

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 1974**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 1974

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Local Government Superannuation Act Amendment Bill;  
 Police Superannuation Bill;  
 Wine Industry Act Amendment Bill;  
 Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act Amendment Bill;  
 Land Surveyors Act Amendment Bill (No. 2);  
 Age of Majority Bill;  
 Commonwealth Places (Administration of Laws) Act Amendment Bill;  
 Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill;  
 State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organization and Environmental Control Act Amendment Bill;  
 Sale of Human Blood Bill;  
 City of Brisbane Act Amendment Bill;  
 Valuers Registration Act Amendment Bill.

### PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that on Tuesday, 1 October 1974, in accordance with the provisions of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act 1974, I administered the oath of office to Mr. David Walter Longland, Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations.

### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

#### LOANS SINKING FUNDS

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Loans Sinking Funds of the State for the year 1973-74.

Ordered to be printed.

### PAPERS

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

#### Reports—

Operations of the Sub-Departments of the Department of Health—"Eventide" (Sandgate), "Eventide" (Charters Towers), "Eventide" (Rockhampton), and Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind (South Brisbane), for the year 1973-74.  
 Agricultural Bank, for the year 1973-74.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

#### Proclamations under—

Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1969 and the State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organization and Environmental Control Act 1971-1973.

Forestry Act 1959-1974.

#### Orders in Council under—

Racing and Betting Act 1954-1972.

Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1973.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1964.

Liquor Act 1912-1973.

Money Lenders Act 1916-1973.

Medical Act 1939-1973.

The Grammar Schools Acts, 1860 to 1962.

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1971.

Water Act 1926-1973.

Harbours Act 1955-1972.

Forestry Act 1959-1974.

#### Regulations under—

Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1973.

Water Act 1926-1973.

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

Traffic Act 1949-1974.

Statement of Income and Expenditure and Balance Sheet of the Coal Mine Workers' Pensions Fund, for the year 1973-74.

Particulars relating to the mortgage of St. Mark's College land—James Cook University of North Queensland.

#### Reports—

Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland, for the year 1973-74.

Queensland Law Society Incorporated, under the Legal Assistance Act 1965-1971.

Queensland Law Reform Commission, for the year 1973-74.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### PROPOSED COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL, MT. GRAVATT AREA

**Hon. S. D. TOOTH** (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (11.9 a.m.): In view of recent Press statements that the Commonwealth Government intends to establish a Commonwealth Government hospital in the metropolitan area of Brisbane, and the reported disagreement between State and Commonwealth Ministers for Health on this proposal, I would like to clarify the situation as far as I am able to do so.

Along with many others, I learned of the Commonwealth Government's intentions for the first time through the medium of the Press. Subsequently, from a letter written

by the Prime Minister to the Premier of this State, I was able to obtain some indication of the Commonwealth Government's proposals. Under the guise of "combating problems that have arisen in the growth of urban areas", the Prime Minister states that "the Australian Government is proposing to assist State Governments by financing the building and operation of hospitals in areas of greatest need or of rapid population growth". The Prime Minister continues that these hospitals are to be located in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane and will be built and operated without cost to the State. The Prime Minister refers to advice given by this department regarding the planning in respect of the Mt. Gravatt-Sunnybank hospital—the hospital to be developed to round about 1,000 beds—and continues by saying, "In the circumstances I can see clear advantages in the Australian Government assuming full responsibility for the project." The Prime Minister has given the Government of this State exactly three weeks to concur with the Commonwealth's proposals.

All of this must sound idealistic to the general public as a whole and, no doubt, to honourable members on the opposite side of the House. But let me point out a few basic facts.

The Commonwealth's proposal is in conflict with the general established principles of forward planning in hospital services, not only in Queensland but anywhere in the Commonwealth. The genesis of the Mt. Gravatt hospital stems from meetings of a special committee appointed by my predecessor, the late Dr. Noble, as far back as 1963-64. A special committee, known as the Standing General Hospital Advisory Committee, with representation from the Department of Health, the North Brisbane Hospitals Board, the Australian Medical Association, the university, and the visiting staff of the metropolitan hospitals, had recommended, as far back as that—1964—that the next major hospital in Brisbane should be a teaching hospital of approximately 800 beds and sited in the general area of Mt. Gravatt. In all the forward planning of the Health Department for hospital beds in the metropolitan and near metropolitan area, this major acute hospital at Mt. Gravatt has always been taken into account. Bearing in mind the bed needs of the area and the developments that were foreseen in both the Brisbane and near Brisbane areas in the public and private sectors, it was envisaged that the Mt. Gravatt hospital would be fully commissioned in the early 1980's. Naturally such an estimate of time must be fluid and indeed the need to develop the obstetrical component of the Mt. Gravatt hospital has become evident at the present time, and a decision was made by the department, some twelve months ago, to bring it forward so that we proceed with a 200-230 obstetrical hospital on that site at the earliest possible date.

In considering the further development of the Mt. Gravatt acute section, the department has allowed for additional beds that will come into use during the next six or seven years at Princess Alexandra Hospital, Redcliffe Hospital, Southport Hospital, Royal Brisbane Hospital, Nambour Hospital, and Ipswich General Hospital. These would aggregate an additional 1000 beds approximately. In addition, the department is aware of the proposed major developments of a private church hospital now in the planning stages.

In the additional beds to become available during the present decade, I have purposely included hospital beds in areas adjacent to Brisbane, as they materially affect the bed situation in the metropolitan area. The development of the Southport Hospital and the Redcliffe Hospital to major acute hospitals must and will reduce the number of referrals to the larger teaching hospitals in Brisbane.

Long-range planning of this kind is nothing new. It is essential in the economical provision of highly sophisticated and very expensive hospital services on a regional basis. It certainly has been advocated by the Commonwealth-appointed Hospitals and Health Services Commission in whose report to the Federal Parliament a recommendation is made that in each of the States a joint hospitals works council, consisting of Commonwealth and State officers, be set up to examine forward planning programmes of the States.

I quote this very important extract from the Sax report—

"For the Australian Government to single out one or two sites in each State for the independent construction of a major hospital would be inconsistent with the principles of co-ordinated and integrated development."

Irrespective of this forward planning, irrespective of the Commonwealth's acknowledgement that there ought to be some dialogue between the Commonwealth and the States if Commonwealth funding is to be provided, irrespective of the recommendation of the Hospitals and Health Services Commission, the Commonwealth Government has demanded that it build its own single hospital in Brisbane and that that hospital be the Mt. Gravatt hospital.

The Prime Minister has further advised—

"Detailed arrangements might be undertaken by our respective Health Ministers with a view to substantial building work commencing early in the New Year."

I emphasise "early in the New Year".

**Mr. Burns:** Are you knocking the money back?

**Mr. TOOTH:** I am endeavouring to give an objective and clear statement of the position.

**Mr. Burns:** The people are suffering.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TOOTH:** I do not want any advice from the honourable member.

I think this last statement indicates not only the haste with which the Commonwealth has come to this decision but also the complete lack of knowledge of the intricacies and required expertise necessary in the development of a major hospital.

We have on the one hand an announcement that the Commonwealth Government is to build a hospital of 1,000 beds, and a figure of \$20,000,000 is involved. It is common knowledge that the planning of a major project such as hospital construction takes more time than the actual building of the hospital. Architects' briefs have to be prepared, preliminary plans have to be drawn, all the interested disciplines involved must be consulted, and in this instance the new university should be involved in some planning for teaching purposes—all of this before a sketch plan can be prepared, to say nothing of the time required in detailed working drawings and bills of quantities. Yet all this is to be achieved so that substantial building work can commence early in 1975. There is no such thing as an "instant" hospital. The proposition is utterly absurd.

The implementation of the Commonwealth's intentions, if the Commonwealth proceeds with them, will, if all other State programmes proceed as planned, make available in the metropolitan area of Brisbane more beds than our planners feel are necessary at this time, and certainly more beds than can be serviced by professional staff. This is where the great weakness lies. If the Commonwealth's proposals continue, the State's building programme in other regional hospitals will have to be appropriately pruned to ensure that beds become available at those times when the need arises. This could mean that the Southport Hospital or the Redcliffe Hospital extensions will have to be postponed.

**Mr. Burns:** Oh, rubbish!

**Mr. TOOTH:** What does the honourable member for Lytton know about it? Absolutely nothing!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! If I have to call the honourable member for Lytton to order again I will deal with him under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr. D'Arcy** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Albert has just walked into the Chamber. He has not been here very long. If he continues to interject, he will not be here very much longer.

**Mr. TOOTH:** Let me quote—

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Don't be such an old bore.

**Mr. TOOTH:** The honourable member for Archerfield referred to "an old bore". I don't know which kind of bore he meant.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Spelt "b-o-r-e", not "b-o-a-r".

**Mr. TOOTH:** Reference to the honourable member as either would be a compliment.

**Mr. Sherrington:** It is "b-o-a-r".

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Bromley:** Why don't you resign?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TOOTH:** Let me quote from Mr. Whitlam's own advisers in this field as stated in the Report on Hospitals in Australia by the Hospitals and Health Services Commission, commonly known as the Sax Commission. I trust that honourable members will listen to this. It is in these terms—

"What is done in regard to the construction, expansion or change in function of one hospital affects other hospitals in the region, and is affected by the provision and use of nursing homes, hostels, rehabilitation centres, diagnostic facilities and community health services. All must be considered jointly. Each element needs to be assigned a degree of priority in an overall hospital and health facility programme."

That underlines the point I am making that we should not look at these hospitals individually; they must be looked at on a regional basis. Any sudden interference will distort the whole picture.

The Commonwealth's intentions to assist the State in its hospital-building programme could be better and more appropriately indicated if State planning proceeds by State planners, with Commonwealth funds being made available to assist in the implementation of a fully balanced and integrated State programme.

What must be remembered also is that, if 1,000 additional beds are suddenly thrust upon the metropolitan hospital market, they must be staffed adequately. If those 1,000 beds are to appear in the metropolitan area within the next two or three years (as the Commonwealth seems to imagine they can) the recruitment of staff at all levels—medical, nursing, administrative and technical—will be a mammoth task for the Commonwealth unless, of course, as I suspect is the intention, staff are attracted deliberately to the Commonwealth hospitals, pillaged from existing staff in our State-controlled hospitals.

**Mr. Bromley:** We did consider—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The next time I call the honourable member for South Brisbane to order, he will be dealt with.

**Mr. TOOTH:** We are prepared to continue to talk to the Commonwealth. Several months ago we sent to the Commonwealth our forward, long-range planning purposes.

We would welcome their release of public funds to assist Queensland in the health area, but sudden and unplanned intrusions into the actual implementation of health delivery by the Commonwealth will throw our planning out of balance, produce serious staffing difficulties and be extremely wasteful of resources both professional and financial.

**QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE**

**COMMONWEALTH AID FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY ROAD WORKS**

**Mr. Tucker**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

Of the \$16.6 million reported by the Commonwealth Transport Minister to the Local Authorities Conference on September 25, as being made available to Queensland as interim financing for road works, how much has been passed to local authorities?

*Answer:—*

“The Main Roads Department, with the approval of the Commonwealth and the State Treasury, notified local authorities that they could draw up to 3/12ths of the anticipated Commonwealth Aid Funds under the interim financing arrangements for roads pending finalisation of the Commonwealth legislation. It is difficult to give a precise figure but local authorities have been able to continue on exactly the same interim financing basis as has applied to the Main Roads Department.”

**BURGLARIES AND BREAKING AND ENTERINGS, TOWNSVILLE**

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

(1) How many burglaries and breaking and enterings have been reported in the Townsville Police District since November 1, 1973?

(2) How many of these cases have been solved and how many convictions have been obtained?

*Answers:—*

(1) “744.”

(2) “Statistics of this kind are not maintained. During the period in question cleared-up offences numbered 114. There is however no correlation between the offences reported and the offences cleared-up during the period referred to.”

**STAFFING, TOWNSVILLE POLICE DISTRICT**

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

(1) How many police stations in the Townsville Police District are awaiting staff replacements and reappointments?

(2) How many training constables performed duties in the district during the past eight months?

(3) What was the strength of police numbers in the district at August 31?

(4) What staff adjustments have taken place since November, 1973.

*Answers:—*

(1) “Four.”

(2) “One.”

(3) “Established strength at August 31, 1974, was 200. There were two unfilled vacancies at that time. There would have been some variation in actual strength as against established strength due to transfers in the course of being effected.”

(4) “Alterations to established strength since November, 1973—

Station	Decrease	Increase
Townsville .. .. .	1 Senior Sergeant ..	1 Sergeant 2/C
Charters Towers .. .. .	1 Detective Sergeant 1/C	1 P.C. Sergeant 2/C
Greenvale .. .. .	Nil .. .. .	1 Constable
Townsville .. .. .	2 P.C. Constables ..	2 Detective Constables
Mundingburra .. .. .	Nil .. .. .	1 Senior Sergeant
Mundingburra .. .. .	1 Sergeant 1/C .. ..	4 Constables
Stuart .. .. .	Nil .. .. .	2 Constables
Total, under respective headings ..	5	12”

**DEMOUNTABLE SCHOOL BUILDINGS**

**Mr. P. Wood**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) How many demountable buildings are in use in State primary and high schools?

(2) How many of these are considered to be in permanent use?

(3) Is there now a shortage of demountable accommodation and, if so, what steps are being taken to overcome the shortage?

*Answers:—*

(1) “493.”

(2) “All demountable buildings are in the nature of an interim accommodation provision.”

(3) "Delay was experienced in obtaining demountable buildings earlier this year because of the effects of the flooding of the factory of the main supplier of such buildings, but production problems in this area are being overcome. My department is continually assessing this and other sources of supply."

#### CAR-PARKING FACILITIES AT SUBURBAN RAILWAY STATIONS

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

Further to my many Questions in the House during 1972 in relation to the Government providing car-parking facilities at all suburban railway stations, will he now consider providing these amenities for train passengers to encourage the public to use the trains more freely, in an endeavour to ease the traffic congestion and ease the risk of road accidents which are occurring much too often for our inadequate hospital accommodation and depleted staff to give the necessary medical attention to the unfortunate people involved in these accidents?

*Answer:—*

"I am unable to establish that the Honourable Member has asked questions previously on the subject of car parking facilities at railway stations but assure him that I share his concern about congestion on the roads with the increased attendant risk of road accidents. The ability of the Railway Department to establish as many parking areas as may be deemed desirable is curbed by the amount of funds which can be channelled for that purpose. However, parking facilities have been provided at 39 suburban stations, affording accommodation for not less than 2,150 vehicles and arrangements are in hand for the construction of a car park to accommodate 60 vehicles at another station. As I have already announced, the Metropolitan Transit Projects Board is examining, as a matter of high priority, the provision of inter-change facilities, including car parks, at selected suburban railway stations."

#### TRAINEE NURSES, ROYAL BRISBANE HOSPITAL

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

(1) Is he aware that second-year nurses at the Royal Brisbane Hospital are required for approximately two weeks of night duty prior to their final examination?

(2) Will he take immediate action to have this roster altered so that these young nurses can have a fair chance of having clear minds to sit for the examination, as some of these trainee nurses obtained higher marks in their first-year examination

than most of their counterparts in the State and are now fearful of failure or posts in their respective subjects?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "The rostering of student nurses is a matter for consideration of the hospitals board in the light of overall requirements of the hospital. I am advised that every endeavour is made by the matron not to roster student nurses on night duty for a period prior to examinations but where this is not possible they are not rostered for duty on the night prior to examinations."

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### OVERHAUL OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

**Mr. TUCKER**: I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to the statement of the honourable member for Maryborough appearing in "The Courier-Mail" of 7 October 1974 that the Local Government Act is antiquated, 15 years behind the times, and in need of complete overhaul? If he agrees with that view, what action is likely to be taken to remedy the position?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN**: The Minister for Local Government and Electricity, who at the moment is very sick, has had a Bill prepared on this matter. It was considered by Cabinet yesterday and will bring every area of the Local Government Act up to date. I assure honourable members that over the years the Local Government Department has been administered in a very able way, particularly by the Honourable Henry McKechnie, who has won the highest esteem and admiration of local authorities throughout Queensland, which I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would recognise.

However, so that the Act may be easily understood and implemented more fully, it is being brought up to date by the Bill I have mentioned.

##### RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN STATE SCHOOLS

**Mr. TUCKER**: I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to the statement in "The Courier-Mail" of 7 October 1974 by the Reverend George Needham and others relative to the breakdown in the present system of religious instruction in State schools? If so, why are the children being denied adequate religious education?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN**: On the following day one of the top officials in the Education Department pointed out in the Press that that statement was completely incorrect and that the matter was still under consideration. As Premier, I can bear that out because I have had discussions with Sir Alan Fletcher and other people concerning this very difficult question of what should or should not be done in religious education in our schools. It is a very important issue. Only last week I had discussions with Dr. Tronc, who is one

of the top educationists in this State on this very subject. He is keenly interested in it and I have arranged to have further discussions on this matter because it is vital that the right thing is done in religious instruction and training in this State.

#### INTERNATIONAL SUGAR CONTRACTS

**Mr. BIRD:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: It was reported in the "Bowen Independent" of 3 October that the Prime Minister had said in Mackay recently—

"His Government has just signed long-term contracts for sugar and Dr. Patterson should be commended for the excellent part he has played for the people in the sugar industry."

Is Dr. Patterson worthy of such praise and what part did he play in arranging that sale?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** Whilst I was in Bowen last week with my colleague the honourable member for Whitsunday, familiarising myself with my responsibilities to primary industries there, the article referred to was brought to my notice. In the very limited spare time allowed me by the itinerary of the honourable member for Whitsunday, I read it. It was brought to my notice by a tomato farmer after a meeting in September. His comment was, "We are well aware of the savage policies that the Prime Minister and his Government are responsible for inflicting on primary industry, but why does the Prime Minister take us for such mugs? Does he regard us as being so naive as to swallow this story?"

The report does not adequately indicate the real situation. When long-term commercial contracts for the sale of sugar are negotiated, it is a matter of prudence on the part of both exporters and importers to have such contracts officially acknowledged by the Governments involved. Once such long-term arrangements have been negotiated by the Sugar Board through its agent, which is the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, this acknowledgment is accomplished by an exchange of letters between the Governments endorsing such contracts.

In the case of the recently concluded long-term contracts with Korea and Malaysia, Dr. Patterson, by reason of the delegation of authority to him under Federal export legislation, was party to the exchange of letters endorsing these contracts. I assure the honourable member that I am kept informed of all such negotiations, and I assure myself, as the responsible Minister (after all, Queensland owns the sugar), that the terms and conditions of such contract are acceptable to the industry before their finalisation by the C.S.R. Company on behalf of the board.

In relation to the two sales of sugar to Korea and Malaysia, I agreed to them in discussion with the late Mr. Jack Winders, the then Chairman of the Sugar Board, about a month before the exchange of letters by

Dr. Patterson and the respective Governments of Korea and Malaysia. Out of courtesy, of course, Dr. Patterson, as the Commonwealth Government Minister responsible for matters concerning sugar, was acquainted with the sales that had been negotiated about a month before, and we had agreed upon simultaneous Press statements. Because Dr. Patterson's statement came from Seoul and Malaysia and mine came from Brisbane, perhaps the Press placed more significance on his statement and gave it precedence over mine.

#### RESIDENTIAL LAND, TOWNSVILLE, GLADSTONE, AND MORETON REGION

**Mr. NEWTON:** I ask the Treasurer: What stage has been reached in financial negotiations between him and the Prime Minister concerning land for residential purposes at Townsville and Gladstone, and in the Moreton region?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** Certain letters have been exchanged between the Commonwealth and State Governments in relation to this matter. I am awaiting a reply from the Prime Minister, and it is my belief that it will be received this week.

#### CEMENT SUPPLIES, SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND

**Mr. NEWTON:** I ask the Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs: As the building industry and consumers are again being faced with a shortage of cement in the southern part of the State and are being asked to pay \$3.60 and even higher prices for cement imported from other States, what is his department doing to obtain an additional cement works for the southern part of the State, and what assistance has been offered to the Darra cement works by his department to bring its plant up to date to meet the requirements of the building industry and consumers?

