought about by strikes. We have also heard him say here that his Government is considering the problem, but no programme of action has been put forward. As to his talk about cutting down public expenditure, as I said earlier, he ought to look at his own Budget in which expenditure increased by 22 per cent compared with an increase of 19 per cent in the Commonwealth Budget. Moreover, he ought to look at his own Estimates, which show that since he has been Premier the expenditure of his department alone has increased by 120 per cent. Of course, we know he has now engaged many speech writers and public relations officers. If today's effort is any example of their ability, they are grossly overpaid.

Why was it necessary for the Commonwealth Government to ask the people of Australia to vote in this referendum? Apart from what price and income control may do for the nation, the whole point is that if the States really object to handing over permanent powers—I notice from the posters in the streets that one of the things the Country-Liberal Government does not like about the referendum is the fact that it is going to hand over powers permanently—the States had it in their own hands to give the powers to the Commonwealth for a limited period.

Mr. Lee: Rot!

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not rot. No wonder the honourable member is not in Cabinet; he does not even know what he is talking about.

The whole point is that the States have the power under the Constitution to hand over to the Commonwealth any powers they want to, for any period of time they decide.

At the Constitutional Convention Sir Gordon Chalk said that he would be prepared to hand over some powers on these matters to the Commonwealth for a limited period. A "Courier-Mail" report stated—

> "The Treasurer (Sir Gordon Chalk) said yesterday he thought all States would co-operate with the Federal Government if it desired to apply price and income restraint."

That is what the referendum is all about. It is significant that this matter was brought on today. Of course, it could not have been brought on last week because the League of Rights had not given its instructions. Mr. Butler had not told the Premier what to do. Government members did not wait until next week when Sir Gordon Chalk will be back. They did not want to embarrass their colleague. Honourable members on that side could hardly argue in favour of the two points of view.

Let us see what the Federal Government is asking. It is asking the people of this State and Australia to exercise their democratic right. That being so, I do not think it is the correct or honourable function of this Parliament to try to influence them as to what they should do. The Constitution lays down that each side shall put its case and that is all. But this government, through the Premier, has constantly sought to attack the Federal Government, and this motion is just another prong of its attack.

The Premier not only personally attacked Mr. Whitlam but, for good measure, made a personal attack on me. I personally do not care what I am called; I have been attacked by many people. In fact, I have been abused by experts, so I say to all the amateurs opposite that they are only wasting their time. If experts cannot hurt me, amateurs have no chance.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: At least I advance the same story each time I speak, and I do not require a large team of speech writers to prepare my speeches for me.

The Premier said, in his personal attack on me—which does not worry me—"Let him stand up for Queensland." My reply is that when he has done as much for Queensland as I have—history will record it—he can be a very proud man. I am afraid he will never be able to do that because our children and their children will ask, "Mum (or Dad), what is the big hole in the ground? Did we get anything out of that?"

An Opposition member: We can reply, "That is Petersen's folly."

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. One can see it over the whole length of the State, and particularly in North Queensland. When a map of the Cape York Peninsula is drawn in years to come, after there is a change of State Government or the Federal Government gets its way, it will be seen to have a different shape. A large portion of it will be covered by water because all the topsoil of the land will have been taken away for a miserable 5c a ton—5c a ton for our national heritage. If anyone should be disgusted, it is those honourable members opposite who have been responsible for this shocking sell-out of our national resources. They constantly claim to be making a profit on the railways from the haulage of coal, but the Grants Commission did not accept their word. I ask them how much of this State's railway is owned by Comalco? Not long ago honourable members opposite argued in this House that the whole of our railway system should be State-owned, but, as soon as Comalco said, "Look, Joh, we want to build a railway line and we want to own it and run it.", they were allowed to build it, and they did.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: The Premier has shares in it.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will not say that. I do not know whether he has or not. But I do know that Cabinet members in this House have shares that they were granted on a very preferential basis. At least I can stand up in this House and say with all honesty that I rejected the offer. No company can buy me.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Burns has them, too.

Mr. HOUSTON: Never mind about what private members of Parliament or private citizens do; they have their rights. But I have said a thousand times before that Cabinet Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition in this House should not be tied up by having shares in companies—and I carry out my belief.

However, let us go a bit further. The Premier says of me, "Let him stand up for Queensland." I ask the Premier, "What about your doing something for Queensland? What about doing something to combat the atrocious crime rate in this State?" Every day, citizens in this State, are being bashed and robbed and women are being raped. What has he done about it? He promised in his election speech that he would bring law and order to this State. What a joke!

Responsible officers of the Police Department warn people not to go onto the south-side of the city. Every day women telephone me and say, "Mr. Houston, I am frightened to stay at home alone at night." Only the other day a person who returned home from a function was bashed in his own back yard. This is what goes on in this State. People are not game to even go outside their back doors, yet the Government allows this shocking state of affairs to continue.

The Premier cannot get up in this House and blame strikes for the robberies and violence that are taking place. On many occasions we on this side of the Chamber have urged the Government to increase the strength of the Police Force and to pay police officers a fair salary as well as provide them with the opportunities of advancement and extra pay for additional skill. Every day a number of police officers resign.

This afternoon I received word of industrial unrest at the Wynnum Geriatric Hospital. This morning the nursing staff attended a union meeting to discuss bad working conditions in general and a shortage of staff. The Department of Health has been advised of the meeting as well as of the fact that the sisters at the hospital have decided to resign en masse in two weeks' time if the conditions about which they complain are not improved. In an endeavour to retain the staff the department has offered a large increase in pay, but the offer will be accepted only if the conditions are rectified. This is happening in the Government's back yard.

Mr. Chinchen: Are you for or against the motion?

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member should clean out his ears and open his brain. I have already said that I am against it. It is rubbish that does not mean a thing. Moreover, it is certainly not the responsibility of this Parliament to deny the people of the State the right to decide the issue for themselves.

As to prices, which are a factor contributing to inflation and also one of the issues involved in this debate, the Minister for Justice has claimed that free enterprise helps keep prices down. What utter nonsense! Why are prices rising?

Mr. Armstrong: Because we have Whitlam in Canberra.

Mr. HOUSTON: There is always the clown who will jump in and give a comic performance.

It is a fact of life that prices are out of hand and are continuing to rise without justification. Everyone is getting on the band wagon. I have spoken to a number of people who have increased prices. They have said to me, "Everyone is doing it. If you pull some people into line, you will bring all of them into line."

All that the Federal Government is asking the people of Queensland to do is to give it the authority to handle a national problem on a national basis. In South Australia experience has clearly shown that the price of a commodity that is both produced and sold in that State can be controlled successfully. However, experience has also shown that the prices of commodities that are either imported or brought to South Australia from interstate cannot be controlled by one State Government alone.

Mr. R. E. Moore: What about bread?

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member's head is made of bread, so he would know more about that commodity than I would.

The Government set up an inquiry into bread prices and was told that it should take certain action. However, it took no action whatever and tried to lay at the feet of someone else the total blame for increases in bread prices.

On each occasion that the price of bread has risen, it was claimed that the increase was designed to assist what were termed the "poor" wheat farmers, who were entitled to a fair return for their wheat. I completely agree that they are entitled to a just return for their produce. However, what is the current situation? The secretary of the Grain Growers' Association has said that the wheat farmers have not received any benefit at all from increases in bread prices. He has condemned as being untrue the claims made by the Liberal and Country Party members in this Chamber.

As I have said before, the Federal Government has taken many steps to tackle inflation.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: How could any Cabinet Minister who is wedded to a policy of "open go, mate" be expected to take any action to combat inflation? He has told every businessman in Queensland, "Do what you like; charge what you like; I am completely for it." This principle has been applied by land speculators and others. The Premier speaks about being a good Queenslander, but what has he done to protect young, prospective home-owners against inflated land prices? Nothing at all! What has he done to provide homes for people who need them desperately? Only the other day my attention was directed to the case of a family living in a shared home after their own home was demolished. They were taken in by the other family, and, because they now have a roof over their heads, the Housing Commission says, "You are adequately housed." It forgets that the people who took them in did so as good Samaritans, but they are now denied the use of part of their home thanks to their desire to render assistance. The people who were taken in have virtually no priority.

A Government Member: What has this to do with a referendum?

Mr. HOUSTON: It is part of doing something for Queensland, and I emphasise that the State Government is doing nothing.

Mr. Lane: Why do they call you "Give-away Jack"?

Mr. HOUSTON: For the same reason, of course——

Mr. Lane: You admit it, do you?

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not admit it at all. I am generous by nature, but I am not prepared to give away this State's natural resources. Unlike the Government, I am not prepared to give our natural heritage to foreigners. That is the difference.

Mr. Lane: You have sold your soul to Canberra.

Mr. HOUSTON: One thing I have never done is take money out of the pockets of drunks, and there are others who cannot say that.

The Premier said later that the Federal Government stopped the Comalco development. I answered that charge the other day in this House. The point is that the Federal Government did not stop the Comalco development.

A Government Member: Who did?

Mr. HOUSTON: It is purely and simply a matter of Comalco making its decision on the economics of the situation. If Comalco had said, "Yes, we are coming to Queensland," State Government Ministers would have run down to Gough Whitlam saying, "Please give us millions of dollars so that we can develop the area, build hospitals, police stations, roads, a power-house and a

dam." The Government breathed a tremendous sigh of relief on the day that the announcement was made that the Comalco development was not proceeding.

I shall now deal with the "No" case prepared by Mr. Snedden. He said—

> "The positive answer to inflation is in co-operation between all Governments, employers and employees."

Mr. Snedden refers to "co-operation", but Queensland has a Premier who would not even go to dinner with the Prime Minister. He would not even attend a social gathering. Of course, when the big business giants in Tokyo said, "Come, Joh, and have a cup of saki with us," that was a different matter altogether. He attended, and I should be interested to know how good an Australian he was on that occasion when he vilified and castigated the legally elected Government of this nation.

Mr. Snedden then said that to put his theory into operation could mean having a short freeze on prices and incomes. Snedden wants to freeze prices and incomes, yet he criticised the Federal Government on the basis that if it gets the referendums through it will control wages. Does he not know that wages are already controlled by industrial tribunals?

Mr. Campbell: A minimum wage is set.

Mr. HOUSTON: Does not that control it?

(Time expired.)

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (3.24 p.m.): When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking——

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lickiss): Order! I remind the House that while I am in the chair no personal invective will be directed to any honourable member.

Mr. PORTER: I am sorry that I did not hear it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member might be good enough to write down his remark.

The Leader of the Opposition made a pathetic plea about future generations saying, "Hey, Mum and Dad, what's that big hole in the ground?" I thought he was going to provide the real answer, which would have been the King George Square Car Park. This is typical of what we have heard. It has been nothing but an array of trivialities and irrelevancies. Indeed, it is hard to believe that the Leader of the Opposition, in opposing a major motion, could be as obtuse as he deliberately chose to be in this debate.

What did we have? We had a puerile and quite infantile display from Opposition members. It was, in fact, a complete replay of their performance when the Appeals and Special Reference Bill was passed earlier this session. We had a series of senseless divisions, as though they wanted to use the vote to delay and obstruct this debate. If they believe in their cause, I cannot conceive how they would not be anxious to meet us head on and get on with the discussion. If they have any faith in their side of politics and feel that what the Federal Government is doing to Queensland is justified, they would have wanted this debate and would have tried to wipe the floor with us. Instead they used every fiddling little device to try to stop the debate.

In any case, the Leader of the Opposition said that he was told about the motion yesterday. We know that the Labor Party meeting this morning discussed the motion. So we had this mock, sham display of histrionics, pretending they were caught by surprise, and they had to react accordingly.

It gives me the greatest satisfaction to be able to support the motion. It is a sad commentary to find an Opposition so destitute of faith in its own arguments, and so ready to prostitute its role in this Parliament, that it is prepared to favour the interests of a Parliament in Canberra rather than of the Parliament in Brisbane. In fact, I think the words "destitute" and "prostitute" are apposite in replying to the argument of the Leader of the Opposition. He spoke noxious rubbish about the League of Rights and tried to pretend that some sinister outside body had organised this debate. It was so childish that it would not warrant being published in the comic strips. This motion was given priority on the Business Paper and, of course, it is the Government's prerogative to arrange the Business Paper.

Mr. Hanson: But not to abort democracy.

Mr. PORTER: In reply to the honourable member for Port Curtis, the business today was to have been the Matters of Public Interest debate. Surely we are now debating a matter of public interest. I cannot conceive of any matter that is of deeper public interest, and that is graver and more momentous, than the issue of establishing where this Parliament stands in the matter of Canberra taking power from Queensland and the other States. This is a massive issue, and it is proper that a State Government, sensible to its responsibilities not only to the people of Queensland but also to those of Australia, should, only three weeks before referendum day, bring the matter into sharp focus and use this Chamber to put the matter into the public spotlight by close, rational and judicial examination.

I hoped that we would have heard some rational argument from the Opposition. Instead, we heard all this noisome, squalid, foetid rubbish from them, trying to pretend that there is some dreadful secret society operating behind this Government. Indeed, it was very difficult to find in the Leader

of the Opposition's 40-minute effort any reference to the referendum, except that he would oppose this motion. I suppose that means he wants the referendum on both counts to succeed. Thank God the Opposition does not represent this State! We now know where it stands.

The Leader of the Opposition made this abundantly clear from his hysterical, phrenetic screaming about the State Government and, in particular, the Premier. This is deplorable when it comes from the leader of a political party. Let it be remembered, too, that he is talking about a Government that every survey and every public-opinion poll demonstrates has overwhelming support in the Queensland electorate. The Opposition will have speakers following me. I challenge them to produce evidence of any poll taken over the last 12 months which shows that the Opposition has stronger support than the Government. Honourable members opposite know that what they are claiming is not true.

Of course, Opposition members do not like this motion. They can no more face reality in this matter than the devil is prepared to face up to a little holy water. They rush away from it. They loathe being forced into the open on this issue. They hate having to stand up and be counted on it. They will do literally anything, including resorting to the most vindictive and personal abuse, to avoid being displayed nakedly to the people as an Opposition that, when the crunch comes, will act as servile stooges for their Canberra bosses. Indeed, they display the same gutless, mindless attitude that we see in so-called people's representatives in countries such as Russia, China, and Czechoslovakia—our new-found friends!

What is this motion all about? In very simple terms, it expresses the urgent concern of this Parliament over a referendum that is aimed directly at the castration of the federal system, to turn this and other States into administrative eunuchs. When the motion is carried, which I certainly hope it will be, it will authorise this State Government to wage a campaign on this Parliament's behalf, which means on behalf of the people of Queensland. To answer the little outburst of Mr. Lourigan the other day, it will undoubtedly authorise the Premier to use the official Government aeroplane in order to do it.

To me, this motion is the very minimum of what a still-sovereign Government—and a still-sovereign State Parliament, too—should enthusiastically support. I was prepared to support much more substantial action, but I was overruled. I say that we are facing the most atrocious attack from within that State Parliaments have seen since federation came about. We are not concerned these days with any foreign foes; we do not have to worry about them. What we have to do is protect ourselves from those forces that are threatening our institutions—our traditional political forums—and the relationships we have with those with whom we share a common ancestral heritage.

All these things are under threat, and the threat is a Quisling one from traitors within. In less than 12 months, these people who want to fashion an entirely new type of national socialism for Australia have plunged the country into the chaos of runaway inflation. Let us not pretend that inflation has been imported. I do not propose to spend time on inflation at the moment. It can be argued quite completely that inflation has not been imported; it is manufactured by the Government.

The Government in Canberra has also confused Australia's friends abroad. There is now a long list of countries—Britain, the United States, Singapore, Indonesia, Japan, Thailand—who are confused and disturbed. Mr. Kissinger even feels it necessary to write letters to Mr. Whitlam asking him to get his facts straight before he attacks the United States, and I think in this case Mr. Kissinger might be more credible than Mr. Whitlam, who has shown himself to be a liar on several occasions.

This is a Government that has set group against group deliberately, and it has done so even in its own ranks. There is the case of Mr. Hawke versus Mr. Whitlam. There is the A.C.T.U. versus the A.L.P. This is a record of self-destruction that Dr. Evatt, even in his palmy days, would not have been able to beat. It is quite obvious that there is in charge of affairs in Canberra a man who believes, "Thou shalt have no other 'Gough' but me."

Certainly the Government in Canberra has alarmed, dismayed and frightened people, from one end of Australia to the other, as never before in our political history, and I say again that every public-opinion poll, every survey, every by-election and every State election demonstrates this.

It may be of interest to honourable members to know what the Gallup Poll has said. The election on 2 December last year gave the A.L.P. 50 per cent of the vote. The last Gallup Poll showed the A.L.P. as getting 42 per cent—down eight per cent. In plain terms, in the election last year Labor had a lead over the Liberal and Country Parties of 9 per cent—that was its margin. On the Gallup Poll at the moment, it is down 7 per cent. That is a 16 per cent swing in 10 months. Such a swing has never been known before in history. And the Australian National Opinion Polls, which have always been overgenerous to the Labor Party, are now forced to concede that Labor's stocks are going down and down, to the bargain basement.