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** The cost of cement brought from interstate to supplement existing supplies has been considered fair and reasonable by all concerned, even though it places another burden on the building-construction industry. So far as present supplies of cement in southern Queensland are concerned, honourable members, particularly the honourable member for Belmont, will be aware that the works at Darra have been plagued, in the first place, by breakdowns, and, in the second place, by industrial disputes. I do not think any fair-minded person would dispute that comment. In consequence, for the last few months cement has been in short supply. The sister companies at Rockhampton and Townsville have been augmenting Brisbane's supplies in an endeavour to meet the demands of industry.

Furthermore, in an endeavour to meet future demands, the Darra company has for many months been dealing with plans to

establish a clinker-grinding plant at a waterfront location, as water transport is necessary in the handling of clinker. Unfortunately, for one reason or another, its efforts to implement these plans have been obstructed. I understand that the way is now clear for the project to proceed, and I am sure that the establishment of a clinker plant will make cement available far more quickly than would embarkation on building a new cement plant, which would be a very difficult project to undertake in the light of the opposition of conservationists and others to the establishment of such a plant in any area in southern Queensland.

#### CLOSURE OF AUSTRALIAN SHIPYARDS

**Mr. ALISON:** I ask the Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs: Does it appear that other Australian shipyards will inevitably be forced to close, as were Walkers Limited in Maryborough? Has he seen a newspaper report of 2 October revealing that a powerful Federal Labor caucus committee endorsed a rapid reduction in subsidies paid to Australian shipbuilders and rejected proposals by the Transport Minister which could have cost about \$500,000 this year in subsidies? Is it a fact that the Federal Government already is in conflict with shipbuilders, the shipbuilding unions are angered by Government cutbacks in naval defence orders and that unions plan a major protest to Canberra about shipbuilding policies? Does the Minister believe that an unthinking, unfeeling and unrealistic Federal Government will deliberately cause worry and loss of jobs, as it did in Maryborough, and continue to have complete disregard for loss of particular skills and for the naval defence of our country?

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** Having regard to the manner in which the Federal A.L.P. reneged on a promise to the shipbuilding industry during the pre-election campaign, I anticipated the question from the honourable member and, in the interests of accuracy, I have some notes with me. So, in answer to the honourable member's question, I say that the Federal Labor caucus committee decision merely speeds the inevitable.

The proposal of the Transport Minister was that the subsidy remain at 45 per cent of the total cost of building a ship in Australia until 30 June next year. It would then be reduced by 2 per cent a year, finally reaching 25 per cent by 1984.

The plan advanced by the Minister for Manufacturing Industry (Mr. Enderby) provided for the subsidy to be cut to 42.5 per cent last June, to 40 per cent in December, to 37.5 per cent next June, and then to be reduced by 2 per cent a year until reaching 25 per cent in 1980.

Mr. Enderby won Cabinet backing last December, pending a final caucus resolution of the infighting between the two Ministers, and his scheme was put into effect. Now

the powerful committee of caucus has endorsed the Cabinet decision. This is the history.

What are likely to be the effects as regards Queensland's remaining major shipbuilders, Evans Deakin, now that Walkers Limited has given up the unequal fight? I cannot answer my own question—it is a matter for the company—but I can say with certainty to the honourable member that the Federal Labor Government is welsching on its promises to sustain the Australian shipbuilding industry. It does not matter which Minister or which caucus committee holds the torch, the end result will be the eventual destruction of yet another facet of private enterprise.

What makes it more tragic is that I understand that Evans Deakin's shipbuilding section has been profitable since an industrial agreement was reached between the management and the Trades and Labor Council. The unions have honoured this agreement, but they, as well as management, are now being sold down the drain by the Federal Government.

Those of us who were present at the naming of the "Robert Miller" will recall the statement by the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) that he had approved of the construction of a further vessel by Evans Deakin because of that particular industrial agreement. But it now appears that words, and the future of Queensland workers, mean nothing. To confirm that expression I intend to quote from the relevant section of a letter I received this morning from eight shop delegates from three unions in the Evans Deakin shipyard—namely, the Metal Workers Union, the Shipwrights Union and the Painters and Dockers Union—conveying to me the text of a resolution of a mass meeting of employees which was carried unanimously by the entire work-force attending it. The relevant section of the letter reads—

"This mass meeting of shipyard workers strongly oppose the recent decision of the Federal Government to quickly remove the subsidies to ship-builders, and protest at the immediate mass unemployment which will follow in the wake of this decision.

"We see this as a complete reversal of policy outlined prior to the Federal elections, such policy providing for a continuity of employment within the shipbuilding industry for all major shipyards in Australia."

The letter is signed by eight shop delegates.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to the latest unemployment figures, described as the worst in 28 years, and has he seen the statement by the President of the Queensland Trades and

Labor Council (Mr. Egerton) that the figures do not reveal the true unemployment position, which he says is much worse?

Has he also seen the statement by the State Opposition Leader that the Federal Government is not to blame for unemployment?

What action is the Queensland Government, on its part, taking to counter rising unemployment?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am aware of the statements that have been made as well as of the reports that have appeared in the Press. There is no doubt that the present high level of unemployment is a national tragedy, one created by the Federal Government. No-one, other than perhaps the Leader of the Opposition, could argue against the claim that the Commonwealth Government has made a complete mess of every aspect of its responsibilities in our economy—trade, defence, employment, foreign affairs—

**Mr. Knox:** Art.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** And in art. In spite of this the Commonwealth Government persists in telling the States how to conduct their own affairs.

The Leader of the Opposition has claimed that the Federal Government is not to blame. He has made a number of statements that certainly would not give him any status or standing in the eyes of the community. For example, he has lied by saying that he will give a job to everyone who is out of work. Goodness me! We could not be blamed for thinking that a three or four-year-old had made such a statement. It is completely untrue and utterly false. The Leader of the Opposition has told a downright lie.

On the other hand, Mr. Egerton clearly says that it is the Commonwealth's responsibility. He does not beat about the bush. All of us know that the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Federal A.L.P. Government.

We have done everything we can to relieve unemployment. We have set up an Unemployment Advisory Committee. We have brought down the most wonderful Budget that any State could have. In it we have not increased charges generally, nor have we increased rail freights to country areas. Rather have we expanded our works programme generally to help relieve unemployment, and we have also sought to help local authorities. We are certainly playing our part in the present economic situation. What a contrast this is to the actions of the Commonwealth Government, which have led to a complete breakdown in our economy and to a tragic level of unemployment.

The editorial in this morning's "Courier-Mail" is of great interest. It reads—

"The State Opposition Leader (Mr. Tucker) recently pledged that a State Labor Government would restore full employment in Queensland. This was obvious electioneering."

It was also certainly a lie. The editorial points out—

"State Governments should co-operate with the Commonwealth in employment-giving programmes, but they cannot control the causes of national unemployment."

We have offered our complete co-operation to the Commonwealth.

The editorial continues—

"The main responsibility lies with the Commonwealth. All States have been affected by the fall-off in employment.

"The Commonwealth Government's aim should be to obtain at least a stability in adult employment by early next year—that is, in three or four months. This would ease the impact of school leavers on the labor market."

It is time that the Commonwealth Government faced up to its responsibilities and did something to alleviate the present situation.

#### SULPHUR DIOXIDE POLLUTION, MOUNT ISA MINES

**Mr. BOUSEN:** I ask the Premier: Is he aware of reports that Mount Isa Mines is maintaining high levels of sulphur dioxide pollution despite statutory requirements to the contrary? If so, is this permitted because Mount Isa Mines is a major contributor to the National Party's funds?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I do not know whether the company is or is not a major contributor to the National Party's funds.

**Mr. Marginson:** You're a liar!

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member says that I am telling lies. I ask him to withdraw his remark.

**Mr. Sherrington:** A moment ago you said the Leader of the Opposition was lying.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I did not hear the remark, but I ask any honourable member who said that the Premier was telling lies to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. Sherrington:** A few minutes ago the Premier said that the Leader of the Opposition was lying.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Who is the offender?

**Mr. Marginson:** I withdraw the remark but the Premier said that of the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I did not hear the remark.

**Mr. BOUSEN:** The Premier has not answered my question. I ask him to do so.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** When the Premier gets the opportunity he will do so.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Will the honourable member repeat the first part of his question? I did not quite catch it.

**Mr. BOUSEN:** Is the Premier aware of reports that Mount Isa Mines is maintaining high levels of sulphur dioxide pollution despite statutory requirements to the contrary?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am not aware of the situation referred to by the honourable member but I do know that Mount Isa Mines has spent, and is spending, a lot of money on countering pollution. That has been so for some considerable time. I know that the air pollution authority people and others have been to Mt. Isa and that many discussions have been held. I am not quite familiar with the present situation, but I know that it is being dealt with.

**A.L.P. POLICY ON ABORTION, PROSTITUTION AND HOMOSEXUALITY**

**Mr. AIKENS:** I ask the Minister for Justice if his attention has been drawn to Press and other media reports of a statement by the Leader of the Opposition, following the recent Labor-in-Politics Convention held at Cairns, that if the A.L.P. is elected to Government at the next State Election it will immediately take steps to provide "decriminalisation" for abortionists, prostitutes and homosexuals? If so, will he explain in simple, easily understandable terms, for the information of ordinary Queenslanders, just what this casuistical, etymological hogwash really means?

**Mr. KNOX:** A similar question will appear on the Business Paper tomorrow, which I will answer in more detail. However, to answer the honourable member promptly, this only illustrates the degree to which the A.L.P. in this State is supporting permissiveness.

**SUGAR SALES TO GREAT BRITAIN**

**Mr. CASEY:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: In view of his statement to the House this morning about the part that he allegedly played in negotiating sugar contracts with Korea and Malaysia, what role is he currently playing in the negotiations for additional sugar sales to Great Britain?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** It would appear that even at this early stage the honourable member for Mackay has attempted to misconstrue my statement to his own advantage without having given much thought to it. He may rest assured that I was fully conversant with the negotiations for sugar sales to the U.K. or the E.E.C., whichever it may be in the future. Daily I received reports of what was taking place.

**Mr. CASEY:** I have a supplementary question. As the Premier recently announced that the Minister for Primary Industries would lead a sugar delegation overseas to negotiate new sugar contracts, what countries

does he intend to visit and will he have authority to negotiate on-the-spot bilateral agreements with the countries concerned?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** An announcement was made. The matter is being examined. I will be speaking with a number of people before any decisions are made and I shall report back to the Premier and Cabinet on what is taking place. We do not act behind anybody's back. The Parliament will be advised if and when the delegation is arranged.

**PAYMENT OF OWNER TRUCK DRIVERS BY ARIZONA INDUSTRIAL PTY. LTD.**

**Mr. N. F. JONES:** In directing a question to the Minister for Justice, I refer him to a previous question of mine in relation to an investigation that I sought into Arizona Industrial Pty. Ltd., in which I claimed that truck drivers were owed \$44,000, and I now ask—

(1) Is he aware that this company is still advertising?

(2) What stage has the investigation reached?

**Mr. KNOX:** I am able to inform the honourable member that the investigations have been very thorough and extensive. There is a letter on the way to him indicating certain action that has taken place. I am aware that there have been further advertisements since he first raised the matter, and I am sure the letter will explain to him the circumstances surrounding it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The time allotted for questions has now expired.

**OPTOMETRISTS BILL**

**INITIATION**

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

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill relating to the qualifications and registration of optometrists and the regulation of the practice of optometry, and for purposes connected therewith."

Motion agreed to.

**MEDICAL ACT AND OTHER ACTS (ADMINISTRATION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**INITIATION**

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): 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 Medical Act and Other Acts (Administration) Act 1966-1973 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

## SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—  
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 26 September (see page 1102) on Sir Gordon Chalk's motion—

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-75, a sum not exceeding \$96,262 to defray Salaries—His Excellency the Governor.”

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.26 p.m.): In his usual blustering desire for publicity, the Treasurer early in Budget week announced that the 1974 Budget would be a “people pleaser”. It is significant that in “The Sunday-Mail” the publicity photograph of a “relaxing in the garden” Treasurer could only point to one telegram containing high praise for the Budget provisions.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** Oh no!

**Mr. TUCKER:** I am only repeating what appeared in the Press. I believe that that one telegram was sent by a relative of his.

**Mr. Casey:** It certainly wasn't sent by Comalco.

**Mr. TUCKER:** It certainly was not.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** Have a look at these, Percy.

**Mr. TUCKER:** What the Treasurer is waving around could be anything. On an earlier occasion I saw him hold up a stack of telegram forms and say, “These are what I have received”, and I found out later that he had rushed down to the Post Office in this building and grabbed a handful of blank forms to bring back into the Chamber. I am quite awake to the Treasurer's tricks.

The attack on the Australian Government that is inherent in the wording of the second and later paragraphs of the Treasurer's Financial Statement gives further emphasis to the opinionated truculence of the National-Liberal State Government and its adoption of the Communist tactic of shamelessly smearing opponents.

Contemplation of the Budget reveals it as mathematical confirmation of our suspicion that it would be another step in the Liberal “have an early election” campaign. Over the past few days we have seen this campaign being conducted. One moment the Liberal Party told us that we would have an early election; the next day it was said that the Premier was having a secret meeting at Dalby to decide whether or not there would be an early election. These behind-the-scenes moves have been going on for the past week.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Can't you handle the Budget provisions? You are roaming all over the place. Can't you deal with the fiscal policies of our State Government?

**Mr. TUCKER:** What a strange interjection that is for the honourable member for Windsor, who has never yet made a worthwhile contribution in this Chamber! If it had come from someone with strength in the Government, it might have worried me, but it came from a member who holds no status whatever on the Government side.

By the Budget the Government reveals itself as a group of politicians interested only in the next election and not as a group of statesmen interested in the next generation.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** We are; you're not.

**Mr. TUCKER:** My claim cannot be refuted.

The whole Budget has now to be considered in the light of the Australian Government's decision to devalue the dollar. There are, of course, many aspects to this devaluation, but it will certainly result in the easing of unemployment and I shall be speaking at length on unemployment to refute the statements made earlier today by the Premier. I am not concerned with whether he calls me a liar or something else.

Devaluation will also make life better for our exporters, particularly the rural and mining industries. All this will flow from the actions of the Federal Government; it certainly will not come from the State Government's Budget.

In 1974-75 Australia's rural industries stand to gain approximately \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000 from devaluation and the mining industries about \$100,000,000. That is the result of action by the Federal Government, but nothing has been said about the advantages to rural industries and exporters. Much has been made of boom and gloom, but, when the Federal Government moves in a way which affords benefit, the Queensland Government and its supporters are very quiet indeed. It is my duty to place it on record that the rural areas will certainly benefit.

With all the power of that natural phenomenon “momentum”, inflation pushes us towards despair. We are all worried about inflation, and it has been the target for some ill-founded economic criticism. Many Government members who have supposedly talked in an educated way about inflation have merely voiced a lot of balderdash and hogwash. The virtually regimented rising of Government members in this House to launch into disapproval of the Australian Government is clear evidence of an unhealthy lack of progressive thinking. The Government has no ideas or planning to put forward for the benefit of Queenslanders. The Treasurer's Budget is merely designed to maintain the status quo. It displays no forward thinking, and is certainly not progressive. It is bereft of purpose and is merely a collection of words of sarcasm and melancholy over woes alleged to be perpetrated by Whitlam and the Federal Government. The attitude of Government members

is portrayed every morning in Dorothy Dix questions, yet the Queensland Government has certainly been assisted by the Federal Government.

The Treasurer's Budget last year and the Budget that he brought down last month clearly reflect that this Government is incapable of dealing with the economic demands of the State and the many factors at work in our economy today. Both Budgets show that the Government is prepared to operate only within the confines of orthodox Treasury advice and that it refuses to co-operate with the Australian Government in the battle against inflation. It persists with a status-quo Budget.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** How can it deal effectively with inflation when the people in Canberra do not know what they are doing. First they devalue and then they revalue.

**Mr. TUCKER:** Did the honourable member want them to leave the dollar where it was?

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Yes, where it was in the first place.

**Mr. TUCKER:** The honourable member for Windsor does not even know what he wants.

There is no doubt that, while the Australian Government has done a great deal of work, it has received no help or assistance from the Queensland State Government. Last year the Treasurer said that he feared the Australian Government's expansionary policy set in a fully employed economy, with decisions being made in crises by persons inexperienced in economic management. I think those were the words he used. He was referring to the Australian Government's Budget, which provided for an increase in expenditure of a little over 19 per cent. But while he was calling for a cut-back in public expenditure he brought down a Budget last year which increased expenditure in the State by 22.7 per cent. Even at that stage the pattern was set. This year, the Treasurer again slated the Australian Government because it budgeted for an increase in spending of 32.4 per cent. But he then brought down a Budget that provided for a 33.8 per cent increase in spending in Queensland. The operative word, in those circumstances, is "hypocrisy".

On the one hand he claimed that the percentage rise in the Federal Budget was increasing inflation. On the other, he himself brought down a Budget containing a higher rate of increase than the Federal Budget, stating that it was a people-pleaser. We have to remember those percentages. I repeat that the operative term is "political hypocrisy".

**Mr. Lee:** You're the one guilty of hypocrisy.

**Mr. TUCKER:** That may be the honourable member's opinion; nevertheless, I hope that he stays and listens to what I have to say.

In his Budget the Treasurer referred to Queensland's ability to overcome adversities such as national disasters. Then he commented—

"The question as to whether our economy possesses similar powers of recovery to overcome the dampening effects of the present Federal Government's economic policies remains to be answered."

He does not need to look far to know that he answers the question for himself. The Queensland economy will find it very difficult to recover from his control of the Treasury benches—hobbled, as he is, by one or two senior officials in his department and dictated to by the faceless members of the sectional-interest party which calls itself the National Party. One must feel a certain amount of pity for the Treasurer in that he has these dead albatrosses hanging around his neck when he is framing the Budget.

Queensland is on the brink of severe economic difficulty, brought about solely because the Government has been unable to keep its own house in order. However, the Treasurer said—and again I quote from his Budget speech—

"It is a matter of some considerable satisfaction to me personally and to the Government that, despite the difficulties of 1973-74 and the uncertainties of 1974-75, the economy of the State and indeed its financial standing are in a very sound condition. It is still threatened with many external influences but I believe the State will continue to prosper under the policies of this Government and that its people can look forward, as I do, with confidence and optimism to 1974-75 and beyond."

That is what the Treasurer said. By way of contrast I say that in all my time in this Parliament I have never heard a Treasurer mouth the arrant, irresponsible nonsense that we have heard from the present Treasurer in his attempt to disguise the State Government's refusal to face up to its responsibilities in the management of the Queensland economy.

**Mr. Hartwig:** A thousand people a day are being put out of work in Australia.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Hartwig:** A thousand a day, and you condone it.

**Mr. TUCKER:** It is the first time I have known the interjector to be concerned about unemployment. What is he worried about? Is he worried about his own area of Callide?

I was talking about the refusal of the State Government to face up to its responsibilities in the management of the Queensland economy. I believe this is a case of

Little Sir Echo, K.B.E., LL.D., M.L.A., not only deceiving himself, but also attempting to deceive the people of Queensland.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition is going a little too far in his reference to the Treasurer. I ask him to withdraw his remark.

**Mr. Bromley:** He's praising him.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I would be careful if I were the honourable member for Lytton.

**Mr. BURNS:** I rise to a point of order. With due respect, Mr. Lickiss, I haven't said a word. I would like you to withdraw your statement about me.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If it was not the honourable member for Lytton, I withdraw the statement. It was someone up in that area. If it was not this time, it usually is.

**Mr. Bromley:** It was me. I threw my voice.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. TUCKER:** The one redeeming feature—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his remark about the Treasurer.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I would like to know where I referred to him.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition is being facetious. He will withdraw that remark or be ordered to resume his seat.

**Mr. TUCKER:** Well, Mr. Lickiss, if that sort of tactic is used, obviously I have only one course.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I advise the honourable gentleman not to reflect on the Chair in adopting it.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I want to be able to continue this speech because it will sting the Government.

The one redeeming factor of this Budget is that it is the Treasurer's last. Whether he retires or not, I can guarantee that it will be his last. It is the straw which breaks the camel's back, and it will pave the way for the return of the Labor Party to the Treasury benches. That is what I mean when I say it will be his last Budget. It does not matter whether he retires or not because there is no doubt that he will be thrown out next year.

In general terms the Budget included no initiatives on behalf of Queensland and relied heavily on funds from Canberra and money the Government was not certain of getting—and is not certain of getting—from mineral royalties. In particular terms it was heart-breaking—notably for what it did not do.

The greatest issue facing Queensland at present is the one issue which suffered the greatest neglect in this Budget, and that is the problem of unemployment, about which there have been interjections today. I intend to devote some time to examining the shameful record of the Government on this question, and I do not want to hear Government interjectors telling me to lay the blame on Canberra. One moment they want a Queen of Queensland; one moment they want to secede from Australia; one moment they want to be in charge of Queensland; and in the very next moment they will not accept their responsibilities at all but try to blame Canberra. That is how the Government sneaks out of every issue. You want to be masters of your own destiny only in so far as—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will address the Chair.

**Mr. TUCKER:** They blame Canberra. This is the ineffective type of Government we have in Queensland at present. If a problem cannot be solved, they blame Canberra. In fact, nothing can be solved by this Government. I will prove beyond all shadow of doubt that the blame lies right here when it comes to the Queensland situation.

This Government, in the Budget, had an opportunity to secure Queensland jobs throughout the State with Queensland-raised money for capital works and development projects but it passed the opportunity up. There was no word about it in this Budget. The Budget demonstrated beyond all doubt that the Government is not interested in people, in jobs or in the security of jobs. Again I say that the Government has a vested interest in unemployment so that it can attack and blame the Federal Government.

At the end of August, 15,801 unemployed Queenslanders were chasing 3,793 jobs and at that stage this Government was predicting that the situation would get far worse. But how did the prophets of doom react when they had such a golden opportunity in the State Budget to help those for whom they claim to show concern? The answer is there for all to see. They reacted ruthlessly. They showed that they were prepared to take their campaign against the democratically elected Government in Canberra to such an extent that they would foster unemployment in this State. And they scrapped completely, the \$2,350,000 grant for unemployment relief in Treasury Department expenditure.

Last week, during my party's policy-making convention in Cairns, I promised delegates that as Premier my first priority would be to ensure that every Queenslanders able to work had a job to do. I mentioned my concern at this Government's lack of sympathy for those who daily are finding themselves without a job and I said that

employment initiatives should have been provided in the Budget. My concern is over the Government's lack of sympathy for those who find themselves without jobs and the absence of employment initiatives that should have been provided in the Budget.

The Premier responded almost immediately—and I could scarcely believe my ears. He said that it was “laughable”—I stress that word—that I should suggest a scheme, financed by Queensland money, to provide Queenslanders with jobs because, to use his words, “it might get Canberra off the hook.” That statement is a further indication that the Premier of this State is oriented to the line of thought that it does not matter if people lose their jobs because reducing unemployment would “get Canberra off the hook.” That is typical of the Premier's thinking on all occasions.

I remind the Premier that “The quality of mercy is not strain'd”—words borrowed from Shakespeare, as all will know. The cruelty expressed in the Premier's words that I have quoted, and which were reported by the media, goes beyond any standard of political bias that I can tolerate. As a Queensland and a politician, I am ashamed that the battle of political interests in my State has reached so low a level that the ruthless leader of a Government will take an irrational vendetta against his political opponents so far as to refuse to help the jobless, so far as to take away jobs—and that is exactly what the Premier has done; he has taken his vendetta so far as to take away jobs—and so far as to say that any proposal to provide employment opportunities is “laughable”. That is his word, and he cannot get away from it. In fact, I believe that with those few cruel, irresponsible words the Premier has talked his Government out of office.

I say that with the Budget the Government had an opportunity to tackle the problem of unemployment. It failed, and its leader has demonstrated that the reason for its failure is a political vendetta against the Federal Government. If the Premier is not prepared to do anything about the present position, I ask for my chance, and a chance for the Australian Labor Party, to do something about it. The need is not for idleness but for new housing, new hospitals and new schools. We need projects to fight pollution, efficient transport facilities to take us to and from work, and industrial incentives. They are not being provided in this State today, nor have they been provided during the years in which this Treasurer has held his office.

I challenge the Government to present to the people its record in employment incentives, and then allow the people to decide the matter.

**Mr. Camm:** You would like the people to decide?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I should think the Minister would be among those afraid to go to the people, because for the first time in many

years he has put in an appearance in Bowen and has been spending time running around his electorate. Everybody there expects an early election. The Minister must be worried because most of his constituents had to be told who he was.

I repeat my challenge to the Government to present to the people its record in employment incentives and then allow the people to decide the matter.

**Sir Gordon Chalk** interjected.

**Mr. TUCKER:** The giggling Treasurer would like an early election because he wants one more throw. I know that the Premier realises that this is the Treasurer's sole reason for wanting an early election; he is not concerned about any other issues. So the Premier says, “Let us delay the election till April or May to enable us to get rid of this inefficient Treasurer.” The Premier may then be able to take over the Treasury himself. I shall explore that possibility a little later. The Premier said that the Government has decided against an early election because in the present circumstances an early election would be irresponsible. I wonder whether the Treasurer, who wants an early election, agrees that his endeavours are irresponsible. The Premier said, “An early election would be irresponsible. There is no reason to go to the electors at the moment.” What he is virtually saying is that the efforts of the Treasurer to bring on an early election are irresponsible. I wonder what the Treasurer thinks of those innuendoes.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** You're frightened of an election.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I am not concerned. If the Government wishes to hold it tomorrow, it is all right with the Opposition. Let us fight it on the issue on which I am now speaking.

My challenge to the Government is both responsible and serious. There is no doubt that, electorally, my party will win more seats at an election next May than at an election next month—I realise that—but the A.L.P. will win whether the Government brings it on now or next May; it is only a question of by how much.

**Mr. P. Wood:** The Government is panicking.

**Mr. TUCKER:** That is right; the Government is panicking. It has to send people who are not members of this Assembly on a tour of the State to try to repair the damage that has been done. I will not mention the names of the people who are being sent round the State at present. I think everybody knows them.

Figures made available to me yesterday convinced me that, in the interests of Queensland and Queensland jobs, the political blight on the Treasury benches must be removed. If an election is needed to create jobs in this State, then let us have an

election—and let us have it right now! Whatever it takes, this State must go back to work.

The issue is clear-cut—a coalition that, on its record, stands for no jobs, or a party of the people, the Australian Labor Party, committed to a policy to provide or stimulate whatever employment the private sector does not provide. I invite honourable members to listen to the radio news at any time during the day and hear what is being said about unemployment in this State.

Let me turn to the appalling figures that made up my mind yesterday on this serious challenge. Last month, Queensland had 17,784 of its best workers unemployed, and job vacancies numbered 3,605; in other words, one job was available for every five people out of work. Now the State Government, which refuses to use a golden opportunity such as that provided by the Budget to help these unemployed men and women, says, "Blame Canberra."

Let us look, then, at the record. On a State-by-State basis, this is how unemployment has risen over the past year: New South Wales, by 86 per cent; Victoria, by 99 per cent; South Australia, by 42 per cent (and need I mention what party is in government in South Australia?); Western Australia by 110 per cent; Tasmania, by 44 per cent (again I refer to honourable members to the party in government there); and Queensland, by a staggering 160 per cent (and I emphasise that). There can be no question in anyone's mind that the Government of Queensland is fostering unemployment. That is the way it conducts its political battles.

Figures since June show an exactly similar trend in the rise in unemployment—New South Wales, 47 per cent; Victoria, 57 per cent; South Australia, 35 per cent; Western Australia, 45 per cent; Tasmania, 49 per cent; and Queensland, once again leading the field, more than 86 per cent in just four months. That is the record that the Government, and the Budget now being debated, condones. I cannot condone such a record, nor do I believe that the people of this State will condone it. An election year is the people's year to speak, so let the people speak. This Government cannot hold up its head and face the people with this shattering indictment clearly recorded as I am recording it here today.

No longer can we be told to blame Canberra. In the 1972-73 Budget of the Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra, Queensland received 16.58 per cent of the total general revenue assistance. I hope that everybody is listening to this, especially those who allege that Queensland is not getting its fair share at the moment. The following year, under the Whitlam Government, Queensland's share rose to 17.29 per cent. This year, the Australian Government's Budget set aside for Queensland 18.29 per cent of the total general revenue assistance. This

is 18.29 per cent of the money for less than 15 per cent of the population of Australia: but the Premier says, "Blame Canberra!"

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It is less than real money, you know.

**Mr. TUCKER:** It is the percentage of the money available, whatever its value.

In the financial year just ended, the Australian Government made total payments to this State of \$382 per head of population compared with an average payment to all States of \$345 per head. But still we hear, "Blame Canberra!"

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** How much did they collect per head?

**Mr. TUCKER:** Just wait a minute! This Budget is based on estimated receipts from the Australian Government of \$504,300,000, or 46.78 per cent. This compares with Commonwealth payments to Queensland last year of \$395,200,000 or 46.29 per cent of the Budget. In the last Budget of the Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra, Queensland received \$323,700,000 or 45.9 per cent of its Budget revenue. It is clearly demonstrated by these percentages that each year we are gaining in moneys received from Canberra. It is equally clear that virtually half of the Queensland Budget is dependent on moneys received from Canberra.

While the Treasurer and this Government have ignored the plight of local government and semi-governmental bodies, their desperate financial situation can be illustrated by the fact that borrowings from the Australian Government for Queensland totalled \$71.35 per capita last financial year compared with the national average of \$55.27 per capita. This is the highest per-capita borrowing of any of the six States—from the Canberra Government that this State Government seeks to denigrate, in spite of the fact that on a per-capita basis we have been well above the other States in borrowing. Yet the State Government continues to denigrate the Australian Government.

This financial year, the per-capita semi-governmental and local authority borrowings are estimated to rise to \$79.60 per head for Queensland compared with the national average of \$61.83 per head. Similarly, total State Government Loan Council borrowing programmes and semi-governmental and local authority borrowings are estimated at \$130.58 per head—\$15.44 higher than the national average and second only to Tasmania. These are figures that had to be put into "Hansard" and taken note of by this Committee while this argument about blaming Canberra continues to be heard here.

It is quite a contrast that in 1956-57, when the last State Labor Government was in office, these borrowings totalled \$50.17 per head compared with a national average of \$51.22 per head. In fact, in 1956-57, only New South Wales had a lower per-capita

borrowing rate than Queensland. Now we are amongst the highest and well above the national average.

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

**Mr. TUCKER:** Before lunch I referred to local authority borrowings. Local authorities in this State are in a desperate financial position solely as the result of the actions and administration of the National-Liberal Government in Queensland.

Queensland had an opportunity to work towards the solution of local authority problems at the referendum held in conjunction with the Federal election on 18 May. The proposal was that the Commonwealth Government be empowered to make laws on two main aspects: firstly, to allow the Commonwealth to borrow money on behalf of local authorities and, secondly, to empower the Commonwealth Parliament to grant financial assistance to any local government body on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thought fit. It is a matter of record that the Queensland Government campaigned vigorously against these proposals.

When bringing down his Government—I mean “Budget”, although he will bring down his Government some day, too—the Treasurer boasted of new help to local authorities to the tune of \$45,000,000 in loans to provide employment for men who were being dismissed. That was his statement. For those who did not study the Treasurer’s offer carefully, I will read again from his own words to show that it is not a generous response from a sympathetic Government.

The Treasurer said—

“These special Treasury funds will be restricted to cases where it can be demonstrated that the authorities have exhausted all other avenues of loan finance and that traditional lenders have not withheld funds because of the Government’s gesture.”

In effect, these words mean that virtually only bankrupt local authorities are eligible for assistance. I ask: is this assistance to local authorities to provide jobs? Of course not. The money is restricted to local authorities that have exhausted all other avenues. And what rate of interest does the Treasurer plan to charge these bankrupt local authorities? I trust that he will answer that question in his reply.

Before moving from the subject of jobs and job assistance, I shall note briefly the trend in some areas. The number of unemployed skilled tradesmen in the building and construction industry has trebled in the past year; the number of skilled metal and electrical tradesmen who are unemployed has doubled; unemployment among rural workers has doubled, to almost 800; the number of unemployed clerical and administrative workers has risen from 2,216 to almost 3,900; and the number of unemployed semi-skilled and unskilled workers has more

than doubled, to almost 8,000. A responsible State Government would help these people. And after the next election a responsible State Labor Government will help them.

My colleagues our shadow Ministers will deal with the Budget accounts for the departments under the control of the respective Ministers. They will deal with them very effectively and possibly much more minutely than I intend to.

**Mr. Frawley:** It wouldn’t be hard to do a better job than you’re doing.

**Mr. TUCKER:** If the honourable member were an authority, I would be worried. However, from the tone of his speeches in this Chamber I have no cause for concern.

**Mr. Frawley:** Stick around later and you’ll hear something.

**Mr. TUCKER:** In any mud-throwing competition or in anything touching upon lunatics the honourable member would probably take first prize. Beyond that I do not think he would be very effective at all.

There are several matters that I wish to deal with now. The first is the Treasurer’s statements in the field of education. They were politically deceitful. He referred to a “massive increase” in provisions in this field. In fact the State Government accepted a \$16,500,000 supplement for education from the Australian Government under the Karmel programme, and then reduced its own spending accordingly. The percentage for education from Consolidated Revenue has declined despite the \$16,500,000 from Canberra. The State Government has attempted to defeat the Australian Government’s purpose in making these funds available, which was to upgrade education in Queensland. But such has not been the case because as the Australian Government provided more money the Queensland Government reduced its own expenditure. That has been pointed out effectively, and will be enlarged on, by our shadow Minister for Education (Mr. Peter Wood).

In these circumstances only our children suffer. Because the State cuts back its share of spending, students are taught in corridors, in school libraries, in open areas such as verandas, and in temporary classrooms that are now in permanent use. Last year Queensland raised \$184,000,000 for education from its own resources. This year it is to raise \$240,000,000, which is an increase of 16.3 per cent, but less than half the percentage increase in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Where do our priorities lie in education?

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Where do they lie in health and main roads?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I wish the honourable member would lie on a main road; he would be run over.

The Treasurer boasted of an extra \$41,000,000 in the total education budget, but a close examination of the accounts

shows that \$38,000,000 of that sum is for salary increases and an additional 2,287 teachers. I hope that we manage to recruit and keep the extra teachers because, at present, the resignation rate of teachers stands at seven every day of the week. Overseas recruitment is only plugging the gaps left when well-qualified but disenchanting teachers leave the service of the Education Department at the rate mentioned.

Police recruitment has also failed. In presenting the Budget the Treasurer said that, with the addition of 251 police officers this year, police strength would increase from the 30 June strength of 3,772 to 4,023. However, if we look closer, we find that last year the Treasurer budgeted for an increase in police strength of 365 to a total (according to him) of 3,949. But at 30 June the strength of the force was only 3,772. In other words, it was 12 fewer than what we started with a year ago. We certainly did not make the number that the Treasurer referred to a year ago. With the increase to 4,023, the strength will be only 74 more than last year's Budget anticipated it would now be.

In those areas we know that all we are reading are pious hopes of the Treasurer that never come true. This is despite the expensive recruiting campaigns and the increasing reliance upon women personnel to make up numbers in the Police Force. I do not reflect on the women personnel in any way, but we must realise that they are used to bolster the number in the force. The morale of the Police Force is low. Obviously responsibility for this condition must fall squarely on the shoulders of the Minister in charge of police, who has failed badly in the administration of other aspects of his portfolio. My able deputy will deal with those matters in some detail.

I shall now dwell for a time on law and order. Firstly, I ask, "What of law and order?" An increase in police strength must be a move in the right direction. If we are able to increase the police strength, I am all for it. Reference has been made to extra civilian clerical staff. That, too, will assist. However, it should be stressed that the additional personnel, in the main, will not be trained police officers but rather trainees. The concept of law and order in the age of dissent means combating violence of differing sorts and degrees—the shooting down of people and the burning, smashing and bombing of buildings and valuable equipment. There can be the swarm of body force. There is a limit to the amount of defiance that a legal system can tolerate.

The policeman is, of course, necessary to control the criminal, as society would regard many people, as well as to remind all citizens of the need to respect the law. The enforcement machinery must, of necessity, be used wisely, with adequate thought and foresight, and with complete awareness of what is needed.

Unfortunately, the effect of the Budget on the man in the street will not be immediate. We are concerned that a girl of nine can be the victim of a sexual assault in a suburban railway station subway at 3 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon; that a young couple can be abducted at knife-point in the main street of Brisbane at night, with the young fellow subsequently having to run a mile to find a policeman; and that bowling clubs regularly receive "visits" from cigarette and liquor thieves. Now is the time for our enforcement machine to be functioning in top gear in the right places at the right time. Sadly, that is not so.

Perhaps Government members may sneer at such allegedly trifling examples of deviant behaviour, but they are strongly indicative of unpleasant interference with what should be "the good life". The Budget, therefore, should have put more stress on law and order. It should have ordered more equipment so that the arm of the law could be quicker and better spread over the areas that need protection today.

And what of the unhappy harvest on the roads? Every day, particularly on weekends, death and destruction mount. Eighteen-year olds, as well as being road-users, are now voters. Cynically, Parliament has a vested interest in keeping our younger generation from becoming statistics in such numbers! "Better late than dead on time" should be made a road-using practice by more than defensive-driving tactics. In the words of Ogden Nash—

"Nothing improves my driving

To quite the same extent

As the police car just arriving

Or the police car that just went."

That is a fact of life.

In the past the Treasurer has been upset when I have contended that the State Government Insurance Office has been a milking cow for the Government. The following figures are therefore relevant: in 1973-74 the State Government Insurance Office paid \$3,547,195 in lieu of income tax. That was an increase of \$1,080,000 on the previous year. In fact, over the past 10 years the State Government has received \$20,131,389 by way of "income tax" on the State Government Insurance Office. That is in addition to stamp duties of more than \$6,000,000 over the same period. This again is an illustration of the Government's priorities. This boost to Consolidated Revenue from the S.G.I.O. indicates that premium rates are higher and bonuses lower than they need be. It shows that the Government will hit the worker at every turn. It is another example and a perfect illustration of what I have been saying.

No matter how much the Treasurer and the Minister for Mines talk about mining royalties in relation to their multi-national friends, it is inescapable that the Government is not concerned one iota with the average Queenslander. The subject of royalties has

caused some vexation, if I might put it that way, among former friends. Government moves for higher royalties were greeted with mining company charges of abrogation of contract and discrimination. All of us remember that not so very long ago the Treasurer, in turn, accused a mining company of a clumsy attempt at blackmail. At present, the Government that the company says breaks its word and discriminates is still at loggerheads with the company that the Government accuses of blackmail. In this far from friendly setting, a legal challenge is being made against the new Bill that governs mining royalties. We understand that the Treasurer will not necessarily be able to collect the money. It is still under a shadow. I make the point that the Treasurer has used that figure to try to balance his Budget.

Notwithstanding this challenge, the Treasurer has forged ahead and budgeted for a royalty increase from \$4,018,740 last year to \$37,856,000 this year. He has no guarantee that he will get this money, yet he has plucked from the air a figure he needed to balance his Budget. This is the point I make.

The Opposition stand on mining royalties has been well known. We have not shifted from what we said many years ago. Our stand has been quite clear on this matter for many years. But the Government's belated move to get royalty increases—though in a most clumsy manner—just shows just what has been lost to this State over the past 10 years. The Government now acknowledges that last year alone the royalty return to Queensland should have been round \$30,000,000, when in fact it was \$4,000,000.

The increase of nearly 1,000 per cent this year is a strong indictment of the Government. If such return can now be obtained, why wasn't similar action taken previously to obtain valuable funds so necessary for (and I quote the Treasurer's own words) "the twin goals of increasing the development of the State while providing the maximum possible Social Services to its people at the minimum of cost in taxation and charges." I ask today as I have asked many times before: as he is able to get it now, why wasn't he able to get it last year and the year before? And, as he did not, I say it is an indictment of him and the Government.

Jumping to conclusions is not half as good exercise as digging for facts. The Government should have got the facts straight on royalties when it started to sell our natural resources for a pittance. In those days we pointed out that it was in fact a pittance, and all sorts of smokescreens were thrown up when the Government started to sell those resources. The Government has defrauded the people of Queensland by its previous pigheaded adherence to a royalty rate not in keeping with current trends. I realise that a common ground of agreement has not yet been reached with all the mining

companies, but the Government's disdain for the guidance of reason has created the situation in which it now finds itself.