Mr. Wright: What about Mr. Snedden's?

Mr. PORTER: Let us not bother about Mr. Snedden; let us talk about Labor and its standing and what it has done in a few

months. We have to remember that until July, in the break-up of State figures in these polls, Western Australia showed the best Liberal-Country Party vote and the worst Labor vote. But in the last three months Queensland has shown the best situation in Australia for the Country-Liberal Parties and the worst for the A.L.P. Is that due to the bungling, stupidities and errors that this Government and its leaders have committed? Of course not! Overwhelmingly, people support what the Government of Queensland is doing and what its Premier is doing. I might mention, too, that Mr. Whitlam's approval rating is lower in this State than in any other State in Australia. So let us not have any nonsense about whether the Government of Queensland is on the right track and the A.L.P. is on the wrong track in this State.

Mr. Wright: You are so used to disseminating propaganda that you even believe yourself.

Mr. PORTER: The honourable member mentions propaganda. I am quoting electoral figures. If he can prove me wrong, I ask him to do so. Honourable members opposite are great ones for making statements of that type, but they simply refuse to deal in facts.

Let me look now at the recent New South Wales election—and I remind the House that many journalists still seek to excuse anything that Labor does and explain away its failures. Let me point out what happened in New South Wales. There has been a tendency to compare New South Wales electorate figures at the final count with those at the close of the count on the Saturday night. Let me say here and now that the Government's position improved on close-of-count figures. The key comparison is: what did Labor get in New South Wales last December in the Federal election, and what did it get in New South Wales at the last State election?

Mr. Wright: It is not relevant.

Mr. PORTER: It is not relevant? Well, that is interesting.

Mr. Wright: It is not.

Mr. PORTER: Irrelevant or not, I shall read it into the record. The fact is that in the Federal election last year Labor received 52.4 per cent of the vote in New South Wales. At present it has received 42.5 per cent of the vote in the New South Wales State election, and, according to the computer forecast of final figures, it will go down to 41.3 per cent. So Labor has lost 11 per cent of the vote in New South Wales in 10 months. That is quite fantastic.

Mr. Lee: It is greater than the rate of inflation.

Mr. PORTER: It is greater than the rate of inflation. Labor is running downhill so fast that in no time it will be out through the door backwards. The Federal Government has run out of credit with an Australian electorate that has run out of patience with it. No wonder, because it is a Government by gimmick instead of by performance, a Government that relies on antics instead of rational action, and a Government that indulges in cheap stunts instead of following policies. The forthcoming referendum is a classic example of how it performs. The Minister for Justice was quite correct in describing it as a fraud. It is nothing more than a power grab presented quite speciously as a move to curb the very inflation that Whitlam wants. I say flatly that he wants it. He is deliberately fermenting it.

Inflation over decades has been the very keystone for implementing socialism. It is the corner-stone of the national socialism that Mr. Whitlam and his cronies are trying to introduce into Australia at the present time. Even the most sycophantic journalists —it is staggering how many there are in the so-called capitalist Press who are anxious to beat the Whitlam drum and find excuses for everything the Federal Government does —are now finding it difficult to justify what is happening, because we continually are seeing third-rate showmanship in lieu of statesmanship. We are seeing a succession of shabby stunts instead of coherent, cohesive government.

We have in Canberra a Government in which each Cabinet Minister is wildly trying to cut off his own individual share of the action as though the concept of Cabinet collective responsibility has been put into the garbage tin. Then, like something from vaudeville's worst days, we have Mr. Whitlam presenting his big animal-taming act—making the wild caucus jump through the hoops, like so many toothless, superannuated circus tigers, by threatening to resign every three weeks. Presiding over all of this is a remarkable man. I use the word "remarkable" in its best sense. Honourable members opposite should not prattle to me about hating this fellow personally. I am concerned solely with how he acts as a political person. I do not even know him. I have no doubt that he is an affable husband, a splendid father and probably a wonderful person as a private citizen. But, as a political leader—well, what have we got?

Mr. Chinchen interjected.

Mr. PORTER: The honourable member for Mt. Gravatt is quite right. He struts around like some latter-day Cassius Clay as if to say, "I am the greatest—'Muhammed Ali' Whitlam." He throws off a succession of bitchy quips whenever he gets into a tight corner, and uses language much more suited to the pot-house than to the Parliament. In order to pander to his soaring ego, he denigrates the leaders of other countries and insults old allies. All the time, of course, he kowtows to the Reds. If they still wear kiminos—I do not think they do—they must be laughing themselves sick up their kimino sleeves at the way this man enables them to play us for a lot of sycophantic suckers.

I said that this is government by gimmick. We have Gough Whitlam, and apparently the "Gough" has to rhyme with "cough". On my version it should rhyme with "rough", so that he would be "Guff" Whitlam. If ever we have had government by "guff", we have had it from Canberra for the past 11 months. He said recently, "I am the greatest foreign Minister Australia has ever seen." When interviewed, his wife said, "Yes, he is arrogant. Of course he is arrogant. And he is entitled to be arrogant." Usually one has to go to a vaudeville show to get that sort of thing.

Just as rigor mortis is obviously well advanced in the caucus of the Federal Labor Government—if it went to the polls now it would go so far out that it would not be able to get back in two decades—so an ugly megalomania is well advanced in Mr. Whitlam's case. Remembering the late, unlamented Adolf Hitler, one should suggest to the staff in Canberra that they watch out for the curtains.

I say that this referendum is typical of the stunts and the gimmicks we have had from the Federal Government in an endless succession of cheap trickery. Mr. Whitlam is like a conjuror. The idea is to use misdirection. That is an essential part of the trick. The onlooker concentrates on one hand while the other hand does the job. So he concentrates attention on price control, which he knows will not work—he has said so—and this will divert attention from the real causes of inflation. We should all remember that when the referendum came up for discussion the first time round in caucus, Mr. Whitlam opposed it.

What are the real reasons for inflation? The Leader of the Opposition was very careful not to touch on this, trying to pretend that State Governments somehow had some stake in causing it. Inflation's causes are generated by the very Government which, by the misuse of its present powers, has made it a wild, galloping thing in a few months, whereas previously it was controlled. The Federal Government's quite fantastic rate of spending, the enormous increase in the Commonwealth Public Service, and the profusion of committees, boards, advisory bodies and tribunals, are the root causes of inflation. The enormous demand of the public sector has had an adverse effect on the private sector.

It would be very interesting to know just how much of the $87,000,000 appropriated for spending on Aboriginal affairs has been soaked up by these so-called expert committees, and how little of it has gone to the people it is supposed to help. This has been a bonanza for the radical fringes that come from so many Australian universities as experts and advisers to the Federal Government. To give that Government more power to do more harm of the type it has already done would be like giving a drink-driver who has already knocked down several people and has been stopped by a police officer, not a breathalyser test but a few more beers to continue on his way, with a blessing to knock down and maim a few more people.

It is essential that everybody should understand what the referendum on 8 December means to Queensland and Queenslanders. If either question is passed—I emphasise "either", not "both"—this will so vitiate State authority and responsibility as to change out of all recognition the present federal system, which has brought Australia tremendous growth and prosperity over seven decades. Nobody can deny that. It is unequalled in the Western world, with stability and full employment being maintained and at the same time a large population growth being achieved. These are facts; they are on record in every official Year Book that exists.

Already the federal system has been greatly eroded by the steady transfer, over the years, of authority from the States to Canberra because Canberra has exerted superior economic power. But let us remember that this power was given to them by the High Court. Never once was it approved by the people of Australia—and they will not approve the questions on 8 December, either.

Of course, Labor is not satisfied with any slow process in the death of the States and the aggrandisement of the Government in Canberra. Its members are mad with the lust for power and they want it all now. Everything has to be centralised in Canberra and come under the control of these academic bureaucrats—the director of this, the chairman of that—today's Australian equivalent of Russia's commissars. It is precisely this new elite, who have been spawned in the radical fringe circles of so many Australian universities, who want to carve out, each for himself, an area of power and glory in the new Canberra bureaucracy.

This is the great danger to the States. This is what the referendum is all about. The A.L.P. will not have anything that is slow and gradual. This is the day of instant action; this is the day of the long knives so far as the States are concerned. The referendum, by the simple malevolent device of providing for power without definition—and it is power without any definition at all—

Mr. Murray: And permanent power.

Mr. PORTER: It is indeed.

By this means, the Federal Government aims at the quick, ruthless and brutal garrotting of the federal system—sudden death, instead of slow death by poisoning.