**Mr. Ahern:** What is the price of coal now compared with what it was a few years ago?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I will talk to the honourable member about that later. I do not intend to waste my time answering facetious interjections.

The Budget proved this Government's vested interest in inflation through high land prices and transactions and also speculation. It is shown up in revenue from stamp duty and pay-roll taxes which exceeded estimates by more than \$10,000,000. In my Budget speech last year, I said I believed that the estimates were low, and, even though we ran into problems in land speculation and high land prices, this tax exceeded the estimate by some \$10,000,000. It was in the Treasurer's interests at that time to keep the estimate low.

The Treasurer almost wept in his speech as he told us that stamp duty receipts this year would be only \$45,000,000 or more than \$18,000,000 less than last year's actual receipts. I again say to the Committee that I believe this is an obvious under-estimation. I am sure that the Treasurer envisaged his colleague the Minister for Justice, or his sometime colleague the Premier—whoever wins the battle for his portfolio—producing extra receipts next year and saying, "How clever am I!" That is what he did. He was able to under-estimate both pay-roll tax and stamp duty and he can now say to the people of Queensland, "How clever am I! I have been able to balance my Budget." He was able to do it only by under-estimating stamp duty and pay-roll tax to the tune of something like \$10,000,000. I will not be convinced that officers in high places are not able to estimate income to within a few thousand dollars. They are usually able to do that. It is strange indeed that there was this under-estimation not by thousands of dollars but by \$10,000,000.

**Mr. Jensen:** If that happened in private enterprise, they would be in trouble.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I will accept that interjection. If a private-enterprise organisation could not estimate with greater accuracy than \$10,000,000, I wonder how long it would last. If the Treasurer cannot make more accurate estimations, there is something wrong with him or his advisers. Of course, the Government has an interest in under-estimation because it allows this subsequent almost miraculous pulling out of the hat of an extra \$10,000,000. Often before bringing down the Budget the Treasurer made statements such as, "I need another \$30,000,000." Then, lo and behold, up pops this extra money and he then says, "We are able to balance the Budget." I

point these matters out because I believe there has again been under-estimation this year.

**Mr. Ahern:** How do you estimate what Whitlam will do from day to day?

**Mr. TUCKER:** After sitting in this Chamber for 15 years and trying to follow what the Premier and Treasurer do from day to day, I find it easy to predict what will happen in political circles. The Premier and Treasurer would be the greatest jugglers of all time. They have certainly done some of the greatest back-somersaults that I have ever seen. I am not concerned about anyone else. I have been able to observe what goes on here, especially the way honourable members opposite circle one another and are ready to stab each other at the drop of a hat. The coalition Government hangs together because each party is frightened of hanging separately. That has been said before today, too. If the Premier has his way, he will make sure that the election is held next year so that he can get rid of the present incumbent of the Treasury portfolio. The Treasurer must know now that next year none of his colleagues will be administering his once-proud portfolio because none of them will be on the Treasury benches.

In an attempt to ensure high land prices and speculation this year, and consequently stamp duty receipts above his \$45,000,000 estimate, the Treasurer juggled his figures on land development. The Government is planning to cut its total spending on land development by about 11 per cent. If allowance is made for the current inflation rate, the reduction will be approximately 26 per cent. In addition, the State Government is continuing to refuse millions of dollars from the Australian Government for land acquisition and development.

By refusing Federal money and cutting back on its own land development, the State Government is virtually allowing private industry to have the field to itself. It is creating a monopoly game in which the man in the street never wins. The figures cannot be denied; they are right here in the Budget.

The T.A.B. continues to be a huge source of revenue for the Government. I might point out here that the Government is led by a Premier who says that he is against gambling, drinking and similar activities. Nevertheless, the T.A.B. was established by this Government. From 1963, when the board began operations, to June of this year, total tax paid to the Government from T.A.B. operations amounted to \$40,200,000. This did not include the amount the Government received from fractions and unclaimed dividends, which have amounted to \$8,920,000 in that period.

In 1973-74, \$8,300,000 went into Consolidated Revenue by way of turnover tax—an increase of \$1,300,000 on the previous year's figures. Distribution, as a percentage

of prize money, to galloping was down 10.2 per cent on last year, while trotting remained the same, and distribution to greyhound racing fell by nearly 9 per cent. The distribution to galloping as a percentage of prize money was the lowest since 1968.

No-one can deny that Queensland racing clubs are facing a deteriorating financial position, but the Treasurer has come up with a scheme to remedy this by way of greater deductions from the pools on T.A.B. doubles and trebles. Consistently with the philosophy of the Government, he is doing it at the expense of the punter, who, in the case of the T.A.B., is usually the working man who likes his 50c interest every Saturday. The small man in the community is going to pay. T.A.B. punters will, in effect, now get back \$3,500,000 less—and I stress that—from their doubles and trebles than they would have under the old scale, and again the small investor is paying.

The Government already has control over trotting and greyhound racing in this State, while galloping operates outside an over-all control board. In the Budget, the Treasurer says he will take \$500,000 of the money generated by the racing game and put it back into the sport instead of putting it into Consolidated Revenue. My argument is that he is putting back only some of the money, not all of it.

On 25 September, I suggested that a special fund should be set up for use solely in the interests of the racing industry. I pointed out that, in this way, the total amounts of fractions and unclaimed dividends, not just part, would be made available to the racing industry.

Of considerable concern to me is the huge increase in the Vote for the Premier's Department since the current Premier assumed office. It now takes more than \$7,000,000 to run the Premier's Department—an increase of 288 per cent since Mr. Johannes Bjelke-Petersen took office.

The increase has been used to supply the Premier with a big personal staff, finance an expensive propaganda and public relations machine, and provide the Premier with a Government aeroplane. The Budget shows that taxpayers will pay more than \$1,000 a week in the coming year for the operation and maintenance of the Government aeroplane, but still the Premier refuses to say where it flies. However, an examination of flight records for the 1972-73 year shows that at least 36 per cent of the total number of flights covered the approximate distance of a trip between Brisbane and Kingaroy. In other words, I am saying that one out of every three trips was between Brisbane and Kingaroy, and that the Government aeroplane is little more than the Premier's personal aerial taxi.

The Budget also includes an item for \$96,000 towards the cost of the next aerial taxi, if I may put it that way. The total cost of this new aeroplane is about \$600,000,

which is \$350,000 more than the cost of the present aeroplane. This means that in four years the price of the aerial taxi will have risen from \$150,000 to \$600,000. Surely that is a huge increase from whichever angle one looks at it.

**Mr. Ahern:** Would you like access to it?

**Mr. TUCKER:** No. I would not be game to fly in it. If I did, the honourable member or someone else on the Government side probably would put a bomb in it.

The Premier says that he is saving Queensland money by trading his plane in every two years. All I can say is that those planning experts of T.A.A., Ansett, Qantas, British Airlines, Air New Zealand, Pan Am—you name it—must be fools for not recognising the value of this quick-shuffle trade-in operation; though perhaps they do and realise that their airlines, unlike the Queensland people, cannot afford a brand of economics that increases costs by almost 100 per cent every year.

We talk about inflation and cutting back, and the cry goes out from the Government to ordinary people to restrain their demands, but how can we expect any response when, in fact, in this Budget the actions of the Government are not restrained in any way at all, particularly when it comes to spending by the Premier on himself, his department, or his aeroplane.

In the year just ended, the over-all increase in money actually spent was 21.7 per cent, which brought the bill to \$855,200,000.

I back-track at this stage to look at the further extension of election gimmicks. An interesting item caught my attention in the allocation for our run-down railways. The Vote for salaries and wages in the Railway Advertising Department is up by 27.9 per cent to \$68,000. Only two people work in this department and I cannot for one moment imagine that a \$13,806 increase in wages is going to be divided between two people. There is no doubt that it is going to be used for party-political advertising under the guise of Railway Department advertisements.

It is amazing how these amounts are tucked away. One has to look at the Budget to find out the reasons. If they are there one has to search very hard to find them. It is well known that, as we move towards an election, some of the departments become very active; they want to tell the people how they operate. It always happens just before an election. I am putting the spotlight on this allocation of \$68,000 and the increase in this department of \$13,806 in wages, which is surely not going to be divided between two people. We all know that that is not going to happen and that in the coming months the money will be used to oil the political-propaganda machine.

Last year the Treasurer budgeted for a \$26,000,000 railway deficit. The Auditor-General's report shows that, in fact, he

achieved a deficit of \$58,500,000. This year he has budgeted for an unprecedented \$43,000,000 deficit. Let us consider that fact in the light of last year's over-all railway revenue, which increased by only 9.2 per cent. The Treasurer claimed that the railways were run efficiently, yet we find these deficits mounting each year. Someone has to pay for them. Somewhere along the line some money has to come in each year to offset the tremendous deficit which is constantly mounting.

Even taking inflation into account, the railways are certainly not doing much good under the stewardship of the present Government. There is something wrong. On many occasions the argument has been put forward that we are gaining a great deal of revenue from the Railway Department's haulage of minerals. In some areas this might be so, but it is not showing up in the over-all receipts of the railways. The deficit is mounting all the time and I do not believe that the Treasurer has adequately informed us about what is happening.

I have referred to newspaper advertisements. We are all well aware of the "Let's look at the law" series inserted by the Minister for Justice. The format of these advertisements would be considerably improved by the removal of the photograph of the Minister for Justice—might I say a smug-looking Minister—from the corner of the advertisements.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** Have you seen Murphy's this week?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I have seen the Treasurer's photograph on a number of occasions, and have been repelled by it.

We are also aware of the cheery little "Dear Householder" letters signed by "Bill Knox" that are now circulating prolifically throughout his Nundah electorate. I know of at least one woman in the Nundah electorate who will not now be voting for Bill Knox at the next election.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Who is paying for them?

**Mr. TUCKER:** That's what I'd like to know. Who is meeting the printing costs? I have with me a copy of a letter that was circulated prior to the recent referendums, advocating a "No" vote. Political propaganda of this type is being disseminated by the Justice Department and I venture to suggest that in the very near future we will see similar material emanating from the Transport Department.

During the recent Federal election campaign the lady to whom I have referred, having changed her address, went to the Hamilton Post Office to collect her mail. After paying 14c she found that amongst her mail was a folksy letter from the Minister for Justice, outlining the reasons why she should not vote for the socialistic Government in Canberra. All this material had been printed at Government expense, and she was 14c

out of pocket. I wonder how many other people found their letter-boxes contaminated by this spurious propaganda from the Minister for Justice. Let him tell us.

He should also tell us the cost of the High Court challenges and the cost of his junket to make the Queen the Queen of Queensland. Where do these costs appear in the Financial Statement? Although it is public expense the figures are hidden because the Government is ashamed to tell the taxpayers the huge amounts involved in these ridiculous challenges. These costs must be tucked away somewhere in the Budget, but we are unable to find them. We are entitled to know the cost of these election gimmicks.

Despite the build-up the Treasurer gave his Budget, there are many reasons for thinking that the Premier wants this part of Australia to remain his private dominion. The fact that Queensland will be the only State in Australia not adopting daylight-saving this year will add to our rate of inflation as well as make Queensland a backwater.

This brings to mind the fact that our tourist industry did not warrant a mention in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. While the gross domestic product can be used to measure the financial well-being of any community, there is no way that a money measurement can be placed on some of the more pleasant things in life that our State can offer. For example, the many matchless beaches, the unequalled opportunities for sporting and outdoor recreations, the unique attractions of the scenery, the mountains and the bush are all intangibles that defy branding with a dollar value, nevertheless they can be highlighted to earn the dollar. The Australian Government is doing its share for tourist promotion but there does not appear to be any advance on the \$250,000 allocation from State funds for tourism last year.

It is realised that the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure and the Tables relating to the Treasurer's Financial Statement contain the house-keeping of State finances. Because the facts are not available to me, it would be futile for me to endeavour to match, in either statistical thinking or words, the many calculations and other matters involved. I leave to my shadow Ministers the avenue for debate on the various departmental matters I have touched on.

Let no-one make the mistake of believing that the A.L.P. is a knocker of this State and its finances. Far from it! Of course we want development, but we want it in the right direction. Let me therefore be correctly parochial about my own city of Townsville. While I appreciate the debenture loan allocation for the Townsville City Council, the continuation of construction of the new courts of law and, I hope, expenditure on housing and other requirements, nevertheless, the Government is neglecting the Townsville area. This stems basically from

the Premier and, presumably, his Cabinet colleagues blocking plans put forward for Queensland's development by the Australian Government.

The Whitlam Government wants to make Townsville a regional growth centre. Apparently the State Government would deny Townsville its limitless prospect for growth rather than work with the Australian Labor Government. Where is the belief in rural development and decentralisation in such a depressing attitude? The New South Wales and Victorian Premiers are not so backward and shortsighted. In this context I cite the Albury-Wodonga project, which will proceed with their co-operation.

Townsville cannot afford to have its progress hampered by political rivalry, but that is happening at the moment. Its future is unlimited but depends deeply on a healthy and productive relationship between the State and national Governments. The development of Townsville is synonymous with the development of the North, with more industry, more job opportunities, and improved facilities for present and future generations of Queenslanders. But plans to halt spiralling land prices, to improve the quality of life and to make urban development more equitable and efficient have been held up by lack of co-operation on the part of the State Government.

In 1973-74 Townsville was eligible for assistance under the national sewerage scheme, but the Premier would not take the money. In 1974-75 the Australian Government is allocating \$13,000,000 to Queensland for sewerage works. I ask the Premier to accept Townsville's share of over \$250,000.

The Premier also clings to his obstinate ban on shipping services by the Australian National Line between Queensland ports. The importance of a regular intrastate shipping service cannot be overstressed. It would provide an alternative means of transport when the highways or railways are cut by floods. It would provide a more rational and diversified transport system. It would maximise the efficiency of the Townsville Harbour Board's facilities for handling freight. There are some types of freight that can be carried only by sea. We have the farcical situation of foreign-owned ships being engaged to carry bauxite from Weipa to Gladstone because the Queensland Government refuses to let an Australian Government ship do the work. There are ships plying between Queensland and the other States with space in their holds for 1,000 tons of intrastate cargo on every voyage.

Nothing could be more unfair than the Premier's dogmatic and bigoted attitude to any approach by the Whitlam Government. What this State needs in Federal-State relations for the people's advantage is less confrontation, more negotiation and more co-operation.

It is common knowledge that the Labor-in-Politics Convention was held in Cairns last week to decide A.L.P. policies. Let me stress that the outcome was a hard and determined search for practical benefits for Queenslanders. Those are now contained in our over-all policy.

If the Queensland Government is not prepared to govern properly by working continually and steadfastly for Queensland's progress without taint of unco-operative Right-wing conservatism, it should get out. It should not continue to try to govern. It should be thrown out by the people so that a Government of the people may govern for and on behalf of the people.

**Mr. CORY** (Warwick) (3 p.m.): In rising to speak in this Budget debate, I certainly do not share the embarrassment of the previous speaker by having to read a prepared brief.

First, I congratulate the Treasurer on the Budget he was able to bring down this year, particularly in the light of the current difficult economic times. Those who do not believe they are difficult economic times have nothing to compare the times with.

This Government's prudent financial husbandry over the last 12 months is patent in the Budget, on both the local and the international scene. Much has been said about royalties. It is quite obvious that, regardless of what the Leader of the Opposition says, a major increase in royalties would not have been possible but for the development that has taken place. Because of the economics of establishing mining companies and getting them off the ground, it was just not possible to set higher royalties. Either we had them at the lower rates or we did not have them at all. Now that the profits of the companies have been established, it is only prudent and proper that a fair share should come to Queensland. However, if it had not been done this way, the companies would not have been here to pay any royalties at all.

It has been correctly stated that the economy is the worst for business since the 1930's. The only difference is that the present economic situation is man made, mainly because of the tariff and currency policies of the Federal Government.

This is the largest Budget presented in Queensland, but mainly because of inflation, which has been aided and abetted by Federal policies on revaluation and tariffs. Through the Treasurer, the Queensland Government has accepted the challenge presented by the current economic situation. We have attempted to do all we possibly can, with a responsible use of the State's resources, to prevent as far as possible economic collapse and unemployment.

The management of our Public Debt, one of the bases of our economic structure, is commendable. In the last 12 months the Public Debt has increased by approximately

4½ per cent; but, when one looks at inflation and the across-the-board cost increases, that is indeed praiseworthy. The Public Debt, which has been forced upon us by Australia's taxing system, continues to spell out the basis of our financial problems and how similar our position is to that of local authorities.

Last year the Public Debt increased by approximately 5½ per cent and the year before by approximately 6 per cent. However, this year the trend has been controlled. Although the Public Debt is a festering sore that is growing and growing in our economy and one that costs us \$92,000,000 to service, it is commendable to see that it is being controlled to a reasonable figure.

The forcing of both State Government and local government to survive on such a large proportion of loan money for capital work has to continue. This is where the weakness of our financial structure becomes so evident, particularly when the Federal Government is able to undertake its capital works programme out of revenue. All of us in both State Government and local government would like to undertake the major part of our capital works out of revenue purely from the security angle but this is impossible under our reimbursement system and monetary structure. It must surely demonstrate the unbalanced formula for these reimbursement payments. I think we must stress that all of us in the different tiers of government have certain responsibilities, and those responsibilities are increasing year by year. If State and local governments got their entitlements according to responsibilities they, too, could ease their debts instead of having them grow.

Because the Commonwealth is in a very happy financial position, it appears to want to spend its money if not constructively then by duplication. I instance the Mt. Gravatt hospital, the Legal Aid Bureau and the national highways proposals. They are all good in concept and principle because they are needed; but there is a right and a wrong way of approaching the matter. As I see it, the right way is to get behind the bodies that already have these responsibilities and so make it possible for these improvements to be undertaken in a sensible and constructive way without the expense of duplication, which exists in so many fields. Let us always remember that it is the taxpayer who is paying, because obviously a government is only the vehicle for the taxpayer.

In the light of this, the Budget's consideration for local government is very commendable. It is quite evident that local government is third in the priority list—behind education and health. This assistance and close contact with the problems of local government are quite important because moneys spent through local government covers the whole State as every area of the State is covered by local government. Every area can get this help regardless of its politics. This is contrary to the Federal

Government's approach of selecting individual areas and projects apparently because of the political affiliations of the people concerned and, at the same time, destroying the initiative of private enterprise and doing it all with taxpayers' money. It has to be stressed that the people who are making these decisions to kill private enterprise and the initiative of the individual are doing it with somebody else's money.

I convey to the Treasurer that the people appreciate his offering \$45,000,000 in debenture loans to local government. They appreciate and accept the conditions placed on applications and I think they are very fair and reasonable. But the fact is that this \$45,000,000 is half of the present shortfall in their loan requirements so it is indeed a very practical gesture to assist them with a problem because of the restricted economic situation which will make loan moneys more difficult to obtain than ever before. The other assistance to local government is the creation of the new \$5,000,000 grants scheme. Its introduction is appreciated, particularly because it does not have the disadvantageous restrictions which apply to the Australian Grants Commission.

There have been increases in the allocations for education and health, which receive the two highest priorities in Government spending. This sounds good and is in fact good, but increased allocations carry with them even greater responsibility to see that the money is spent wisely. As the Vote increases, so does the responsibility to obtain full value for it in either community benefit or monetary return. This is a field in which I believe that community benefit has to play an important part.

In the field of education, the further inland one goes the more expensive it becomes to provide education facilities for children. In Boulia, for instance, the cost might be five or six times the Brisbane cost, and in Warwick it might be twice the Brisbane cost. But this is a service that the Government has a responsibility to provide, and the community benefit obtained from the spending of money at Boulia would be far greater than the community benefit obtained from the provision of similar facilities in Brisbane, because obviously Brisbane has so many things to offer in other directions.

The reward obtained in terms of community benefit is therefore extremely important. Community benefit is, of course, what the Education Department and the Health Department are providing by the establishment of as many of their facilities as possible throughout Queensland, particularly in the western areas. The arbitrary monetary return from such expenditure is important and where it has the greatest priority is in the metropolitan area, where vast sums are being spent. The responsibility to spend this money wisely in the health and education fields is extremely high. I do not think this aspect should be overlooked

because it is the Government that is spending the money. Let it be remembered at all times what the Government represents. Some pressure groups are inclined to take the view that, because the money is being spent by the Government, they should get what they can regardless of value. They forget that the Government is merely a body composed of representatives of the taxpayers.