We must realise that the referendum seeks approval for two quite undefined powers. We are asked to add to section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution the words "incomes" and "prices". I do not propose to waste any time talking about the word "incomes", because we all know that this proposal will be ignominiously defeated.

Labor's poor showing all over Australia, the public-opinion polls, the fact that the A.C.T.U. is offside, and the further fact that Mr. Hawke is operating against Mr. Whitlam—Hawke seems to be the more popular of the two at the moment—will ensure that the "incomes" referendum will be lost.

However, in the language of earlier television shows, the $64 question is, "What about prices?" Perhaps I should say it is the $1,700,000 question, because that is the amount Mr. Whitlam has appropriated for propaganda purposes—not the official case—in keeping with his grandiose ideas. We all know that price control has been a miserable failure wherever it has been tried, and it always will be. World experience, South Australian experience, which the Leader of the Opposition tried to play around with, and our own Queensland experience when we had it, have all demonstrated that price control will not work.

It is fascinating to see that the former chairman of the United States Treasury, as well as the former head of the now-defunct Prices Commission for President Nixon have both admitted that the attempts in that country to control prices failed, and that price control could not work. Quite recently, the Professor of Economics at the Manchester University, Professor Michael Parkin, appeared on television (surely the A.B.C. made an error in allowing him to appear on television!) and blasted the concept of trying to control inflation through incomes and prices control. He said that if the two referendums were carried they would represent a disastrous attempt to implement direct controls on a relatively narrow range of prices. He, too, said that price control will not work, and expressed the hope that the referendums would not be carried.

Let me point out to people who keep on claiming that if the Federal Government is given price control it will control the cost of land, that control of land prices was tried in the days of price control at the end of World War II. Whereas that price control was only temporary, this certainly will not be, and the situation will be worse. All that happened in those days was that there were black-market dealings, complete contempt for the law and a dreadful artificial land shortage. We will be in the most awful bureaucratic chaos if we attempt to control prices, particularly land prices, by this method.

We know, of course, that Mr. Whitlam is aware that price control will not work and, until someone pointed out to him how it could be used to overthrow the federal system, he never wanted it. He has not the remotest intention of using this power, if he gets it (I do not think he will), to control the price of household commodities. Many people fondly imagine that this is what the referendum is all about. Not for him!

On 17 September, at a manufacturers' dinner held in Canberra, Mr. Whitlam said—and I urge honourable members opposite to listen to these words, because Mr. Whitlam is their big white chief—

> "For myself, I frankly confess that I have always had reservations about the value of price-control powers—reservations I have publicly acknowledged and explained."

Are members of the Opposition now going to deny their Federal leader? Will they try to tell me that he really wants the power to control prices and does not want it for some nefarious reason? Of course he does.

Mr. Wright: Move along at very low key now. Let us hear the "old" Porter.

Mr. PORTER: The honourable member seems to be quite happy, as I am. In that case, we are all happy, and therefore the sting is taken out of the debate.

We need to look carefully at the specific dangers for Queensland and Queenslanders in Canberra's assuming power over prices. Let us bear in mind that once any power is passed to Canberra it becomes exclusively Canberra's and is not shared with anybody else. The significance of this is that it means that each and every State activity, as well as all personal activity, that involves a charge for service will become subject to Federal whim and will. The only exception for the State will be charges in the nature of taxes.

On the State scene it means that all the activities of the S.G.I.O., all freight and passenger rates, all the charges imposed by the Railway Department, all the determinations of marketing boards, all the rentals fixed by the Queensland Housing Commission, all the charges set by the regional electric authorities, and all other charges made by semi-governmental bodies and statutory authorities, will come under the direct, total and absolute control of Canberra.

We have to recognise, too, that many constitutional experts claim that price control means wages control. In plain terms, this means that Mr. Whitlam can afford to lose the incomes referendum. He is playing it in such a way that he expects to lose it, because he knows that if he gets power over prices he also gets power over wages and a large number of incomes.

In South Australia, under price control doctors' fees are controlled, and the Supreme Court in that State has upheld that power. I would remind honourable members that, in the first speech made by Mr. Whitlam on television in support of the referendum on price control, he said it would probably be held to mean wage control. He said—

> "There are many lawyers who believe that power to control prices alone would include power over wages."

Opposition members can tell their unionists that—if they are game enough. Price control means wage control. This, said Mr. Whitlam, was because wages could be regarded as the price of labour.

With power over prices also meaning power over wages, Canberra could, through Commonwealth awards, totally usurp the State industrial field. It could make quite obsolete our Industrial Court and Commission. It could fix the salaries of State public servants, and all who are employed by Government instrumentalities. It could debase those salaries in order to force out of the State service anybody worth a "cracker", and thus force him to take a job with the Commonwealth. In other words, it could totally eliminate the State as a sovereign form of authority.

Mr. Murray: Could it fix parliamentary salaries, too?

Mr. PORTER: Undoubtedly it could fix parliamentary salaries. They are a fee for service, I hope.

In such circumstances it would be impossible for any State Government to frame its own Budget, or to have any real control over its own economy or be aware of its fiscal future.

Mr. Chinchen: That is the purpose of it.

Mr. PORTER: Of course it is. That is what it is all about. It has nothing to do with commodities. In this way, the federal system would be killed as surely as if a sharp knife had been passed across its jugular vein and the hot, red blood of Australian political and economic freedom had gushed right out. There is no doubt about that.

We should remember clearly—and this is what the motion is all about—that the paths become different and dangerous when powers pass to Canberra. It is the professed intention of the Federal Government, as a dedicated socialist Government, to use these powers in a way different from the States, and for different purposes. The powers are not absolutely defined. In fact, they are not defined within the States. The result is that, transferred to the Commonwealth, they become undefined and absolute, and, as such, represent a new power rather than a head of power transferred to Canberra. I repeat that once they are taken over by Canberra, they are there for ever more and are totally exclusive to Canberra.

This is not a case of transferring State powers to Canberra, which, in turn, will merely exercise them in the same way as the State might have exercised them in the past. By the transfer, the powers become different and sinister. I think I could use an old analogy here, and that is that it is very easy to break one stick across one's knee, but, when a bundle of the same sticks are tied tightly together, it becomes very difficult to break them. That is the transformation that takes place in power when it is collected from peripheral points and amalgamated at a centre. I think we must accept that this is perhaps the greatest crisis that State Governments have faced since federation. I regard it as a greater crisis than that posed by the First and Second World Wars.

I have tried to give—reasonably, I hope—both fact and argument on the enormous danger of giving Canberra any new and sinister head of power by saying "Yes" to either the incomes or the prices proposal. These powers will not reduce inflation, nor will they hold down prices. But they will give socialist planners virtually unlimited power to plan, direct, control and interfere with the daily life and the occupation of virtually everyone. Is that what we want for Queensland? In my view, it will mean not just a transfer of existing State powers but the creation of an irrevocable and new head of despotic power. I certainly do not want that to happen.

In short, these powers are sinister tools wanted by an avowedly socialist party in office with strong radical ties, whose pressures cannot be withstood. It wants these tools to mould the fully planned and regimented society to which it is committed in plain print.

The Leader of he Opposition was out of touch with the sentiments in this Parliament, and throughout the electorate in Queensland, when he suggested that the people are prepared to give more powers to Canberra. We must keep Australia free. We must keep Queensland free. We must retain the federal system, with a safe sharing of political and economic power—the federal system that Opposition members came into this Parliament sworn to uphold and which they are now trying to throw away.

The Leader of the Opposition, in suggesting that the Constitution is out of date because times have changed, played the same soggy, sorry old tune that many of the apologists for the socialist line try to play. Is it suggested that one changes the Constitution two or three times a week as one changes socks? Does one decide that, because the socks are dirty, a new pair should be worn? This is absurd, puerile rubbish. The Australian Constitution is a very fine statement of principles for effective government of the Australian nation, with powers safely dispersed in a balanced partnership between the central Government and the State Governments. The principles are as valid today as ever they were. Indeed, Mr. Whitlam himsef has said so.

It is very fortunate that I am able to quote Mr. Whitlam so readily to Opposition members, because they will accept what he says as gospel truth. He admits that there is nothing really wrong with the Constitution. On 26 July 1972, he was reported in "The Sydney Morning Herald" as saying—

> "It would be intolerable if a Labor Government were to use the alibi of the Constitution to excuse its failure to achieve

its socialist objective, and doubly intolerable because it is just not true that this need be so."