Whilst I am speaking on education, I want to refer to the help provided to non-State schools. It is pleasing to see that this assistance has been increased from \$62 to \$81 a pupil in primary schools, and from \$104 to \$132 in secondary schools. I realise that the State Government alone could not do more, but the grants now being provided are obviously not sufficient to overcome all the problems of non-State schools. Nevertheless, I think we all have a responsibility to assist in overcoming these difficulties in the future. Surely we do not want a situation in which parents have no choice in the type of education for their children. If some parents give the education of their children a higher personal priority than others, surely they should have the opportunity to obtain that extra standard of education for them. That is what is provided by the non-State and denominational school system, and the help given by Governments to private schools represents in effect a saving to the taxpayers because the very fact of keeping non-State schools open and viable means a saving of the enormous sums of money that would be needed to educate these children at State schools.

The Federal grants for science and library blocks, introduced by a Liberal-Country Party Government, are very much appreciated, and they have provided very worthwhile facilities for schools. Similarly appreciated is the subsidy on interest rates on loan moneys paid to schools, which was introduced by the Queensland Government. This together with the progressive increase in the yearly allowances, has made it possible for many schools to continue operating. It must always be remembered that what has been done in this field has been in spite of opposition from the A.L.P.

When one sees denominational schools or portions of them—perhaps grades 11 and 12—that are serving large areas closing because of lack of finance, it becomes obvious that the assistance now being provided is not sufficient. I know that the Federal Labor Government wants to kill non-State schools. However, the good job such schools are doing and the amount they are actually saving the taxpayers by remaining open, as I have pointed out, certainly show that it is a very shortsighted policy to try to push them out of business. In addition, so much public money has already been used to assist them to provide better facilities that it would be very shortsighted indeed not to continue the assistance needed to keep them viable.

In my opinion, the next move must be for the Education Department to take over the payment of the salaries of the teaching staff at non-State schools. Teachers' salaries now impose a crippling burden, and they have certainly escalated considerably in recent years. Obviously, other financial factors in these schools have not increased to anything like the same extent, and certainly the ability of parents to pay has not increased in similar proportion. Therefore, it is necessary to provide assistance and relief through other avenues. Payment by the Education Department of the salaries of teachers at private schools would ease the financial burden, particularly of the smaller schools, and enable those schools to remain open and provide a complementary alternative system of education, thus assisting the taxpayers in the way I mentioned earlier.

Never in Australia's history has it been more important for people to realise the need to encourage any organisation that will assist in keeping Australia a Christian country—and denominational schools certainly are among such organisations. The fact that Australians basically are Christians probably is the greatest single factor preventing Australia from becoming a Communist nation. A person cannot be both a Christian and a Communist, and once he ceases to be a Christian or to lose his basis of faith, there is little to prevent him from becoming a Communist. Christianity is based on love; Communism is based on fear. I leave it to honourable members to decide for themselves which they prefer.

Sixteen members of the House of Representatives do not take an oath on the Bible, and they all belong to the A.L.P. They represent about 25 per cent of the A.L.P. members of the Federal House, and they are supposed to be national leaders. I believe that is far too many people in leading positions in this country to be non-Christians, because they do not have the same moral fibre as I would say 99.9 per cent of other Australians have.

**Mr. Frawley:** Some honourable members opposite didn't pledge their allegiance to the Queen in their speeches in the Address-in-Reply debate.

**Mr. CORY:** Some of them are only showmen, and I do not think they are prepared to bring their moral beliefs into the open and make them public. However, I am dealing with the Financial Statement and do not intend to become involved in any argument at the moment.

The Education Vote provides additional assistance to persons operating school bus runs. Again, that is very much appreciated. The part about it that appealed to me was that it was a reasonably bold increase, far exceeding any previously granted. It will mean that the operators will be able to continue in viable businesses. I thank the Treasurer for setting the date of operation

at 1 October. The increase will become available to the operators immediately instead of their having to wait until perhaps the beginning of next year while their costs continue to rise.

My only disappointment and criticism about this otherwise good Budget is the fact that road permits were not eliminated. On this subject I again wish to thank the Treasurer for his courtesy in giving me, as late as yesterday, a very full explanation of the Treasury's problems in this regard. I will not elaborate at this stage other than to say that I fail to see how we, as a Government, can hold down rail freights for country people and city fares for city travellers at the taxpayers' expense—both actions which are to be commended because they are realistic approaches to the problem—but at the same time continue to charge country people extra taxation through road transport permits. After all, country people are already taxpayers; they are already paying their whack towards the railway deficit, which, as we have heard, was \$38,000,000 last year. How can we justify a second special levy on country people by way of permit fees?

I appreciate what the railways are doing by holding freights down. It means that more than ever they are continuing as a public service to all sections of the community. This will always be necessary but, because they provide such an important service, we have a responsibility to assist their operation.

I now want to refer to the obvious trend towards a drop in business activity and turnover which affects, for example, stamp duty and other receipts. The Government derives a certain amount of income from these areas but, if business activity is reduced and the viability of these areas is affected, the Government, as a consequence, receives less revenue. This situation is very different from that of the Federal Government, which has a vested interest in inflation because the natural increase in income tax due to inflation automatically covers the extra costs of their inflationary expenditure. So the Federal Government derives these benefits while the State Government and local authorities pay the penalty. This all ties up with the increase in the Public Debt and the loan money required to operate in these other two fields.

Pay-roll tax could well be reduced. Although total receipts may not be reduced because of the increased rate, there certainly will be a reduction from the amount that should have been received had unemployment not reached its present level. Employees are being retrenched throughout all States. I can only speak of personal experience of a country business but it is not uncommon these days for the number of employees in country businesses to be reduced by half. One business in my area that normally employed 36 people can now employ only 16—and that is the over-all picture today. Pay-roll tax which normally would accrue from these

activities will be reduced. This does not affect the Federal Government, although it has been the cause of the problem.

The increased hospital fees for private and intermediate beds represent a very sensible move and will probably have more far-reaching repercussions and be of more assistance to people than might be generally realised. Certainly the patients will not be greatly affected because most of them are covered by hospital benefits funds. The increases will be of tremendous benefit to private hospitals and will enable them to continue to play their important part in the health services of this State. They provide a personal service that cannot always be given in public hospitals.

I am sure that all sections of the community will greatly appreciate the increase in exemptions from the provisions of the Land Tax Act. The exemption level for urban land will be raised from \$15,000 to \$20,000 and for rural land from \$45,000 to \$60,000. In increasing the exemption level, the Government is honouring a promise that it made several years ago to keep the exemption level ahead of the rate of inflation. Moreover, it is a further step in the gradual phasing out of land tax to the individual. This year there is a further reduction in the number of persons liable to pay land tax.

The increased revenue provided by the Budget to race clubs will be of assistance to them. The new formula to be applied for the 1975-76 year will assist the clubs to meet their ever-increasing costs and return the percentage of reimbursement. It is interesting also to note that the revenue expected in the short term to be available will increase from the present figure of \$4,200,000 in 1973-74 to \$4,900,000 in 1974-75.

In recent times comments have been made as to both the possibility and the advisability of amalgamation of race clubs. Amalgamation is not necessarily the answer to the problems that arise, nor in most instances is it desirable. The smaller race clubs that do not possess their own race tracks rent the facilities owned by larger clubs. In this way the smaller clubs are, in effect, supporting the larger ones, and at the same time are making use of the facilities at times when they would otherwise be unused. I consider it better to retain both the smaller and the larger clubs so that by supporting the smaller clubs we are in turn also supporting the larger ones.

If the T.A.B. reimbursements were available only to the principal clubs, there is no guarantee that there would be a commensurate increase in the prize money offered by them, and it is quite possible that some of the improvements envisaged by the increased reimbursements would not be made.

Many small race clubs were formed for particular reasons. For example, there are Hibernian race clubs as well as picnic and digger race clubs. Generally they conduct

annual race meetings. The clubs that hold meetings only once a year would not receive any benefit, but the number of people putting money into racing in the area would certainly be reduced. Each of the special clubs has its own supporters, who assist the racing industry and thus make the whole industry a lot more viable.

I shall now refer to a few matters in the Federal Budget. Most people were shocked that it did not try to combat inflation. Basically, the only approach lay in restricting private enterprise and increasing the number of Government personnel. Restricting private enterprise encouraged retrenchment thus causing the unemployment problem that confronts us.

The Leader of the Opposition said that Queensland should have done more to overcome inflation by budgeting for far greater expenditure. He suggested that the Government should impose higher taxes on Queenslanders. How could we justify doing that when a big sum of Queensland money lies in the Federal Treasury? We are only looking for a reasonable and proper reimbursement of the money that Queensland taxpayers provide in the first place. It is terribly short-sighted—and shows a complete lack of knowledge—to suggest that the Queensland Government should tax Queenslanders more heavily while their tax money lies in Canberra. The Leader of the Opposition asked an honourable member if he thought that devaluation was not necessary, but he did not acknowledge who caused the problem that made it necessary. I believe that devaluation was necessary but I ask why we revalued in the first place, thus making it necessary to devalue. Many exporting industries were wrecked by revaluation, and that is what made the devaluation necessary. The Federal Government admits that it made a mistake—admits that it was wrong—but that does not help the industries that have been wrecked.

Devaluing currency when overseas markets are lost is like closing the stable door after the horse has gone. Lost markets are not easy to recapture. Importing countries will decide when we get markets back. Beef is a prime example of pricing a commodity off the export market. We know that decisions made by other countries did not help, but they were made only because we priced ourselves off the overseas market. Our product was not acceptable and our buyers had to look elsewhere.

The price of export meat has dropped since devaluation. In the week in which devaluation was announced it dropped 3c and it has continued in that way ever since. This is mainly because America has a monopoly. We have priced ourselves out of the other markets and America buys at the price it wishes to offer. There is no competition. We have no-one else to barter with. If we want to export meat, we sell to America. We

cannot afford to hold meat stocks indefinitely; we have to move our production at whatever price we can get.

In the light of these problems the Federal Government cannot excuse its stop-go policies. On its tariff, currency and taxation policies, it announces its intention but within a week a caucus meeting reverses the decision. We see it all the time—the subsidy on superphosphates, taxation deductions on soil conservation, and so on. They are thrown back into the melting-pot and people are going broke while the Federal Government is arguing about them. Because of the Federal Government's meddling in our rural industries—particularly the beef industry because of the export marketing collapse—the producers have a very long row to hoe before they can get back on their feet. People are going broke and becoming unemployed while the Federal politicians gamble with an ideological academic fervour.

Many of the social services provided by the Federal Government are very desirable, acceptable and much appreciated by many in the community. But why kill the goose that lays the golden egg? I refer to those who provide the money that makes these benefits possible. The person who promotes activity within a community is the one who provides the money within the community. It is that money from which taxation is collected—and that tax, of course, enables the Government to pay for social services. Therefore, activity and production should be encouraged, thus putting value back into the dollar. It is because production and activity result in taxation income that social services can be met. At the present time sufficient revenue is being received because the Federal Government is taxing a synthetic situation. As production continues to drop, income will drop and nobody will benefit. Why kill business incentive? If it is killed, the Government's income will drop off and the whole plan for social welfare will come to an end, to everybody's disadvantage.

I turn now to the Federal Government's recently announced capital gains tax. I have previously said in this Chamber that capital gains tax could be justified if it were levied as an alternative to death duty. A true capital gain results in money being available from a business transaction out of which tax can be paid. Death duties, however, are totally different. Death duty is a straight-out tax on valuation regardless of earning capacity. Often the earning capacity of the capital is nil, but it is heavily taxed. Of course, with a tax on capital gains, if there is no capital gain no tax is payable, whereas, if there is a capital gain, there is money out of which tax may be paid. However, in the case of death duty, no money is accrued. It is a straight-out valuation.

The Federal Government did not consider the matter in that way. Not only was it not prepared to look at death duties and be a little honest, but it also came out

with a capital gains tax which went far beyond capital gain. As I see it, it is a tax on the inflated value of a person's capital as well as the profit made from that capital. It is quite obvious that, if one has a valuation taken on 17 September this year, in 10 years' time the property will be worth considerably more, but only because of inflation. The amount of capital gain to attract tax should be confined to any increase over and above the amount attributable to inflation. It is completely dishonest and unacceptable for a tax to be based on inflated capital gain.

The 10 per cent surcharge on unearned income is, of course, another figure of speech to get at somebody the Government did not like. However, such a tax applies right across the board and affects everybody.

I am yet to be told what unearned income is. If a person has a set of priorities, one of which is to put a little aside each week, I cannot see how any income derived from it can be termed unearned income. If anybody has money that has not been worked for at some stage, I would be terribly surprised. I do not know of any other way to acquire money than to work for it. We should have a climate in which thrift is encouraged not ridiculed. Anybody who tries to do the right thing by being thrifty and putting money aside for a rainy day or for the education of his children should be encouraged, not ridiculed.

We in Australia have the ball at our feet. The only two things needed to reap the advantage are to work hard, accepting our responsibilities and producing, and also to encourage initiative. That is the very thing we are not doing. If we do not, production figures will certainly fall.

I congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget and its provisions. I know that the State will benefit from it over the ensuing 12 months.

**Mr. B. WOOD** (Barron River) (3.42 p.m.): There is much in the Budget for which the Treasurer can thank the Australian Labor Party. His task in framing the Budget was made much easier on two grounds—increased mining royalties and Australian Government assistance.

On the first ground, I recall that in my campaign in 1969, when I entered Parliament, the major issue in the electorate was mining royalties. The people in my area were very firmly of the opinion that the Government was not receiving enough money by way of royalties. They let this be known publicly and they supported a candidate who held this view. I believe that this is a widespread view throughout the State and has been for a number of years. Eventually the Treasurer got the message and was then able to act and increase the royalties this year by something in excess of \$30,000,000. The only regret is that it was not done soon enough.

The second ground is Australian Government assistance. The Budget shows the substantial increase in Queensland funds received

from the Government in Canberra. The other day in Cairns the Acting Prime Minister (Dr. Cairns) quoted figures to indicate that in 1970-71 \$223,000,000 was paid to Queensland by the Australian Government whereas in 1974-75 the figure will be \$434,000,000. Those funds are without ties and are not committed to any particular purpose.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It's our money.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Let us get this quite clear: it is taxpayers' money. Some Government members constantly claim that it is Queensland money. It is taxpayers' money. It comes from them and it should go back to them.

For specific purposes—that is, tied grants—the figure in 1970-71 was \$93,000,000 whereas in 1974-75 it will be \$145,000,000. To give some specific examples, university expenditure has increased in that period from \$7,000,000 to \$41,000,000. Expenditure on colleges of advanced education has been increased from \$1,500,000 to \$24,500,000, and on Aboriginal affairs from \$216,000 to \$2,000,000. On health, it has been increased from nothing to \$2,900,000. Those figures demonstrate the substantial assistance that is being given to the Queensland Government by the Australian Government. They represent large increases on the assistance given in recent years.

In various parts of his Financial Statement the Treasurer mentioned his appreciation of the additional money being provided from Canberra, whilst at the same time he was critical of spending by the Australian Government. Both the Premier and Treasurer have said that the Australian Government should curtail its spending as one means of reducing inflation. The Treasurer, however, quite proudly boasted of the expenditure to be incurred as a result of his Budget. I recall that at one stage he referred to it as the first billion dollar Budget in Queensland's history. Government members cannot have it both ways; they cannot criticise the Australian Government for its expenditure and at the same time seek to spend every dollar that they can get their hands on. A little more logic than that is necessary.

I want to be critical of the Queensland Government for its lack of expenditure in the Far North. I do not believe that sufficient money is being spent in this very important area. I know that the Treasurer comes to Cairns from time to time, but that is mainly in connection with horse-racing. I invite him to my area at any time, when I shall try to give him a greater and wider-ranging interest in the North.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** I am coming up for your speech night.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That is fine.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** I spent seven years there.

**Mr. R. E. Moore** interjected.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** In reply to the interjection of the honourable member for Windsor, after the Treasurer's visit during the last election campaign the Liberal candidate received 3½ per cent of the vote.

**Mr. P. Wood:** He lost his deposit.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Yes.

I now want to make some reference to the additional assistance being given by the Australian Government for main roads purposes. In doing so, I wish to refer particularly to a dispute over the construction of certain roads in the electorate of Barron River. A short time ago in this Chamber I asked a question concerning the reconstruction of the Captain Cook Highway between Stratford and Smithfield. I draw the attention of members to speeches that I have made about this highway on a number of occasions going back almost six years. It is a very dangerous stretch of road. There have been quite a number of fatal accidents on it, especially round the bridges. It is also a road that is frequently cut during the wet season. People are then severely disadvantaged because many of those who use it travel to Cairns daily for their work. Its reconstruction should have the greatest priority, yet there is very little activity on it. Recently I asked the Minister for Mines and Main Roads when its reconstruction would begin. He tried to blame the Australian Government for the delay.

**Mr. P. Wood:** They blame it for the rains, too, don't they?

**Mr. B. WOOD:** They blame it for lots of things. The Minister tried to say that because of changes in policies—and certainly there have been changes—funds would not now be available, and that the road might not be programmed for reconstruction before 1976. In fact, the Minister's statements are quite inaccurate. Over the next three years the Australian Government is to give \$230,000,000 to Queensland for work on all classifications of highways. This amount compares with \$176,000,000 made available over the preceding three years.

It must be noted that certain categories of roads have been changed, and the section of road to which I referred now becomes a rural arterial road. There is no question that funds for such roads have been reduced. I do not argue about that. The Minister has made that statement, but what he has declined to comment on is the fact that the additional Commonwealth assistance—specifically the \$80,000,000 on the major highway—will save the Queensland Government funds, allowing it to release them for rural arterial roads and also, if it so desires, for urban arterial roads. The simple fact is that the additional Australian Government assistance will allow Queensland to expend more of its own money on roads.

What the Minister for Mines and Main Roads wants to do—or so it seems—is divert that saving to other purposes. Perhaps he

is allowing the money to slip away from the Main Roads Department allocation. In my opinion, he should maintain, if not increase, the Queensland money that is now expended on these roads. There is no doubt that that is what the Australian Government expects will happen. It expects that the saving will be diverted to other roads. The Minister is only playing politics in arguing as he does. He is distorting the facts; he is trying to pass the buck. He is again trying to blame the Australian Government, as the Government of Queensland does on so many occasions, but his arguments cannot be substantiated. The assistance from the Australian Government should ensure that much more money is spent on Queensland roads in the next three years, and the Captain Cook Highway is one road that must have first priority.

Other roads in my area require attention. Honourable members heard me talk of the Yorkey's Knob Road, and I am pleased that work has begun, though it is rather later than I had hoped.

**Mr. P. Wood:** It would not have begun if you had not pressed so hard for it.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That may be; but, regrettably, it is likely to be delayed and hindered by the forthcoming wet season.

The Rex Range Road in my electorate also needs much greater expenditure on it than it has received in the past. It runs up the range west of Mossman and, although it carries a large volume of traffic, is unpaved. It is a winding, mountainous road, as some honourable members may know, and it is urgently in need of upgrading. The two shire councils involved receive too little assistance from the Government.

I might refer also to the section of the road from Mt. Molloy to Mt. Carbine that remains unsealed. The Government has done some work in that area. It did a great deal of construction work on the section from Maryfarms to Mt. Carbine, but left it unsealed. The Minister claimed subsequently that it was never intended to seal it and said that it was not of a standard that permitted sealing. The road has now fallen apart, and, in view of its present state, it seems to most people that the expenditure on it was hardly justified.

One of the most difficult aspects of living now confronting people in my electorate is a lack of housing. I know this is a problem throughout Queensland and Australia, but the pressures for housing in Cairns and surrounding areas are as great as they are in other parts of the State. The area is expanding rapidly and building costs are very high. Therefore, many people find that they have not sufficient resources of their own to acquire housing, and the Government has failed to provide sufficient.

Regretfully, this Government, as in so many other things, is involved in an argument with the Australian Government on

the details of acquiring additional land. It seems that the Premier and his Government do not like some of the conditions relating to leasehold property. They seem to forget that thousands upon thousands of people in Queensland are living in houses built on leasehold land and that these householders are not at all anxious about this. They are quite happy to be living in these homes and will go on living in them. They own the lease and the house. If it does not worry them, I do not see why it should worry the Government.

**Mr. P. Wood:** It worries land speculators, though.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Yes. The plain fact, as I see it, is that the task of providing land and houses for the people of Queensland is beyond this Government. It simply cannot keep pace with the demand; it cannot tackle the critical situation we are in and one has only to examine the Budget papers to understand this. Nearly \$6,000,000 from last year remains unspent. Out of a total allocation of \$24,000,000 set aside for housing last year, \$6,000,000 was not used. What a shocking situation! When I tell people in my area of this, they are appalled. Probably more than those anywhere else, the people in this area are desperate for housing, yet they see unspent a large sum of money that could have been used for housing.

To give the Committee an example—some three months ago about nine homes constructed by the Queensland Housing Commission became available in Cairns. In the months before they were finally ready, my colleague the honourable member for Cairns and I were rushed by people who wanted them. There are literally hundreds on the waiting list and we were under great pressure from people desiring to obtain a home. But there were just not enough becoming available. More will be ready soon and the same pressure for these continues.

In Mareeba, no homes have been built in recent years.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** None at all?

**Mr. B. WOOD:** None at all. The Queensland Housing Commission called for tenders and tenders were received and rejected. In their wisdom, or lack of it, the commission decided that the tender prices were too high. I do not believe they were. I live in this area and, not so long ago, I built a house there. I know the additional cost involved in building a home in the North. It costs a great deal more. As I said earlier, this is one reason why the problem there is so much more critical. The Housing Commission refused to accept the tenders, so people in Mareeba are still without homes. Every week at least one person from Mareeba comes to me seeking accommodation, but there is nothing available through the Housing Commission.

The situation is no different in Mossman. Cairns, Mareeba and Mossman are the three major centres where the need for housing is great and where the building activity is far too low.

Still, I am pleased to note in this Budget a 26 per cent increase in funds allocated for housing. This includes Commonwealth funds under the Housing Agreement Act. I trust that the Minister is capable this year of spending all that money plus the money that remains unspent from last year. I can assure him that there is urgent need for him to do so.

On this subject I refer to aged persons' units still under construction in Cairns. They have been in that state for a couple of years. The Minister did not make sure that the contractor carried out the work properly.

**Mr. Newton:** He should turn it over to day labour.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Exactly; that would be the answer. I do not think they will be completed until Labor is elected to office.

**Mr. Newton:** When I become Minister for Housing the job will be done.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Thank you. Aged persons in Cairns, who are anxious to occupy these units, are forced to sit back while the units stagger towards their completion. Unfortunately, even when they are completed there will not be sufficient aged persons' units to meet the demand.

I make the point, however, that the need for housing, particularly units for aged persons, is not confined to the larger centres in my electorate. Places like Port Douglas and Kuranda, which relatively speaking have older populations, also suffer from a shortage of Housing Commission homes and aged persons' units. I do not think we should seek to shift a person from a place where he has lived for many years—perhaps all his life—to a larger centre in order to accommodate him.

Steps are being taken to improve Aboriginal housing in various parts of my electorate, particularly in Mareeba and Kuranda. Various co-operative societies have been and are being established to involve Aborigines in the business of building their own homes. Unfortunately, however, delays have occurred. I inquired on behalf of a group of Aborigines in Kuranda, members of the Ngoombi Housing Society, as to the reasons for the delay in the registration of their society. I have been advised that there is some doubt that the society will be registered in the manner proposed. As it is no different from any other society, this is difficult to understand. I am also told that a number of other Aboriginal housing societies are experiencing similar delays. I sincerely hope that the reasons are not political. I trust that the Queensland Government is not seeking to withhold this worth-while expenditure simply because it wishes to continue its fight against Canberra. There is an urgent need to improve

Aboriginal housing, and I hope that the Queensland Government will co-operate in every way.

**Mr. Newton:** There shouldn't be any fight at all; it's a straight-out agreement.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That is quite so.

While I am dealing with the portfolio of the Minister for Works and Housing, I must again stress the need to replace the courthouse and police station at Mossman. The building is a very old one that has outlived its usefulness. Its walls are white-ant eaten and it is far too small for the use to which it is put. For several years the Minister has deferred taking action to replace it. He had proposed extending the building, but I think he now realises that that would be impractical. I again call for the replacement of the building.

I note the allocation in the Budget of slightly in excess of \$1,000,000 to small-boat harbour facilities. In due course I expect to be advised that a good deal of this money will be spent in the coastal area north of Cairns. As is widely known, the area is immensely popular with tourists, many of whom either bring their own boats or hire craft up there. Unfortunately, however, launching facilities are simply not available. The majority of boating enthusiasts are, of course, local people, and through not being provided with launching ramps, they suffer a great deal of inconvenience and in fact damage to their boats. Boat owners contribute substantially to Queensland Government revenue and expect some facilities in return. In the near future I would like to see a boat ramp in the Barron River, one at Trinity Beach, and another one constructed at Palm Cove or Clifton Beach. I should also like one built in the area just north of Mossman.

While talking of things marine, I shall mention the Port Douglas Harbour. Some years ago its use declined when it ceased handling sugar. Sugar is now transported by road from Mossman to Cairns. The port suffered but there is now much more activity. Fishing and prawning are very important to Port Douglas. People engaged in these industries are very keen to have the harbour improved. I am pleased to note that the responsible Minister is in the Chamber. I am sure he knows what is happening there. I am aware that planning of harbour improvements is under way. Dredging is to take place and port facilities are to be improved. There is a plan to use the dredged material in building up the walls, but a flow of money is required to ensure that the work commences. I believe that the planning stage is almost complete. I hope that work starts before very long. Port Douglas is waiting for this development, and it should not be restricted by lack of revenue.

The Australian tobacco industry has contributed substantially to the economy of Queensland and Australia. For many years it was given great assistance by both the State and Australian Governments. For

example, a Labor Government in Queensland commenced the construction of the Tinaroo Dam. Subsequently a different Government introduced the stabilisation scheme. These two factors resulted in tobacco becoming a viable industry, free of the great fluctuations of the past. Governments have derived enormous income from tobacco. In fact they have taken a great deal more from the industry than they have given to it.

The industry is now under attack by both the Queensland and the Australian Governments. I am very sorry to note that the C.S.I.R.O. is to close the tobacco research institute at Mareeba. For many years this institute contributed a great deal of knowledge to the tobacco industry. It has been responsible in no small way for the progress made in tobacco-growing. I therefore regret very much the decision by the C.S.I.R.O. executive to close it. On one occasion I spoke to the responsible Minister (Mr. Morrison), and I was rather optimistic that the institute would not be closed. However, I was disappointed. I am continuing my efforts through the Department of Northern Development to have this station remain in operation.

A short time ago the Queensland Minister for Health (Mr. Tooth) also launched an attack against the tobacco industry in this Parliament. He pointed to the alleged dangers of smoking and referred to it as a health hazard. The Minister should pay some attention to recent research on this matter and to the extent of the contribution by the Queensland Government towards tobacco research. Much could be done to improve research in Queensland. Admittedly, the Queensland Government also contributes to the Queensland C.S.I.R.O. station. Having taken so much money from the tobacco industry, I believe that both Governments owe it something. On the subject of closures, I place on record that it was the Queensland Government that closed the Parada Research Station, which is near the one I have been talking about. The Queensland Minister for Primary Industries decided not long ago that its continuation was not justified.

I turn now to the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation scheme. I note that funds have been allocated in the Budget for other irrigation schemes, and I have no argument about that. However, costs per acre-foot for the Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme are generally very much lower than those indicated for the other schemes. Therefore, the Queensland Government would be quite justified in completing that scheme. When viewed economically, it is obvious that it should have greater priority than other works. The result for every dollar spent would be far better in the Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme than in any other. The State Government has asked the Australian Government for \$1,200,000 to carry out further works. I myself made approaches to the Australian Government, though I must say that it has

not been acting very quickly either. There is no reason why the Queensland Government must wait for Australian Government assistance.

The administration of the Health portfolio has, by general agreement, been in the hands of the most incompetent Minister. I am disturbed by his apparent lack of concern for hospitals in rural areas. For example, he closed the hospital at Mt. Molloy and he is about to close the one at Herberton. He expressed no interest in particular health problems within my electorate.

Members may be aware of health problems that have occurred round Kuranda. Infectious diseases have been spread through the community, notably among the Aborigines. Very little has been done with the long-term view of improving the health not only of Aborigines but also of all people in that town. The Aborigines are without transport, so it is no easy matter for them to travel to Cairns or Mareeba for treatment. On a number of occasions the local people have asked the Minister for Health to provide a clinic, but without success. I believe that it is badly needed. However, it seems that only a sympathetic and understanding Australian Department of Health will be able to help us.

I am pleased to note that plans for the Mareeba Hospital and new buildings there are getting closer to finalisation. The people working at the hospital have need of better facilities to aid their good work.

The scattering of environmental responsibilities makes it impossible to see what money has been spent and what is proposed to be spent on these important matters. Looking through the Budget papers, no-one can see where money is going. We do not know what money is allocated to conserve the environment and to prevent pollution. I suspect it would be far too little. The Government's activity is strictly limited so there is not a great deal spent on it.

It is important to me that the money should be spent. I believe that the Barron River electorate more than any other in Queensland is an area of great natural beauty. It shows now the need for Government interest and protection if we are to retain its natural features as it grows.

One matter of importance is the loss of good rural land—some of the best productive land in Queensland—to meet the demands of urban development. We have to provide land for housing but I do not think we can go on for ever using good rural land for this purpose. There are tremendous pressures around Cairns for land. We also find on the Atherton Tableland, especially around Atherton and the Tinaroo Dam, that in recent years land that was formerly used for farming is now being subdivided. This is an undesirable feature. While we must have land, we should have rational use of

it so that it is not needlessly lost or held in subdivisions for many years before houses are constructed.

I should like to see the State Government provide the regional council with funds to carry out a survey and determine the best uses for land in that area. This should be done in association with the Environmental Control Council Land Usage Committee. This would be an important and necessary task for the regional council. Under the State and Regional Planning Act project boards are able to be established and I envisage that they would be the likely bodies to carry out such a task.

In the past few weeks people in Cairns have been very concerned about the problem of hillside fires. Delegates to the Labor-in-Politics Convention last week noted that the hillsides surrounding Cairns were black. The same problem exists above the railway line to Kuranda and indeed in many areas along the coast.

There has been devastation of these hillsides over many years. They were once covered with heavy vegetation. Over the years a great amount of it has been lost. There have been very severe fires in recent weeks. I admit that the answer to this problem is very difficult to find. Controlled burning has limited success, especially in this area. As the natural vegetation is removed, the area is taken over by guinea grass, which grows prolifically. In the dry season it burns at a very high temperature and consequently causes great damage to any vegetation that may remain. If possible we should control the growth of guinea grass, but it is very difficult.

**Mr. Kaus:** What about the snakes?

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Obviously the honourable member does not know that snakes are protected now.

Ideally the growth of guinea grass should be restricted. Because it is used for pasture in many areas insect pests cannot be introduced to control it. I have been involved in proposals to replant certain areas of the hillsides, and, as a result of that involvement, I realise how difficult this is. It is a mammoth undertaking quite beyond the capacity of the local organisations that have endeavoured to do something about it.

The Government should take all possible steps in fire control. A recent fire was believed to have been started by railway workers burning off along a railway line. A floater crossed the road and set the hill ablaze. As I understand it, Government departments are not subject to the Rural Fires Board, and no prior permission to burn off is required. I believe that it is important that Government departments be subject to the same regulations as private citizens. This would be of minor assistance only.

**Mr. Bromley:** It should apply to all Government departments. They should all be bound by the Act.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That is right.

I should like to see the Government acquire more national parks and environmental parks in this area. There is no area in Queensland that has more need for them, nor is there any area more suitable for them. This is particularly the case in rain-forest country. There is too little rain forest preserved in this State, especially where the country is low or flat. I propose to make some detailed submissions on this matter in the debate on the Lands Department Estimates. The Australian Government will provide money for the purchase of land for national parks and environmental parks, and it is my hope that the Queensland Government will obtain some of it. I know that a submission has been made to the Australian Government. I hope also that the State Government will depart from its present policy of relying mainly on the conversion of forestry land for the acquisition of additional national parks. I think there has to be a willingness to spend some money from time to time to get what is needed. The Government should act in these important areas to help local authorities and interested people because the matter is sufficiently important to warrant assistance.

As I am talking about the natural assets of this area, I think it is relevant to mention briefly the role of the artistic colony in the North. I think the North naturally attracts artists. Perhaps some are not northern residents, but some have made their name in that area. Ray Croke and Arthur Evan Read are two names that are known throughout Australia. Others, such as Ron Edwards, Liz Brophy, Laurel Hall, David Preston and Strom Gould, are also well and favourably known. Incidentally, a couple of these artists have benefited from assistance given by the Australian Government.

The Budget contains a small but useful allocation for research in the sugar industry. Certainly in my electorate the sugar industry remains, and always will remain, the most important productive activity. I have spoken before about the need to intensify marketing efforts, and in this Chamber recently there has been some debate on this matter. This has in the main been sparked by the activities of Dr. Patterson on his overseas trips, and the excellent results that he obtained in securing additional markets. I commend his efforts.

I have said before that the marketing of sugar must not be left exclusively to the C.S.R. Company. I have been told—I think by the Minister for Primary Industries—that it is a very good company and it looks after Queensland's markets. But the future of the industry is so critical that we must know what is being done relative to marketing, and I am afraid that the boardroom

of the C.S.R. Company is not the forum where we can debate it; the floor of this Chamber is the forum.

Queensland probably can produce as much sugar as is needed. There are only minor problems, no major ones, in producing the crop. The major problem for the sugar industry, as for all rural industries, is selling the crop. The Australian Government has done an enormous amount of good work in opening new markets, and the industry is now looking to the future. Sugar is the strength of the North, and with the interest of the Australian Government and Dr. Rex Patterson, I am sure it will continue to be.

I noted the remarks of the Queensland Teachers' Union in the Press recently, when it listed a few schools requiring immediate and urgent attention.

**Mr. Dean:** Sandgate is one.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That may be; Yorkey's Knob school is another. Incidentally, it is in a very fine location, adjacent to a golf course and in a good centre. However, that does not mean that the school itself is adequate. The area is growing so rapidly that the Government has not been able to match the growth with school expenditure.

**Mr. P. Wood:** I would give it very high priority under a Labor Government.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** I will make a note of that. As I said, the area is growing rapidly and the school building is not adequate for the children. A demountable classroom is on the site. It has been approved that the school be located elsewhere on a larger site where extensive development can take place. In only a few years the school at Yorkey's Knob has grown from a small one-teacher school to a large school, and it will not be many years before it is a very large school. I sincerely hope that the construction of the new school on the new site is not delayed as long as the Minister for Mines and Main Roads delayed construction work on the road to Yorkey's Knob. This is a matter that must be taken up very quickly.

I hope the school at Yorkey's Knob does not receive treatment similar to that given to the school at Mt. Molloy. About seven or eight years ago, an announcement was made in the Budget speech that the Mt. Molloy school was to be rebuilt. It has not been rebuilt. I am informed that a fire somewhere in Brisbane meant the replacement of a school here and that funds for the Mt. Molloy school were used for that purpose. In the intervening period the school at Mt. Molloy has deteriorated further. It has a very fine teaching staff, but the replacement of the building is still awaited.

The school at Rocky Point occupies perhaps the finest site in Queensland. It overlooks the ocean on a rocky point, as the name would indicate. The children cannot appreciate the view—or perhaps they can—because the school is so small that

they carry out some of their classroom work on the veranda. It is an old school, and the two rooms are altogether too small.

The schools I have mentioned urgently need attention, and I hope it will not be long before the appropriate announcements are made.

I must mention also the need for a high school top at Kuranda. The children travelling from Kuranda to Cairns for high school education have to spend upwards of four hours a day in travel. That would not be quite so bad if the Railway Department would provide a satisfactory rail motor, but to this date it has refused to do so. The motor is subject to breakdowns, and there have been occasions on which school children have not arrived home till well after dark. The answer primarily is to provide a high school top and I should think it would not be long before this is done; but, in the meantime, a new rail motor must be provided.

While talking on matters of education I want to stress particularly the need for a college of advanced education in the northern area. I would not particularly specify Cairns, but in the area adjacent to that city. The population of this area certainly warrants a college of advanced education. Very many people living in this part of the State do not realise that the population of the Cairns region is in excess of that of Townsville. Admittedly, Townsville is a larger city but the area around Cairns carries a greater number of people. The population is there and the need as well.

I believe that, time and time again, it has been proved that we simply do not know enough about living in the tropics, and any college of advanced education in the Far North should emphasise matters tropical. It could be a centre for both research and education. I am pleased to note a decision of the Labor-in-Politics Convention held in Cairns recently that the Labor Party would support a college of advanced education in Cairns as well as in other provincial centres.

The Treasurer is understandably nervous about elections. He has been trying very hard to have an election this year.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** You reckon I am nervous?

**Mr. B. WOOD:** I reckon so, and I can understand why he should be nervous. The Treasurer knows that the Premier is losing ground in this State; he knows that the Premier is going to run this Government into defeat. We have seen a great conflict between the Premier in particular and the Australian Government. We realise that the Premier's stated interest in Queensland is really only an interest in maintaining his own position. His opposition has gone to ridiculous lengths and, as a result, Queensland has suffered. Also as a result, the Premier will suffer and this Government will lose the next election. So I can well understand the fears of the

Treasurer. He thinks that the earlier an election is held the more chance the Government has of retaining office. As the Leader of the Opposition said, I do not think that time matters; the Government will lose no matter when the election is held.

The Treasurer has a habit of giving a name to his Budgets. I know he has been trying to get out of this Parliament, but he will be here for a few years yet though not in the position he occupies at present. I will give a name to his Budget.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** A half hour ago you had me gone.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** Well, he has been trying to get out but nobody will give him an offer. This Budget will come to be known as the Treasurer's last Budget, and with good reason.

**Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (4.34 p.m.):** I have been in this Parliament now for about eight years and in that time I have heard some meandering, anaemic, piffling concoctions of nothingness that purport to be significant contributions to debate, but I have never yet heard anything as utterly banal and empty as the contribution by the honourable member for Barron River. One would never know from anything that he said that we were now debating a State Budget produced in quite unique circumstances under the greatest economic threat that this country has faced in perhaps the last 40 years—certainly since the last depression. Not one word about it came from him. He seems to operate on the ostrich basis—put your head in the sand; ignore anything that is happening around you and it will all go away. All I can say is that, if the honourable member for Barron River was making one of those clarion trumpet calls preparing himself for the election that his leader spoke about only a couple of hours beforehand, I hope that he never has to sound the last trump; he would make it sound like a thin squeak on a penny whistle.

Ever since I entered Parliament I have used the Budget debate to some degree to examine Federal intrusion into State areas. Both before and since this Whitlam Government—now the Cairns Government—came into office, I have been constrained to make comment on the fact that because of Federal intrusion into our constitutional areas of responsibility our financial independence and our fiscal rights have been gradually whittled away. More and more we are being put in the position not of partners in a Federal system but of vassals in a unitary system. Once upon a time I used to be described as an eccentric for wanting to concentrate on this, but now, of course, everyone admits that this proposition is the fact. Our Budget is, unhappily, dominated by the Federal Budget, and it can be claimed very truly now that Canberra has the affluence and we in the States must do our best with the effluent.

In these circumstances the Treasurer's Budget is a remarkable one; in fact it is unique. In view of the circumstances in which it was framed, we have done something in this Budget that other States would give their eye-teeth to be able to do. The Treasurer has been able to achieve a financial equilibrium that was expected by no-one and will certainly be envied by all other States. This has been achieved of course at a cost, and I am sure the Treasurer will be the first to admit it. Drastic situations—not of our making; they have been forced on us—call for rather drastic remedies.