The baby talk of the Leader of the Opposition that the Constitution is out of date and needs to be changed to permit the central Government to make the changes that changed times demand is not even supported by his own leader, Mr. Whitlam. What he is after now is not an improvement to the Constitution. He does not want a change in this basic document for Australia's good. What is proposed in the referendum is certainly not in the best interests of the State, or of the nation. What he proposes are tools for socialist ends. All of us on this side of the House, and all sensible people in Queensland who do not want socialism—and that is the overwhelming majority—will denounce and reject the proposals and support this motion, and so help this Parliament and this Government to fight the referendum.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville West) (4.3 p.m.): The honourable member for Toowong spoke of $1,700,000 supposedly set aside by the Federal Government for propaganda. I take this opportunity to point out that this Parliament comprises 82 members, and that it has lost a day because the Premier saw fit to move this motion. This exercise in propaganda has cost the people of Queensland $40,000. The honourable member for Toowong speaks of irresponsibility. The Premier is a fine example of irresponsibility because he is prepared to use this huge sum of money purely for propaganda purposes.

The honourable member for Toowong spoke of dangerous powers. In this motion, the Premier is asking Parliament to authorise him and other Cabinet Ministers to take whatever action they consider necessary or desirable. Does that not mean that the Premier is calling for unlimited power? Is it unlimited power to declare states of emergency, as he has done before? Is it unlimited power to introduce sectional legislation, as he has also done? Is it unlimited power to discriminate against certain persons and unions, which he has also done? Is this the unlimited power that he talks about?

When this motion was brought down today, I realised that it was the first shot in the Premier's propaganda war against a "Yes" vote at the referendum, and I also realised that in the next week or two he will parade through the length and breadth of Queensland speaking in this same way. He has, first of all, used this House as a platform to spread his spurious propaganda. I thought that we were going to hear something pretty strong from the Premier. In fact, I thought he might perhaps generate enough heat to steam up the windows of the Chamber. However, as usual, what he had to say was a pitiful political flop.

This action by the Government is shabby and shallow. Honourable members have always been allotted one short hour a week in which to speak on matters of public interest. The Premier could not leave even that period alone, although this afternoon was available for this debate. After he demonstrated that he wished to use this House as a platform for his propaganda, is it any wonder that the Opposition used every available tactic in an endeavour to prevent the Premier from saying what he wanted to say? I cannot see that there was any necessity for the Premier to act as he did when this afternoon was available to debate his motion. This again is proof of the insincerity, dishonesty and misrepresentation that emanate from the Government in its campaign against the Australian Government, of which I have been speaking in this House for so long.

Again we see a campaign of vilification without parallel. Again we see a campaign by representatives of the greedy interests that are using propaganda, fear and misrepresentation in attempting to negate the mandate given to the Australian Government in December. The Premier is sore about that mandate. He has never been able to get over it, and he uses every opportunity to denigrate the Australian Government. The Premier calls on the Prime Minister to invoke Federal measures against inflation. He did that again today. There are many such measures, he said, that could be used. Inflation has been bandied around the House today as though it was a creation of the present Federal Government. In fact, it was inherited from the economic policies of the previous Liberal-Country Party Government. The traditional Federal measures that have been used by Liberal-Country Party Governments are unemployment, credit squeezes and starvation of pensioners.

The Premier also referred to the threatened resignation of the Prime Minister. As I listened to him, it seemed to me that he was using this incident to denigrate both the Prime Minister and the Australian Government. Has the Premier forgotten that he was once saved by a proxy vote, and by voting for himself? If he has, I remind the House that it is by virtue of such flimsy support that he now sits where he is in this House. At least that cannot be said of Mr. Whitlam. He did not have to resign, and he did not have to vote for himself to retain his office.

We are governed in Queensland today by what I would call a White September group —not a Black September group; a White September group. The Leader of the Opposition has spoken of these dangerous political guerillas—I ask "Hansard" to note that the spelling is "guerillas"—who are led outwardly by the Premier of this State, the Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, who received 19 per cent of the vote of the people of Queensland. But, behind the scenes, I detect, as the Leader of the Opposition has also detected, the extremist hand of Eric Butler, the insidious boss of the equally insidious League of Rights. This is the same League of Rights, Mr. Speaker, which has infiltrated, infected and influenced the Country

Party in Queensland and openly boasts that it controls a number of its Parliamentarians in this House.

These demented White September disruptives play a divisive political game known, as I have said before, as "one-outmanship". They were the last in Australia to support 18-year-old voting; they were the first to oppose national price control; they were the first to want conscription and the Vietnam war; and they were the first to oppose recognition of China and the trade gains that this involves. They violently oppose fair elections. In fact, they oppose anything that reflects even a glimmer of democracy.

Again today, Mr. Speaker, we have noticed this denigration of democracy. The Premier is the first to talk about democracy; but, the moment he gets a chance, he, by using the gag, denies the democratic rights that the Opposition should have in this House. Whenever we see this denigration of democracy, even though there is lip-service to it, I know where it comes from. It comes from the League of Rights. From its minority base in Queensland it wants also to control Canberra.

Members of the League of Rights are the apostles of wealth and the opponents of equality. Their philosophy is perhaps best summed up in the words of their leader, the Premier of Queensland, who said, "We, as a Government, have a responsibilty to protect the people from themselves." This is the same Premier who has said that the people of our cities cannot expect an equal vote. He opposed the 40-hour week, he opposed long service leave, and he opposed workers' compensation. In fact, he even opposed the Golden Casket, which assists the State's hospitals. Unlike the Black September organisation, the White September group does not hijack planes; it hijacks Queensland and also, if possible, the Commonwealth of Australia.

Let me touch now on the question of prices and incomes, on which a challenge has been thrown out in this Chamber today. I am not afraid to debate the question in the House, so let me turn first to prices.

The referendum on 8 December is designed to do no more than give the Commonwealth the powers of control at present held by the individual State Governments. We have heard that question debated today, Mr. Speaker, and there is no doubt that the State Governments have those powers of control. All that the referendum asks is that the powers held individually by the States be given to the Commonwealth. What is wrong with that? It has been forced on Australia by the refusal of certain States to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in using these powers on a uniform, national basis, and Queensland has been the arch offender. It was the first State to reject a proposal by South Australian Premier Dunstan for Commonwealth-State prices justification. He put forward that proposal at the Premiers' Conference in February this year and called for co-operation. Who stood out? Who was the first to reject the proposal? The Premier of Queensland.

A number of us here were delegates to the recent Commonwealth Constitutional Convention in Sydney. The Premier (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) was the only one who refused to go to dinner with the Prime Minister to discuss prices and incomes policy. I know why he did not go. Once he gets among people of stature, he is completely lost. He becomes almost completely inarticulate when he is taken away from his speech writers. He did not want to be shown up so he said, "I won't go to dinner."

A recent Gallup Poll—the Roy Morgan Group Poll—showed that 70 per cent of Australians and 60 per cent of Queenslanders are in favour of price control. Prices justification was a key plank of the Australian Labor Party's platform in its Federal election campaign prior to 2 December last year. We did not hide our light under a bushel. We said that we would bring in prices justification. The people knew that before they voted. They knew the exact intentions of the Australian Labor Party. It was also a plank of the Australian Labor Party in its campaign prior to the Queensland State election in May 1972. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Houston) let the people of Queensland know that that was part of our platform. What happened on 2 December? The majority of the people of Australia voted for the Australian Labor Party, and they therefore voted for its platform. Yet there are those who would attempt to negate the mandate that was given to the Australian Labor Party in the Federal sphere on 2 December. All honourable members opposite who support this motion today are guilty men because they will not hand over powers to assist the Federal Government in carrying out its mandate from the people.

The Federal Government has already established a Prices Justification Tribunal, but at present it can function only in the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. Everybody in Australia knows that at the present time, because of the powers that flow from the Commonwealth Constitution, they are the only areas in which the Prices Justification Tribunal can act. South Australia has price control. But its effectiveness is reduced because similar provisions do not apply in other States. It is very easy for a company to slip over into another State that has no price control, and thumb its nose at the South Australian efforts to control prices.

Queensland has a Commissioner of Prices. I acknowledge that. Provision is made for a Commissioner of Prices in the Estimates. He is also the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. But the office of Commissioner of Prices is redundant. Only one investigator is listed in the Estimates. Although there is supposedly such an office, there is no way in

the world that the Commissioner of Prices is working effectively in Queensland. Of course, we could not hope that the Commissioner of Prices would work effectively in Queensland, because the State Government would be afraid to offend those in business who obviously support it liberally.

It is not so long ago that the Federal Liberal Party Leader, Mr. Snedden, was reported in the Press as having called for price and wage restraint as a measure against inflation. And during an interview on television one evening he again advocated that policy. But in one of the typical somersaults of the Liberal and Country Parties, he now refuses support when the Commonwealth Government seeks powers to legislate nationally in these fields.

Mr. Sherrington: His policy is a bit like that of his Budget.

Mr. TUCKER: That is so.

One moment he calls for it and, as soon as Gough Whitlam says, "Let's have it", in typical fashion he turns a somersault and goes the other way. That is why I would not be afraid of a Federal election. It would be a contest between Billy Snedden and Gough Whitlam and Gough Whitlam would wipe the floor with him.

Price justification, or "price control" as we call it, does not seek the elimination of a fair and reasonable profit as has often been suggested by Government members, who know that they are putting forward a spurious argument. All price justification does is place an obligation on the companies involved to justify proposed rises on essential commodities, in the same way that wage-earners must justify their claims at arbitration. The only persons who would be adversely affected under price control would be those who desire excessive profits through excessive prices. I do not believe that anyone, individual or company, who is reasonable in setting prices has anything to worry about under price control. Only the greedy sections of the community, who seek to secure higher and higher prices in order to obtain outrageous profits, have anything to fear. If they are reasonable, they have no need to worry at all. This Government, of course, speaks on behalf of the greedy people who want outrageous profits.

Now let us look again at the question of incomes. Some powers of wage or salary control are already held by the Commonwealth and the States through arbitration and conciliation machinery. We know that the majority of workers in our community have to go to arbitration or conciliation in order to obtain a wage rise. The Commonwealth and all the States have their own systems, and among them there is what could be termed a reasonable degree of co-operation and consistency in arbitrating on wages, so in that field at least, for the great majority of workers in this State, there is already restraint on wages. There are already forces that make workers go to arbitration on wages.

In addition, provisions exist for certain wage claims to be determined through State and Federal Public Service Boards. As to the Public Service of this State, wages are determined, to a certain degree, by the Public Service Board. Federally, wages are virtually all determined by the Public Service Board. There again we have a certain amount of restraint and the Government can exercise a degree of control. At least it can go to arbitration and put its case. And I believe that, after all the cases have been submitted, arbitration judges come up with fair and reasonable judgments. In contrast to prices, wage-restraint powers not only exist but are being used.

This is in what I might call the field of "salary justification", and in most cases arbitration commissions or judges deliver their wage and salary judgments on a number of related factors, one being the cost-of-living fluctuation in the period between determination of the previous claim and the current claim. This is the pertinent point: a decision to award a rise of, say $2 a week, is based on the capacity of the industry to pay at that time. But here is the catch: it is not determined according to the capacity of industry to absord wage increases by increasing prices. It is only logical that, in circumstances of uncontrolled price-and-profit inflation, this trend will be reflected in higher wage-claim determinations. I repeat: the Arbitration Commission decides that a particular industry can afford to pay certain wages at a specific time. However, after the new wages are declared, quite often the industry involved increases its prices and claims that only by doing so can it absorb the increased wages.

Although this is absolutely and patently wrong, it happens in the community all the time. As I have said, it is only logical that whenever prices are pushed up there will be claims for higher wage determinations. With uncontrolled price-and-profit inflation, it is a case of the dog chasing its tail. Something needs to be done to bring a halt to this uncontrolled price-and-profit inflation.

Let me assure those persons who will read our speeches that if the referendums are carried there is no possibility at all of a wage freeze. With the reduction in the inflationary factors in the cost and price structure of the community, wage and salary fluctuations should level out. If we can prevent prices from rising, even only temporarily, we can also halt our wage and salary fluctuations, which quite naturally follow price increases. It is always the workers who lose. We believe that when we can control the price structure, we will also be able to level out salary and wage fluctuations.

In addition to wage and salary-earners there are large numbers of people who derive income that is not subject to either arbitration or other forms of justification. So far I have confined my remarks to those who must go to arbitration, in other words, the ordinary wage-earners, but I turn now to contractors, landlords, solicitors, land developers, doctors, dentists and all the other people who rely for their income on charges for services. The charges that they impose have a direct influence on the over-all cost structure of the community. They alone determine what they shall charge, and it is only natural to expect that, in many instances, these charges should be directly related to the cost of labour. One would expect, for example, that contractors would relate their prices to labour costs. And, as we know, the cost of labour is determined by arbitration through wage and salary determinations. However, quite often people who fix their own charges abuse the responsibility that they owe to the community.

For instance, an electrician may have his wage fixed at $2.50 an hour by arbitration. I have plucked that figure out of the air; the rate may be $3 or $4 an hour. However, it is determined by the Industrial Commission. When an employer charges for the electrician's labour, he costs it out not at $2.50 an hour, but quite often at $6.50 or $7 an hour. Where is the justification for that? Too often I have heard it said that people are charged anything between $5 and $8 an hour for the labour component in fixing a television set. That is not a true labour cost.

In Queensland, rent control has been abolished. There is no machinery in this State to fix rentals. That is done by the owners themselves. Decision-making on rentals in Queensland lies in the hands of property owners, at a time when demand far exceeds the number of properties available. They determine the fair and reasonable return on their original investment. Many landlords have owned homes for 10 years, and the homes are worth much more than they cost originally. In fixing what they consider to be a fair and reasonable rental, they do it on the basis of the original investment plus some hundreds per cent. That is what many greedy landlords are doing today. If I were pushed, I could cite numerous examples of what is taking place in Townsville by way of rental overcharges.

The person who profits directly from land development is the developer who himself determines the price to be charged. He does not have to prove to a court of arbitration what the land cost him initially, what it cost him to develop, and what percentage of profit he should reasonably expect. Today, when land is scarce, the developer, who is his own arbitrator, reaps the profits from the prices he fixes.

Professionals employed in industry are members of associations or councils comprised of people directly associated with the profession. These bodies fix charges and, accordingly, determine the income of their members. It is not right or just that some people in the community should have to go to arbitration to have their wages determined while those in professions can determine their own incomes.

The salary of a daily newspaper journalist is determined by arbitration—and rightly so. However, if he resigns and establishes himself in public relations, he can charge whatever he likes for his services. In one field his salary is decided by arbitration, but in the other he can charge what he likes.

The salaries and expenses of business executives are usually determined by a board of directors. Those executives are frequently members of the board of directors that determines their salaries. All of these people rely on income and have a direct influence on any inflationary or deflationary trend. However, they are not subject to any income or cost justification.

The present economic controls at national level are one-sided, inadequate, or non-existent. Uniformity, even in the field of prices, cannot exist because some States refuse to use their powers. In the field of costs and charges, controls that do exist are flimsy or sectional and impose no responsibility on those exercising them to act in accordance with the national interest or over-all economic climate at the time.

Some people blame trade unions and wage rises for inflation. They neglect to point out that this is the one area of the cost-of-living structure where effective justification machinery actually exists and is applied on a national basis. It would be economic injustice, to my way of thinking, to impose tight restraints in this one section of the national cost structure while unchecked inflation was free to thrive in all others, with certain incomes, not within the ambit of arbitration, open to inflation.

At present, with inflation running at about 13 per cent a year, as has been bandied around the Chamber today, most major companies are announcing record profits. They are being achieved at a time when the representatives of industry and commerce are complaining about wage and salary rises. These people are reaping tremendous profits, yet complaining about wages and salary rises.

Some people—the Premier is one—have suggested that the Whitlam Government should use the policies adopted by past non-Labor Governments to combat inflation. Under the present powers of that Government, judging by the records of previous Governments, those policies would be sectional and depressive. If the policies of past Governments were adopted, we would have, as I said at the beginning of my speech, horror Budgets, credit squeezes and high unemployment. The main effects would be felt by those least able to cope with them.

Opposition members do not want that to happen. We do not want the main burden to be placed on those in the community least able to bear it, so we have asked for certain restraints.

Results would be achieved through the substitution of sectional hardship for inflation. This should not be done. Such a result would be only temporary, as has been shown in the past. Even if the immediate inflation was checked, the factors that caused it would remain and could flare up again without control and virtually without warning. Even if something could be done with existing powers to curb the present state of inflation, no controls would exist to contain it permanently. If it flared up again without warning, there would be no methods of combating it.

In speaking to the motion moved by the Premier, which I am against, I take the opportunity of advising the people of Queensland and Australia to vote "Yes" to both issues on 8 December. In their own interest, it is essential for them to do so. It would indeed be a tragedy if the destiny of this nation were to be denied by the Liberal and Country Parties that have sold or lent their principles to the objectives of the land developers, the mining exploiters, the price promoters and the international extremists. They are a sorry, shameful, sinful bunch who are prepared to sell Australia to the highest contributor to their political slush funds.

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (4.40 p.m.): I support the motion now before the House. Opposition members in this Parliament would be the greatest group of give-aways, hand-over men and State traitors that this State has ever known. Is it any wonder that they are referred to throughout Queensland as, "Give-away Jack and his happy give-away group"? That is in fact the situation today, and in this respect they are unique among Australian parliamentarians.