I want to lay a few facts on the line. As the Federal Government is now virtually in sole control of the whole fiscal and monetary spectrum, we would expect that its Budget would at least be some sort of economic statement or chart showing the state of the national economic health and also to some degree a blueprint showing us how we could maintain and improve that economic health in the year ahead. But would anybody suggest that the recent Federal Budget is any pretence at all of an economic document? Not at all, because it is nothing of the sort! It is in fact an ideological statement—literally a Left-wing political pamphlet.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What's the matter with that?

**Mr. PORTER:** The honourable member is a great asset to his side as well as to ours. He asks, "What's wrong with the Federal Budget's being an ideological statement?" It is the type of document extolled by the honourable member, and good for him. At least he knows where he stands—that is, on the brink of the precipice, trying to push the rest of us over the side.

The Federal Budget pays literally no heed at all to the enormous erosion of confidence that is occurring in our community today nor to the mounting tide of inflation and the rising level of unemployment. It totally ignores the growing fear, despair and panic in our community.

The Federal Budget is chapter 2 of democratic socialism. Last year when commenting on the Federal Budget I said that we were then getting chapter 1 of democratic socialism from Federal Big Brother, and it had to be viewed in the context of the 37 points made in the Coombs report.

Now, of course, we have much of what that Federal Budget predicted for us. We have massive spending, which is oriented to a socialistic welfare programme, and we have had official pro-union stances, where encouragement has been given to any extravagant wage claims that unions wanted to make. Indeed, Federal Ministers, such as Mr. Cameron and Mr. Crean, encouraged the Commonwealth Public Service to be the pacesetter in union wage demands.

We had a mushroom growth of a new bureaucracy, and the Budget set in motion all those anti-initiative, anti-business and anti-individual-success trends. Clearly last year's Budget was gleefully hailed by the lunatic Left (if my honourable friend opposite wants to include himself in that category I shall accept that) as a big step forward towards democratic socialism. Inevitably we have had this year's Cairns Budget. If last year's Budget was a great step forward, this year's Budget is a suicidal leap for all of us over an economic precipice. All economic common sense, all moderation, and all concern for decent people have been abandoned. Instead, we have got from the Federal Government a miserable, vindictive, glowering Budget which shows an unrelenting hostility towards thrift, energy and enterprise, which fans the flames of resentment, envy and jealousy, and which extols dependency and parasitism as virtues. Under the guise of social justice what we are now getting from Canberra is a monument to bludging.

Already the insensate stupidity of these Marxist plotters and their quite malignant, almost pathological hatred of free institutions has plunged Australia into a chaos that we have not known since the depression of the 30's. All this has happened in less than two years. Who could have dreamt in his worst nightmare 24 months ago that we would move from what we then had to the mess that we have now? Two years ago we were coming to the end of 23 years of unprecedented progress with stability. I defy anybody to prove otherwise. All the indices of home-ownership, high standard of living, growth in the gross national product, full employment and stable prices showed that we rated among the best-off nations in the world. Inflation had been held to minimal proportions. For the 10 years up to 1972 the annual rate of rise in inflationary terms was 2.2 per cent. In the last quarter of 1972 it was 4.6 per cent.

I remind honourable members opposite who talk about importing inflation at the present time and ask how we can escape it because other nations have got it, that, during the 10 years I am talking of, many of our trading partners suffered inflation running between 8 and 14 per cent. Let nobody believe that our trouble at the moment is totally one of imported inflation. Another achievement during the 23 years before the Labor crowd got in related to our migrant intake, which, in comparable population terms, was equivalent to the great migrant floods into America in the 70's, 80's and 90's of the last century. Yet, despite that, we absorbed them all and maintained stability, progress and growth. From that, what have we been flung into?

A person does not have to write it for himself; he has only to pick up the various newspapers to find out.

One headline reads—

"Drop in the building industry grows. Building approvals fell by a record 72 per cent in August, according to figures released last night."

Another article states, in part—

"Australian share markets yesterday crashed to the lowest levels for 14 years as thousands of millions of dollars were slashed off market value."

Yet another article states that unemployment is likely to rise between 4 and 6 per cent in less than eight months. Yet again we see that the balance of payments is now running out at the rate of over \$2,000 million a year.

Another headline reads—

"Output by factories in decline. Survey shows a slump."

This was a 14-year annual survey undertaken by the Bank of New South Wales and the Chamber of Manufactures. Everything one sees indicates it. Mr. Cameron now admits that unemployment will reach 150,000 at the end of the year. As at this moment unemployment at seasonally adjusted figures is 132,000. The fact is, of course, that that does not include school-leavers, so a comparison between the figures at the moment and the figures 12 months ago is loaded very much in the Federal Government's favour.

In plain facts, unemployment at the moment is over 150,000, which means it is running at just on 3 per cent of the workforce. It is a safe bet that by the middle of next year it will exceed 250,000 and approach 300,000. Over 1,000 workers are losing their jobs every day, as disclosed by headlines of papers not usually—how shall I say it?—friendly to our side of politics.

On the subject of unemployment—when making his contribution to this debate a little while ago, the Leader of the Opposition made the statement that he would fight an election on the unemployment situation. He suggested that Queensland's record in coping with unemployment—I think I have recorded him correctly—was four times worse than the record of South Australia. I do not know who are preparing his scripts, but somebody should get hold of them and really put them on the carpet. The figures are available in the monthly review of the employment situation, published by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and Immigration.

What are the facts of the official figures from August 1973 to September 1974? They show that in New South Wales the unemployed have risen from 9,622 to 46,427, an almost fourfold increase; Victoria, 5,013 to 33,258, increased four-and-a-half times; South Australia, from 1,251 to 11,187, an eightfold increase; West Australia, 1,405 to 12,421, almost an eightfold increase; and Tasmania, 365 to 4,362, almost an elevenfold increase. In Australia as a whole from

August 1973 to September 1974 the unemployed have risen from 21,402 to 129,363, which is a fivefold increase. The Queensland situation—I will state the facts so that honourable members know them—shows an increase from 3,746 to 24,348, which is an increase of almost five-and-a-half times. It is not as much as South Australia and certainly not as much as Tasmania. It is only the Australian average. Therefore, if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to fight an election on unemployment, I suggest that he has chosen a very dicey battleground. Mr. Tucker's script writers—because, to be fair to Mr. Tucker, I do not think he said a word that was his own except when he dealt in his usual gutter abuse—should undoubtedly look up their figures once again.

The situation we now face—the dreadful unemployment and the scourge of inflation that takes so much away from every sector of our community—confronts us because Labor's Left Wing (the fanatical men who seem to learn nothing and forget nothing) are determined to restructure the Australian society on the Moscow and Peking models. Why in God's name must these benighted men in the Labor Party try to force us into these alien moulds? If they so admire these places, why don't they go and settle there and leave us alone?

**A Government Member:** They'd shoot them.

**Mr. PORTER:** They probably would. Why do they try to make us fit into a pattern which does not work over there—a pattern which people risk their lives trying to escape from? Of course, the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber supports those men. He is with them all the way in what they are trying to do. Before the Budget recess, he moved a quite tasteless and gimmicky motion extolling what Canberra was doing to us. His motion got the short shrift that it richly deserved; but the whole tenor of his remarks then, as with the tenor of his remarks in this debate, was that the Federal Government is good to Queensland and good for Queensland and that we should be grateful to it. Grateful for what? Grateful for the kicks in the groin it gives us? For the knives it stabs in our backs? For the chains with which it wishes to bind us, as it is trying to bind all other States and tie them to Canberra chariot wheels? Is this what we are supposed to be grateful for?

The Leader of the Opposition in his motion set out a long list of munificent gifts that he said the A.L.P. socialists in Canberra had given us and he said that we should genuflect and lick their boots.

**Mr. Chinchin** interjected.

**Mr. PORTER:** As the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt said, it is our own money. But according to the Leader of the Opposition we should be grateful for it, as though it

were so many crumbs from the rich man's table; we should get down on the floor and lick them up and be grateful.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why don't you co-operate for once?

**Mr. PORTER:** I shall deal with co-operation in a moment and the honourable member may regret that he used the word.

Let us ask ourselves what were these gifts that the Leader of the Opposition spoke about. Just what was in them? Of course the Leader of the Opposition took care not to unwrap the glossy paper from the packages to reveal what was inside because the simple fact is that many of these things were just broad announcements with no detail yet known or discussed as with the new hospital proposed for Brisbane that the Minister for Health commented on this morning. Many of them are enormous exaggerations, such as the suggestion that the Federal Government has done tremendous things for education in Queensland, and yet the Treasurer's Financial Statement shows plainly that Federal money represents only 7.1 per cent of the total amount we are spending on education.

Some of the Federal propositions call for matching grants. Some are only loans. Where there are grants, literally always they carry conditions that would remove this State from its area of constitutional responsibility and put Canberra in the driver's seat. Is this what honourable members opposite urge us to accept? Does the honourable member for South Brisbane accept that that is what is involved in this sort of deal? Does he consider that that is co-operation? Does he seriously maintain that our getting out from under and letting Canberra take over would be in the best interests of Queensland or of Australia? Time and time again, as honourable members on this side of the Chamber have pointed out the "Feds" are only giving us our own money. When they give it back, they attach totally unreasonable and unconstitutional conditions to it. But members of the Opposition want us to believe that their Federal colleagues are giving us back far more than they take from us in tax and that for that we should be eternally grateful.

Let us look at this proposition. The taxation situation is, of course, that the Federal Government in 1972-73—the latest figures I have available—took from Queensland \$952,700,000 in all forms of taxation. We got \$821,400,000 back from it, in all forms of grants, repayments general revenue disbursements and the rest. In other words, it kept \$131,300,000. But included in what it gave us was \$171,000,00 of specific-purposes grants which this State, left to make its own decisions, in all probability might not have wished to spend. So to be reasonably financially fair about it, one could say that the Federal Government takes out

of Queensland \$302,000,000 more than we get back from it to spend on the things we wish to spend money on.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** They're running away now. They don't want to hear you.

**Mr. PORTER:** It is always interesting when one deals with a few facts to see honourable gentlemen opposite dash under any log that is available.

To view the situation in perspective—what Queensland gets and what it gives—one has also to consider exports and imports. The fact of the matter is that Queensland and Western Australia between them, with only 25 per cent of Australia's population, provide well over 40 per cent or almost half of the nation's total export earnings, and they require less than 14 per cent of the income bill to sustain them. The plain fact is that the two big productive States in primary terms, namely, Queensland and Western Australia, are enabling States such as Victoria and New South Wales to enjoy the standard of living to which they have been accustomed. Were Queensland and Western Australia to secede from the Commonwealth of Australia, disaster would hit not Queensland and Western Australia but the two large States within a matter of three to six months. We are the ones who sustain those States by what we produce and what we earn on world markets, and that is certainly seen when what we produce and earn is compared with what we require from income payments.

The position of Queensland is one of which we should be enormously proud. We are nothing to the Federal Government, but it owes a tremendous amount to us. That should never be forgotten. Queensland is in the strongest possible position when it comes to holding up its head on the part it plays in the Commonwealth scene. If ever Australia is threatened by Left-wing Marxists with the imposition of a republic, I for one would infinitely prefer secession to becoming part of a socialist republic. Honourable members opposite can quote me as much as they like on that.

In speaking of the budgetary situation, I think that we should also consider for a moment that dirty three-syllable word "recession". There is a great refusal among people with socialist inclinations to admit that there could ever be another recession, and they say that that certainly is not what is taking place now. Yet the Federal Budget tactfully admits the problem, because in his statements and figures Mr. Crean shows that he expects wages to continue rising in the coming year at the rate of 22.4 per cent. This is consonant with inflation running at an anticipated 20 per cent. Mr. Crean also said in his Budget presentation that he expected employment to increase by only 2 per cent throughout the total work-force. He expected that the real output from each worker would not increase at all. The maximum hope—indeed, the only hope—on

Mr. Crean's own figures is for real output to grow by only 2 per cent. On the best interpretation that anybody can give, and certainly on current trends, there will be no rise at all in real income per capita.

What does this sort of monetary moonlight-madness mean? It means, of course, that the people are now so alarmed and so apprehensive that confidence in the whole Australian economy and monetary system is at its lowest ebb in almost 40 years. Witness the run on the funds of housing societies last week. Great attempts have been made to suggest that the Treasurer played a role in this run. That is similar to suggesting that a person who says, "You had better take your raincoat because it is raining", is also responsible for the storm. The fact is, of course, that the tremendous erosion of confidence which made it possible for the temporary run on housing societies to take place indicates the damage that has been done to the Australian system, and the confidence of the people, by the present Federal Government.

Small businesses are moving into bankruptcy and larger businesses are looking to voluntary liquidation because of their liquidity problems deliberately created by the A.L.P. egg-heads—or, should I say, bone-heads—in Canberra. People are losing their jobs at the rate of over 1,000 a day, and school and university-leavers will not be able to find the jobs for which they have been prepared. What is this if it is not a recession? Are we to believe that this is prosperity on the 1974 Cairns-Whitlam style? Are we to believe that this is more of the "you've never had it so good" syndrome, second instalment? Or perhaps it is just so much hoo-ha, I say again, with a lot more accent on the "hoo" than on the "ha". Not many people will be able to do much laughing over this situation.

We are now hearing from many of Labor's tame experts, who find everything all right. Not the 130 who subscribed their names to the advertisements before the May election! No; all those fellows are staying in their bolt-holes. They are very reluctant to come out now and admit what fools they made of themselves in their predictions. But we have another lot, just as brittle, just as superficial, just as ready to try to explain away Labor's disastrous doctrinaire situation, and just as wrong and just as specious in attempting, by using big words, to cover up what is happening.

We have been told that we have not got a recession; that we are only going through an adjustment. The Government is not soaking the sturdy middle class in order to finance extravagant aid to the thriftless and the shiftless! No, it is only doing social restructuring. In other words, we have a Government which is so beset by outmoded doctrinaire theory that it is making the greatest hash of the economy that anybody could possibly

conceive, and it is doing it against a background of stupidity, cupidity, nepotism and unparalleled extravagance that is positively Byzantine in scale.

I wonder, for instance, what Mr. and Mrs. Whitlam are earning between them. The average wage? I wonder how anybody justifies the \$150,000,000 that is going to liberation movements, which in fact means, of course, terrorist movements. I wonder how anybody justifies the 42 per cent increase to \$227,000,000 allocated for spending to that casting-couch coterie in the area called culture. I wonder how anybody justifies the millions already spent and planned to be spent on ugly art. How does one justify Senator Willesee abroad with a 23-man entourage, or Mr. Whitlam abroad with 21?

You know, Mr. Lickiss, I can remember, in my day, when Mr. Menzies used to go abroad with his faithful secretary, Miss Hazel Craig, and one Press officer, and I do not think he was less effective on the international stage than Mr. Whitlam or Senator Willesee.

I think most people would regard it as extremely unfortunate that Dr. Cairns should find it necessary to take his son and daughter-in-law away with him on trips at Government expense.

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. PORTER:** She has gone with him to his ideological homeland, Red China, probably to see how well he is received in Peking.

I have said, Mr. Lickiss, that we are now a long way down the slide. We are far into the morass that Labor has carefully prepared for us. We are in worse than the mud; we are in a bog that literally has no bottom to it. Unemployment is accelerating, with many experts suggesting that by the middle of next year it will reach half a million before it peaks. We have a spate of business failures. We have interest rates that are designed to kill private home-building—and the honourable member for Belmont should know that—and to steer all future home-buyers into welfare housing, to be renters from Big Brother landlord. That is in fact what Mr. Johnson, the Federal Minister for Housing, said recently—that the emphasis is going to be on welfare housing, not on allowing the private sector to build.

This takes me back 30 years to the days of the Chifley Government, when Mr. Dedman was the Minister for Housing and Post-War Reconstruction. Speaking of home-ownership, Mr. Dedman said, "We are not going to allow people to become home-owners. We are not going to turn Australia into a nation of little capitalists." Nothing has changed except the names. We have Mr. Johnson on behalf of the Federal Government saying that he does not want anybody to be a home-owner. Pull the carpet from under them; they might be little capitalists; they might not be dependent on the Government; they might not be as obedient as we

would like them to be? I say that Labor has carefully prepared this holocaust into which it has thrust us. In fact, none of us should be surprised at its steady, dreadful progress.

You will know, Mr. Lickiss, that a person named Adolf Hitler wrote a book called "Mein Kampf" and in it he outlined step by step what he would do to achieve a dictatorship if and when he got to power. He got to power, and lo and behold, what happened? He, in fact, implemented step by step, as he had written in his book, all the apparatus for a dictatorship.

We have the A.L.P. platform, which sets out step by step what must be done in order to achieve complete centralism and power in Canberra. If that is not enough—and the A.L.P. Government is doing it step by step—we have Dr. Cairns's book "The Quiet Revolution", which should be required reading for everybody. Dr. Cairns, that dedicated, fanatical Marxist, sets out in "The Quiet Revolution" step by step what is necessary to change Australian society, without one atom of constitutional alteration, into a totally planned centralised society. And he is doing it and getting away with every section of it.

That is why we must see just how dire the situation is and how perilous is the threat with which we are now faced, particularly when, within 24 hours of each of the great pronouncements of Dr. Cairns, he is always followed by his faithful Little Sir Echo, Mr. Hawke. We had them saying "The system is wrong. You will always have trouble while you have the system. Get rid of the system and put mine in its place."

That was bad enough, but now we have Dr. Cairns saying that there is a danger of insurrection, that there may be armed revolt and that action may have to be taken to counter this. Within 24 hours Mr. Hawke, having returned from Western Australia where a piece of State legislation gave him an opportunity to sound off, says that there are moves afoot to put in a dictatorship and that we have to be ready to counter them. This is what Mr. Hawke had to say in "The Courier-Mail" of 1 October—

"What worries me terribly . . ." looking very worried, one eyebrow up and the other down—

". . . is that because of the rapidity, the acceleration of change that's going on, there's a terrible possibility that we are likely to move to a position where we'll have a dictatorship of the extreme Left or the extreme Right."

What is all this setting the stage for? Like all the other things we have had, it is setting the stage for the things that they themselves will do. He is preparing us for a situation where there could be revolution and bloodshed. It is a build-up to the take-over and I do not think anybody could suggest otherwise. That is why we in this State cannot co-operate with these people.

The honourable member for South Brisbane talked about co-operation, but members of the A.L.P. Government have never sought co-operation. What they seek is subjection to the objective at which every move they make is aimed. Every action is part of their total strategy towards putting all the elements of power in Canberra, under their control, and we cannot consider any one move or any one proposal in isolation.

**Mr. Chinchon:** If you don't do that you are not co-operating.

**Mr. PORTER:** That is the whole suggestion. Their idea is, "Well, here is a good thing; let us look at this good thing. You can surely take this one, can't you?" The fact is that every item is a link in a causative chain. Accept one of them and the prospect of standing out against the rest would be infinitely reduced.

The old saying that who sups with the devil needs use a long spoon was never truer than in the matter of dealing with these new Canberra tyrants. These are the men who want to turn us from a free to a controlled society, who ignore the ballot-box and subvert the Constitution to achieve their ends. And in all this they are aided by their Quislings in this and other State Parliaments. The men on the Opposition benches, who pretend to stand for free people and for Queensland in the Federal system, are doing all they can to ensure that our capacity to resist is reduced in the hope that it will virtually be eliminated.

It should be remembered by everybody that all this change envisages the debasing of the accepted living standards of the overwhelming majority of people in this country, because the great majority of people in Australia are ordinary middle-class people. In the area that Mr. Crean himself specifies as being the average wage, on which he predicated all his computations—that is, between \$6,000 and \$8,000—reside 92 per cent of the Australian taxpayers. We are, therefore, a middle-class people, and everything that this Federal Government does is aimed at debasing the standards of the Australian middle-class. Unfortunately, any attempt to debase the economic standards of a country is accompanied by another form of debasement. This is evident in countries where doctrinaire welfare socialists have tried to implement their plans.

This other form of debasement has the ripe smell of putrefaction and decay about it. And so it should, because it is moral decay. We saw it all very clearly at last week's Labor-in-Politics Convention, where it was resolved that a future A.L.P. Government in Queensland would legislate so as to accept homosexuality, to open the doors to abortion, to legalise prostitution and to make available for anybody to see on screen, stage and TV as well as in the bookstalls all types of pornography. If I have the facts wrong, members of the Opposition can correct me.