Labor members in other States have expressed very real concern about the constitutional changes that are being sought. It will be interesting to see how they react to what has taken place in this Parliament today. Anything that is asked of Opposition members by the Federal Government is dutifully given by them to their grand masters. State sovereignty is sold out with the speed of summer lightning, and nothing is to be given in return except a large, powerful, socialist republic of Australia, which is the opiate dream of every modern-day socialist. There seem to have been many of them in this Parliament today, as so consistently they urge a "Yes" vote in the referendum to be held on 8 December.

The one method of approach of the Leader of the Opposition in opposing the motion was to draw the long-bow, and draw it hard. He spoke about the League of Rights, and he said that in some mysterious way it influenced the introduction of this motion and the attitude of Government members. All I want to say is that that is a red herring of the greatest proportions. So far as I am concerned, I repudiate the League of Rights and I endorse all the adjectives used by Mr. Edward St. John in his references to it that were quoted by the Leader of the Opposition.

Again I say that I repudiate the League of Rights, and I believe that all members of the Government parties do likewise. The reference by the Leader of the Opposition to the League of Rights was a red herring, and nothing else. It was the main point made by him in this most important debate, and it really has nothing to do with it. It was piffle and poppycock.

I stand in the House today to urge the people of Queensland to wake up to what the referendum really means, and to urge those whom I represent to vote "No" on both questions. But my particular purpose is to say something on behalf of the rural people of Queensland and Australia.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members for Salisbury and Archerfield have been warned previously. I would be reluctant to send any member out, as there will certainly be a division on the motion. However, if the honourable members to whom I refer continue to interject, I am afraid they will not be here for the division. I ask them to refrain from interjecting. I shall not warn either of them again. This is the final warning.

Mr. AHERN: Honourable members opposite say that they thought I would never get round to this subject. That demonstrates the attitude of Opposition members to the rural people of Australia, who are very rightfully concerned about the referendum and the intentions of the Federal Labor Government. They certainly have very good grounds for their fears. The Prime Minister said last night on a television programme, "The powers, if you give them to us, will be used carefully, selectively, with restraint and discrimination." The people of rural areas are rightfully fearful of what those words suggest. On 17 September the Federal Minister for Labour, Mr. Clyde Cameron, was questioned about items that would come under immediate control if the Federal Government was given price-control powers. He answered, "Every item that makes up the cost of living of the family will be under price control if we are given these powers."

Anyone who cares to study the list of items comprising the Consumer Price Index can be left in no doubt that rural interests will be the primary target in this campaign. The list comprises cereal products, bread, dairy produce, preserved fruit and vegetables, potatoes and onions, soft drinks, and other food such as sugar and meat and a large number of other consumer items directly affecting primary producers. There is no

doubt that the Federal Government will be moving against primary producers if it is given this power, or that primary producers are again to be selected for special treatment by the Labor Government. They have been battered and bashed by that Government since it came to power on 2 December last.

The list of summary action against primary producers is tremendously long. There has been a reduction of $9,000,000 in the butter and cheese bounty; a reduction of $800,000 in the processed-milk products bounty; meat export charges, $18,000,000; brucellosis and tuberculosis levy, $7,000,000; cancellation of accelerated depreciation allowance, $10,000,000; cancellation of deductibility of certain expenses, $17,000,000; cancellation of investment allowance, $10,000,000; increase in rate of tax on private companies (when related to primary-producer companies), $6,300,000; phasing-out of special grape products valuation, $15,000,000; cancellation of sales tax exemption on carbonated beverages, $2,500,000; cancellation of concessional postage rates on newspapers, $3,000,000; increase in telephone charges in non-metropolitan areas, $20,000,000; phasing-out of aid for essential rural air services, $20,000,000; and cancellation of petroleum prices stabilisation, $3,000,000. So far it adds up to $143,000,000, and there will be more if these special powers are referred to the Commonwealth Government. There is no doubt at all that the first person to feel the effects in his hip pocket will be the poor old primary producer, who has already been belted about so much.

Every privilege that might help primary producers was coldly axed by the Federal Labor Government. Is it any wonder that there were swings of up to 20 per cent against Labor in some country electorates in New South Wales last Saturday as compared with the figures at the last Federal election? This shows the type of approach that country people have to the Labor Party because they have been coldly axed in that way. And how right they are!

It seems that the meat industry is to be the first to be nailed to the wall and made to bleed with some spurious scheme to cure inflation. That was the first statement made by senior Federal Ministers—"Meat will be the first." The meat industry, which has suffered years of drought, rising costs, and all sorts of vagaries, will be the first fall guy of this grand pretence of a fight against inflation.

Most fruit and vegetable growers, whose products are mentioned high up on the list of goods in the Consumer Price Index, are living on 1952 prices and meeting 1973 costs. If the market moves up seasonally, they will be faced with paying maximum prices.

Mr. Blake: What did your Government do about it? It is disgraceful.

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member for Isis has not done anything about it. He has not even raised his voice in protest against this cruel treatment of primary producers. As one who represents fruit and vegetable growers, let me say that I regard the attitude of the present Federal Labor Government as contemptible. The honourable member for Isis and several other honourable members on that side of the House should hang their heads in shame for failing to at least try to raise their voices against this campaign against primary producers.

Controls will worsen the supply situation. Farmers will refuse to produce certain controlled lines, and the supply situation will thus be aggravated. There is no doubt that price control will have the effect of arbitrarily and viciously lowering gross farm income. Primary producers are already paying hard for Labor's fantasies. There is no doubt, either, that if this huge fabric of price-control regulation and legislation is to blanket Australia, it cannot be made to work in the area of primary industry without a huge battery of export-control legislation and regulation. And so meat controls, which were temporarily shelved by the Labor Government, will be trotted out again, because price control on these lines alone will not work without a battery of export controls as well.

Primary producers are entitled to be very suspicious about the whole proposal. They are quite sure that they are being sold a pig in a poke. In being asked to give the Federal Government power to control prices and incomes, they are suspicious that the Federal Government is looking for powers to legislate over a wide variety of situations in which it now has no power to act without the consent of the various State Parliaments. I refer particularly to marketing schemes, which at the present time are under the direct control of industry. A referendum such as this could give the Federal Government power to legislate to give it control over these situations.

And well have primary producers cause for fear. They have seen some problems already with the Federal Government bringing in extra controls in relation to wheat sales to Egypt, a deal that could easily cost the industry dearly. When the Prime Minister is offering all sorts of deals to China, again the primary producers are suspicious that they are being sold out. Without doubt, the Federal Government would have a wide brief to legislate over a very large area of direct concern to primary producers, whereas at the moment in that area it must consult with the various State Governments.

The Federal Government says, of course, that it will not use these powers immediately. But let us look at the situation that has applied since 2 December last. Since it came to office, the Labor Government has exploited every nook and cranny of the Australian Constitution to implement the

socialist plan. There is nothing to indicate that it will not exploit the situation further if it is given these extra powers. Without doubt, the whole fabric of marketing in this country will be changed. At least the power will be there for that to happen.

The present Federal Minister for Immigration is on record in the "Fabian Newsletter" of November 1970 as saying—

> "The Labor Party has drawn on the experience of the U.S.S.R. and other countries to prepare a programme of socialist agriculture for this nation."

Can there be any doubt about the Federal Government's intentions? Is there any doubt at all that its intentions are to move in this direction to bring socialist agriculture to this country? There is very real reason for fear for the future in the rural industries. There is very real reason for suspicion of the motives of the Federal Labor Government. We have had too many "stand and deliver" Acts in the past. There have been too many Acts of that type in relation to primary industries. Any primary producer who voted "Yes" in the referendum on 8 December would have to be stark, staring, raving mad.

Let us look at how the farmer has contributed to inflation. If he is to be the fall guy in this situation, if he is the one who is to be nailed to the wall, if he is the one who is to be made to pay for it, and if he is the one who is to be made to finance the corrective measures, let us look at the situation. Farmers are inflation fighters, not inflation promoters. Over the last decade, farm-food prices have increased at the "princely" rate of 1.5 per cent annually. The increase in consumer food prices over that time has been 3.2 per cent.

The increase in farm income has been 3.4 per cent per annum over the last decade, but, if we take the last couple of years of wool-price boom out of those figures, farm income has increased less than 1 per cent per annum over the last decade. In that time, what has happened to wages? They have increased 7.2 per cent per annum, while the farmers have had to put up with 1 per cent per annum or less over the broad spectrum. It now seems that they are to be nailed to the wall in this instance also.

Mr. Camm: The honourable member for Isis is strangely silent on the matter.

Mr. AHERN: As the Minister for Mines points out, the honourable member for Isis is strangely silent. Perhaps he is not game to speak.

The fact is that the Federal Labor Government has a very empiric view of primary industry. Recently I was reading a speech delivered at the official opening of the annual conference of the Australian Farmers' Federation by Dr. Jim Cairns, in which he said—

> "At the present time, the rural sector is experiencing unprecedented prosperity. Seasonal conditions, in general, are favourable, and they give promise of improved production in most sectors of primary industry. The demand for rural products of Australia remains strong in world markets, and prices for many products are at world-record levels."

This is the type of approach that every Federal Minister has made in his utterances on this subject. It seems they feel that rural industry can afford to be nailed to the wall in some spurious fight against inflation. This is just not true, and the situation in rural industries cannot be viewed as empirically as it is. This applies especially over the last year or so, as farmers are battling in an endeavour to repay debts that droughts have foisted upon them over the last 10 years. If prosperity exists in some sectors now, it has been of only short duration. And this has been the situation in primary industry over the years.

Mr. Sullivan: They would have had an excellent chance if there had not been a change of Government last year.

Mr. AHERN: As the Minister for Primary Industries so rightly points out, we would have had an excellent chance if there had not been a change of Government in December last year. The Federal Labor Government has been unquestionably vindictive towards primary industry, and we are fearful that this referendum will pave the way for worse things to come for primary industries in Australia.

The price-control referendum should be cast out because it will not work—and it should be cast out on that simple basic premise. Let us have a look at the situation that applies in South Australia, where a princely scheme was paraded before the public. What has happened there? It has resulted in a Government-sponsored register of price increases. The price of bread in South Australia is higher than in this State. One would think that if price control worked, the price of a basic food item such as bread would surely be lower; yet, although bread prices have been controlled in South Australia for some years, instead of being 5c a loaf cheaper, it is dearer than in Queensland.

As I say, price control in South Australia has become no more than a prices-justification register. Whenever an increase in cost is registered, there is then a Government-registered increase in the price of the consumer item. This is how it has worked, and has been shown to work, throughout the world. At a time when this State is experiencing its worst shortage of consumer goods since the war, it is suggested that an extra control be allowed by the Australian people. Without any question, any extra controls in this situation will compound the problems still

further and add fuel to the cause of black-marketeers, who are already at work in the community.

If price control is introduced where shortages are now occurring, the problem will simply be compounded. As in the war years, we will need legislation to control the operations of black-marketeers. Teams of parliamentary draftsmen will be required to frame legislation and write up the Statute Book in order to make price control work. Any attempt to spread the fabric of government across the business world of a nation that is as diverse as Australia would be very foolish indeed. Similarly, any attempt to impose control over prices as well as wages and incomes would be quite stupid.

Like my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, I am left with the clear impression that the Federal Government has no intention whatever of instituting meaningful price and income controls. It is quite clear that it is aiming at other goals. It is bent on grabbing power to legislate over a very wide area that presently does not come within its jurisdiction. If the Federal Government is allowed to succeed, half the legislation that is presently on our Statute Book will be superseded by Commonwealth legislation and will therefore disappear.

I do not believe for one moment that the people of Australia are in favour of the appointment of the teams of inspectors who will necessarily be required to parade across the nation and implement the Government's proposals. Nor do I believe that the people would want to see the gazettal of a host of regulations that will be required to segregate all manner of consumer goods into countless classifications. I am sure that if the people were to see such a system operating, they would reject it. Just as a previous Federal Government was defeated because it followed such a course for a lengthy period, I believe that this Federal Government, too, will be defeated on 8 December.

The people of Australia certainly will not favour the spate of legislation that they consider has nothing to do with the referendums but that will nevertheless be seized upon by Senator Murphy, Mr. Crean and Dr. Cairns.

I conclude by saying that this issue is a non-party one. It concerns State sovereignty, and is a matter to which we as a State Parliament should pay very close attention. I claim it is a non-party issue because quite clearly several members of the Federal Parliament of our political colour desire to see these powers transferred to Canberra and are deliberately running dead on this issue. The Federal Government's proposals are nothing more than a direct, frontal strike at the rights of the people of the States as well as the rights of State Parliaments. They are nothing more than a phoney attack on inflation, which cannot be controlled unless the Federal Government exercises all the powers presently held by it.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah —Premier) (5.4 p.m.), in reply: Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. BURNS: Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER: I call the Premier.

Mr. BURNS: Government members have taken over this debate. Like everyone else in this Chamber, I have the right to speak. Don't let "old yellow-belly" try to take over the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BURNS: I am not going to be gagged by him, or by anybody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURNS: The Premier has claimed that this is a matter of public importance. If so, it is a matter for the people of Queensland, not one for four Government and two Opposition members to debate.

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

Whereupon the honourable member for Lytton withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is easy to see that the honourable member for Lytton has just returned from Red China and, like the Chinese, is endeavouring to throw his weight around.

I make a final appeal to the Leader of the Opposition, as well as to other members on the opposite side of the Chamber, to stand up for the State that has nourished them. I challenge them to support the State in which they have grown up, prospered and reared families.

Mr. B. Wood interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Barron River has already been warned.

Mr. Hanson interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Port Curtis has prospered greatly in this State, thanks to development under this Government. I wonder if he, with other honourable members opposite——

Mr. Wright: You're sick.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you to restrain the honourable member for Rockhampton. He does not seem to be able to control himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! On several occasions I have heard the honourable member for Rockhampton say that the Premier is

"sick". He has been warned already. I have been very tolerant with all honourable members today because, as I said earlier, I am rather reluctant to suspend any honourable member when a division is imminent. However, under the provisions of Standing Order 123A, I now ask the honourable member for Rockhampton to leave the Chamber.

Mr. Wright: I will leave, but the Premier is sick. I would be personally happy to pay for his psychiatric consultant.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to leave the Chamber immediately. Otherwise, I will name him.

Mr. Davis: He accused us——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Brisbane has also been warned.

Mr. Bromley: Would you like us all to leave the Chamber?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for South Brisbane has been warned also.

Mr. Wright interjected

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I again ask the honourable member for Rockhampton to leave immediately.

Whereupon the honourable member for Rockhampton withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Probably there is not much sense in appealing to the honourable member who has just been ordered from the Chamber. He is completely irresponsible in his duty to the State.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. The Premier appealed to you, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the honourable member, and you did so. He is now abusing the honourable member after he has been sent from the Chamber. I completely disagree with that sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I will direct my attention for a moment to the Leader of the Opposition. He has lived in this State for a long time and he has prospered. At different times he has held very responsible positions. I ask him, and other Opposition members in the Chamber, if they are prepared to acknowledge their duty to the State.

Mr. Bromley: Did you acknowledge your duty during the war?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member is trying to bait me, but he will not get me off course. I now ask the honourable member for South Brisbane if he will be loyal to the State.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I venture to say that he, like every member of the Opposition, will be completely disloyal to Queensland. However, I shall wait to test his loyalty.

Mr. Marginson interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable members for Wolston and South Brisbane that, if I hear another word from either of them, they, too, will be suspended.

Mr. BROMLEY: I rise to a point of order. Am I supposed to "cop" this from the Premier without saying anything?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no valid point of order. The honourable member has been saying too much all day.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It hurts honourable members opposite to be branded disloyal Queenslanders, but that is what they will be if they do not stand up for Queensland by supporting this motion. To relieve them of further stress, strain and anxiety, and to show the people of Queensland where they stand, I will take the matter no further, but simply note what they do when the motion is put.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 42

Ahern	Lee
Armstrong	Lickiss
Bird	Low
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Camm	Miller
Campbell	Moore, R. E.
Chinchen	Muller
Cory	Murray
Crawford	Porter
Edwards	Rae
Fletcher	Row
Frawley	Scott-Young
Gunn	Small
Hartwig	Sullivan
Herbert	Tomkins
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tooth
Hewitt, W. D.	Wharton
Hinze	
Hooper, K. W.	
Houghton	*Tellers:*
Kaus	
Knox	Alison
Lane	Neal

NOES, 27

Aiken	Leese
Baldwin	Marginson
Blake	Melloy
Bousen	Moore, F. P.
Bromley	O'Donnell
Davis	Sherrington
Dean	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Houston	Yewdale
Inch	
Jensen	
Jones, N. F.	*Tellers:*
Jones, R.	D'Arcy
Jordan	Hooper, K. J.

PAIRS:

Hodges	Newton
Chalk	Wood, P.
Hughes	Harvey

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at 5.16 p.m.