These policies of the A.L.P. give rise to interesting speculation, don't they? When members of the Opposition take over the reins of Government they will legalise prostitution. I wonder which honourable member opposite will be Minister for brothels. How will the system be worked? On what basis will it operate? Will a Government testing officer be appointed?

It is very important that everyone realises that what we are seeing is a total pattern of economic degredation, to be accompanied necessarily by a pattern of moral degredation: complete annihilation of the standards that most of us have accepted for the greater part of our lives.

Finally I touch briefly on taxation in terms of this middle-class Australia to which I have referred. I have already said that the Queensland State Budget is unique in that it does not impose new taxes and does not raise costs of essential State services. The Federal Budget, on the other hand, fashioned by these so-called friends of the workers, imposes the most iniquitous, discriminating and immoral taxation that this country has ever known. The Federal Budget is a total weapon aimed at destroying the independence of the Australian middle-class, which, as I have said, comprises 90 per cent of the nation's population. The Federal Budget pretends to give tax cuts to the workers, hopefully in return for wage restraint—which the great union bodies indicated very smartly would not be forthcoming.

What are the tax cuts? What workers will benefit? As Mr. Crean's Budget figures have pointed out, the income tax yield to the Federal Government has doubled since this crowd took office two years ago. Mr. Crean admits in his Budget figures that the officially estimated tax increase, and the official acceptance of an inflation rate of 20 per cent, will more than offset expected wage increases, which he puts at 18.5 per cent. In fact, the Federal Budget is nothing but a poor, shabby, shoddy sort of conjuring trick. The worker gets nothing out of it except more disaster, more despair and more harsh tip-offs.

In 1939, the worker in the average-wage class paid 6 per cent of his net income in income tax. Today, under the Federal Budget, the worker on the average income accepted by Mr. Crean, pays 14.3 per cent of his net income in tax. The worker now pays in tax far more than double the proportion of his net income that he paid in 1939—before we got into this fantastic morass in which we are floundering at present.

As for the dreadful tax on so-called unearned income, which, of course, is not unearned income at all, as it would not be there unless it had been earned by somebody, this is one tax that will hit all retired people and widows. I think there are about

2,500,000 savings bank accounts in Queensland and 1,500,000 housing society accounts. Even throwing in the proposed ceiling placed on this, which I think is an income of \$5,000, I should say that the overwhelming majority of people with savings accounts will have to pay this surtax on so-called unearned income. This is a dreadful tax. It staggers my imagination how a Government which pretends to be concerned about the welfare of ordinary people and to be the champion of the working-class and the middle class can possibly do this.

I shall conclude speaking about Budgets in the plural—I have spoken about the State Government Budget, and largely about the Federal Government Budget—by adverting to the clamour of the Leader of the Opposition for an early election. It was very interesting to hear. All he was doing was making a virtue out of necessity, because he has to face a poll in the next few months. We therefore had him huffing and puffing and flashing his shark-like grin in a desperate pretence of confidence. If he thinks he will win a number of seats, whether the election is held now or some two or three months hence, I suggest he has another think coming. I accept that nothing is certain in politics but I do suggest that some things are a little more probable than others. If we judge by the only indicators that count, that is, votes in ballot-boxes in recent months, they reveal that the propositions of the Leader of the Opposition are totally and absolutely without foundation.

**Mr. Newton:** Why don't you take up the challenge?

**Mr. PORTER:** The honourable member for Belmont suggests that we should take up the challenge. I suggest that he should restrain himself. The Federal referendum polls of last December and May this year were overwhelmingly defeated in Queensland where the vote was amongst the highest against the Federal Government in any State in Australia. In May, the House of Representatives vote showed that we improved visibly over the A.L.P.—by 12 per cent over the 1972 performance—and left the A.L.P. literally without one safe seat in Queensland. Not even Oxley was safe, because there was a landslide swing from Labor. We had a Senate vote in Queensland which enabled this State to provide six out of 10 Senators for the Opposition. I might mention in passing that, by so doing, the electors of Queensland put paid to the Canberra socialists' dream of easy control.

I make it very clear that I would welcome an early election. The honourable member should not imagine that he is issuing any challenge to me. The times are so frightening, the future so fraught with menace, that I believe it is highly desirable that a State Government be able to face up to the inescapable tasks that will confront it fortified with a freshly renewed mandate rather than

be running out of time, as it were, at the tail end of a mandate. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that he is throwing down gauntlets, like the TV knight on a charger trying to whistle up some white tornado somewhere, then I for one certainly hope that his bluff is called—and, for me, the sooner the better.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Quote to them the results of the Sydney local authority election.

**Mr. PORTER:** Every indicator we receive shows that the A.L.P. socialists are so far down the drain that they will never be able to crawl up again in our lifetime. They will be fragmented and dispersed, and I would say that their capacity for forming a useful Government in the next 20 or 30 years will be very much reduced indeed.

**Mr. BLAKE (Isis) (5.21 p.m.):** I gather from listening to the honourable member for Toowong and the few references he made to the Budget that he decided that it was an excellent document; it was not inflationary; it was adequate. As a matter of fact, one might well conclude that he thought it was somewhat better than adequate. It was stimulating without being inflationary. If that could be achieved by any Government or any Budget, of course, it would be excellent.

Condensed to one sentence, it could be said that the Budget provides for receipts of \$1,077,873,043 and expenditure of \$1,081,043,147, thus budgeting for a deficit of \$3,170,104. The Treasurer stated with obvious pride, like the member for Toowong, that for the first time in the State's history the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget will exceed \$1,000,000,000—an increase of some \$273,000,000, or about 33.8 per cent. That is greater than the 32.4 per cent increase in the Australian Government's Budget.

As a factual document, the Queensland Budget is very illuminating. It unintentionally but factually illustrates the hypocrisy of this Government's harping and carping day after day that the Australian Government's spending is one of the main causes of inflation in this country. Inflation is running riot all over the world in developed and undeveloped countries. India could hardly be described as a developed country, but it has a great rate of inflation.

The continual repetition by the Premier and the Treasurer that Australia's inflation is caused by Whitlam's policies must surely die hard following the presentation of the State Government's Budget. The continual calls for reduction in Australian Government spending must now surely cease, because the Queensland Government—the epitome of virtue in its own eyes if in nobody else's—is budgeting for a bigger increase in public spending than the Australian Government itself. I hope that Government members and Queenslanders in general appreciate the political hypocrisy of this Government in its

attacks on Australian Government spending and its call for restraint in servicing its responsibilities to Australians.

I refer to the greater increase in spending by the State Government over that of the Australian Government as political hypocrisy on the part of the Queensland Government and its Treasurer rather than as economic hypocrisy, because everybody knows that the cost of servicing the responsibilities of Government has continued to increase irrespective of the political colour of the Commonwealth Government. This Government is always seeking more money from Federal sources to service its debt. It is always complaining about the shabby deal it gets from the Federal Government. Each electorate seeks extra money. I am always seeking more expenditure and I intend to keep doing so. Let us dispense with this great hypocrisy of expecting the other Government, the other person or the other institution to do with less while we, like the Queensland Government, seek more for ourselves.

As an example, the Minister for Works and Housing was off to Canberra looking for an extra \$5,000,000. I do not know whether he is back. In inflationary times it does not matter whether a dollar is spent by the Federal Government, the Queensland Government, the individual, or private enterprise; it is equally inflationary. This is something that the Government has to admit now that it has produced this document for everyone to see. There is no walking away from it.

Here lies the great moral and political inconsistency of our society with inflation today. I shall leave the Government alone for a moment. This is a time when everyone agrees there must be restraint; but nobody wants to restrain himself and the Queensland Government is a prime case in point.

The Financial Statement is full of examples of increased financial assistance from the Australian Government to this State. Although there is often criticism of increased spending by the Australian Government, I note that there is no criticism in this Financial Statement of the principle of increased assistance from the Commonwealth to the State of Queensland; in fact, the Treasurer expresses a note of appreciation in this regard, and this is to his credit. It is in contrast to the attitude of the Premier, who appears to be incapable, through his bigotry, of recognising the unusual universality of inflation and his own demands for extra finance to service his needs. I do not say he is incapable of expressing it.

He is absolutely incapable of comprehending the national and, I grant, the State need to have and to implement adjusting changes. He of course refuses to implement adjusting changes that will fight inflation. At the very time he was campaigning and illustrating that price control was of no use in stopping inflation, the bread manufacturers and petrol retailers said they would

put their prices up. He promptly threatened them with price control because he could see it would embarrass his campaign against the Federal Government. And it was effective merely to threaten to use the powers which the State has but will never use. In that case they were to be used only to prevent jeopardising his campaign and making him look ridiculous.

There are many examples of the great infusion of Commonwealth funds in the fields of education, health, welfare and transport. I do not speak of "welfare" as though it were a dirty word, as the Treasurer did a few moments ago. Those funds have made this self-admitted election Budget possible—and when I say "self-admitted" I mean admitted by the Treasurer.

The Financial Statement contains many entries relating to receipts as well as expenditure which far surpass the Treasurer's estimates. Obviously, the cries of doom we hear so often from the Government and its officers about the disastrous management of the national economy are not supported by fact. Of course, we have just heard a prime example of this cry of doom from the honourable member for Toowong.

A significant item that has enabled the Treasurer to produce a Budget which at this stage is not onerous on the State is of purely State and not Commonwealth nature. I say "at this stage" because I am afraid that if the Treasurer gets back into power the big bite will be on immediately. That facet is the expected increase in State revenue from mineral royalties from \$4,018,740 in 1973-74 to \$37,856,000 in the coming year. I am not going to be hypocritical and claim that this amount of royalty should have been levied in the initial stages of development of the mining companies. I claim, however, that increased royalties should have been levied long ago. The A.L.P. advocated this course of action for many years, but it was strongly opposed by the Government. The Government insisted that the Opposition was ill-informed, and that they would wreck development.

This view was not shared by Treasury officials when, in the days of a Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra, the Premier and Treasurer went there seeking grants for the State. Those officers, who were not at that time working for an A.L.P. Government, wanted to know why assistance grants should be made available to this State when, as they put it, the Queensland Government was giving away, at too low a price, the mineral assets of this State. I do not think it can be said that those Treasury officers were ill-informed at that time or were bent on wrecking mining companies, I believe, along with those Treasury officers, that mineral royalties could and should have been increased long ago.

There has been gross neglect in the development of much-needed facilities in Queensland because of the loss of this

revenue. I instance hospitals and schools and their staffing. Queensland still has an antiquated transport system. To ascertain the truth of that statement, one has only to board a train and travel up the coast, noting particularly the quite unique facility known as the griddle car that is used on the Sunshine route and other top passenger services. Look, too, at the congested streets, and remember that when the present State Government came to power it immediately scrapped the foundations of an electrified passenger rail service in this city. If reasonable royalty demands had been made, the State would have had sufficient money to carry out some work in these greatly neglected areas. How many barrages across streams such as the Mary River, and how many water reticulation schemes, could have been provided by finance obtained from mining royalties?

I am not suggesting that the extra \$34,000,000 from mining royalties envisaged in the Budget could have been obtained yearly since the beginning of mining projects, but doubtless many millions of dollars that could have benefited Queensland have been sacrificed by this inept Government. In effect, Queensland Government spokesmen have themselves confirmed this fact officially by suddenly applying an increase, expected to amount to \$34,000,000, in royalties. How many times have we heard the Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Mines and other Government members say that an irresponsible Australian Labor Government has destroyed mining companies, or at least brought them to their knees? If they are expected to cough up an additional \$34,000,000 while they are down on their knees under a supposedly iniquitous Labor Government, surely they could have contributed something more than a mere pittance to the Queensland Treasury during the term of a supposedly, and actually, benevolent, mining-oriented Liberal-Country Party Government. I say that the Queensland Government has exposed itself as being guilty of a dereliction of duty to Queensland in that up to the present time it has given away the State's mineral resources too cheaply. That was the opinion of the A.L.P., the Commonwealth Government, and the Grants Commission.

Time and again Government members have expounded on the rape of mining interests under the present Australian Labor Party Government. For years the Minister for Mines and Main Roads has been saying that any further impost would drive miners and customers from this State. He instanced Japanese coal buyers. Years ago he said in this Chamber that any further impost would mean that they could get coal more cheaply from the North American continent—I believe it was from Canada—and that demands for higher royalties would drive them away. He is still singing the same tune about coal and iron ore that they are going to obtain from Korea and Manchuria and

from Brazil because he claims the Australian Labor Party Government has brought the mining companies to their knees.

We now see the great paradox of the State Government proving that it has been wrong all these years by dumping the demand for an additional \$34,000,000 in the lap of the mining companies. Obviously the Government believes the companies can stand it, and if it believes that, it has been singing a hymn of political hypocrisy all these years against an Australian Labor Party Government. Surely it proves beyond doubt that the mining industry is not debilitated even by the policies of the Australian Labor Party Government. If the companies do meet these royalties, I should say that the Government of Queensland will stand condemned, not for imposing higher royalties at this time but for not imposing higher royalties in the past for the benefit of the people of Queensland.

I noted in the Budget various amounts available for primary-producer assistance schemes through the agencies of the Agricultural Bank, the Rural Reconstruction Fund, the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Fund, the Woolgrowers Assistance Fund, the Assistance to Primary Producers Special Fund, and the Farm Water Supplies Assistance Fund. I noted with interest the grant of an additional \$100,000 to the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations for special projects, and it could not go to a better organisation. The Bureau's contribution by way of disease and pest-control, and technology, both in the field and in the laboratory, has been of great benefit to the Queensland sugar industry's pathology, plant breeding, and so on, and I do not hesitate to acknowledge the additional assistance, which no doubt will be utilised to the best advantage.

The sugar industry is very important to Queensland. The value of the Queensland sugar crop last year was \$313,584,100; the value of the New South Wales sugar crop was \$15,751,618; and the value of the combined Queensland and New South Wales crops was \$329,335,718. The sugar industry is a labour-intensive industry in the field, in the factory and in transport. The materials used in it are labour-intensive—fertilisers, fuels, chemicals, machinery, etc. It is a great consumer as well as a great producer, and that must always be remembered. I do not think I could estimate accurately the great number of people in the coastal areas of this State who are directly or indirectly attached to the sugar industry or affected by its welfare. Therefore, the welfare of the industry must be a matter of great concern to every member of this Assembly.

Recently in this Chamber the Minister for Primary Industries made a statement, directed, as he said, to "honourable members opposite", in which he said that recent statements could injure the welfare of the sugar industry. He suggested that such matters should be above petty partisan politics, and I suggest

that he direct those admirable sentiments to members on his own side of the Chamber, because no utterances would be more prejudicial to the welfare of the sugar industry than those of his colleague the Minister for Mines and Main Roads (Mr. Camm) in this Chamber on 24 September.

After exhorting the Australian Government to forget about Peking and Moscow, Mr. Camm attempted to denigrate Dr. Patterson in these words—

“The Minister for Northern Development returned to Australia and received headlines about what he was to receive from China. I challenge honourable members opposite to say how much he has received from China for sugar, which we have not yet exported. Where is the long-term agreement that was negotiated with China?”

As Mr. Camm is a senior Minister in the Government of Queensland, as Queensland is the sugar State and as he is a cane-grower himself, responsible observers could be forgiven for thinking that he reflects the sentiments of the Queensland Government and the Queensland sugar industry. In view of the sugar negotiations involving the Australian and Chinese Governments and Queensland Government and sugar industry representatives, I consider his attitude and statements to be highly irresponsible and possibly damaging. I believe that I have overwhelming support when I say that his outburst is not indicative of the sentiments of this Parliament or of this State. I believe his outbursts resulted from the usual petty, party-political preoccupation of the National Party—or the Country Party depending on which side of the border one is on—which manifested itself in Canberra when Mr. Anthony imputed that Dr. Patterson, in initiating dialogue on sugar trade with China, was usurping the role of the Sugar Board. Anyone who is honest and not politically blind in one eye knows that Dr. Patterson had been requested by the Australian sugar interests to establish such a dialogue—and he had succeeded.

Mr. Camm's further comments in this Chamber on 24 September did nothing to assist sugar negotiations now taking place. In fact, if taken literally they could well have a very adverse effect. He said—

“To my knowledge, no long-term contracts have been negotiated with China so far. We successfully sold sugar to China long before the A.L.P. Government came to power in Canberra.

“So far it has not sold any sugar or negotiated a long-term contract with China, and it has received no indication of the price that will be received if it is ever successful in negotiating a contract.”

That is not a very fortuitous view to take of negotiations. He further said—

“We are selling sugar now under the contracts we have negotiated over the years.”

Let us look at the remark about our having sold sugar to China long before the A.L.P. Government came to power in Canberra.

**Mr. Wharton:** Does this affect the Budget?

**Mr. BLAKE:** Yes, this affects the Budget. I'll say it does! It affects the Budget greatly. I will tell the honourable member shortly what we borrowed and what we still owe after this Government legislated for an expansion of the industry without any attempt at guarantees for the future following the expansion. Of course it affects the Budget! It could break Queensland.

Now let us look at the relevant period immediately prior to the A.L.P. Government's coming to power in Canberra. This surely is the relevant period. Let me give the Committee the sales of sugar to Mainland China starting with the calendar year 1969. They were: 1969, nil; 1970, nil; and 1971 nil. Honourable members should note that it was in 1971 that Mr. Whitlam and Dr. Patterson first went to Mainland China—I am sure Dr. Patterson went and I think Mr. Whitlam went with him—as representatives of the A.L.P. in Opposition. That was in 1971. Sales of sugar to China in 1972 amounted to 37,150 tonnes and in 1973 to 66,220 tonnes. No figures of subsequent sales are available to me but I venture to say that, as long as no senior politician, blindly pursuing his narrow party-political ambitions, fouls things up, there will be very significant sales of sugar to report in the future.

**Mr. P. Wood:** It is good to see you educating the Minister.

**Mr. BLAKE:** I take it the honourable member means the Minister for Mines? I thought he was referring to the Minister for Primary Industries, who was asked a question this morning by the honourable member for Mackay. It must be embarrassing at times for Ministers to have to answer questions without having their answers prepared, particularly if they have a short time previously given a prepared answer to a so-called question without notice.

As I was saying, I understand that the Australian Government wishes to see orderly, long-term marketing arrangements operating for sugar to underwrite the bulk of the industry's production that goes to foreign countries. This objective would be best achieved within a multilateral framework such as an effective international sugar agreement, complemented of course by separate bilateral contractual agreements. It is my understanding that this view is shared by the Australian sugar industry, and it

makes eminent good sense, given the high proportion of the crop—nearly 80 per cent—that we export.

No nation worked harder than Australia to achieve the negotiation of an effective new international sugar agreement in Geneva last year. It proved impossible, however, to reach agreement at that time, when a number of the major importing and exporting countries pursued their own self-interests in total disregard for the position of others. I fully appreciate, of course, that in the hard world of trade this is understandable, even though I do not approve of it.

The Australian delegation to the International Sugar Conference was led by the Federal Minister for Northern Development (Dr. Rex Patterson) supported by the Queensland Premier and the Queensland Minister for Primary Industries. Recently Dr. Patterson referred to the good team spirit displayed by the delegation at the Geneva conference, and expressed the hope that it might be continued in the future. I ask honourable members to note the difference between Dr. Patterson's approach and that of some persons, such as Mr. Anthony and Mr. Camm, who take every opportunity to try to drag a strip off someone politically, regardless of the welfare of the industry involved.

In the absence of satisfactory multilateral market management arrangements for sugar, bilateral deals which provide security of access for stated quantities in the long term, at prices that are fair and reasonable both to the Australian producer and to the consumer in the importing country, can be effective in underpinning Australia's export returns for sugar. This is important, because, as I say, we are approaching a level of 80 per cent in our sugar export markets.

Agreements have already been written with the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Singapore and New Zealand, and consideration is being given to separate arrangements with the European Economic Community, the People's Republic of China, and Japan.

I am assured by Dr. Patterson that it is the objective of the Australian Government, with the support of the sugar industry, to have the long-term contracts with these countries for the purchase and supply of sugar endorsed at national Government level. It is also my understanding that the Australian Government, through Dr. Patterson, is prepared on behalf of the industry to negotiate inter-governmental arrangements that would provide the maximum security for long-term contractual agreements, and where this is not possible to provide adequate cover for long-term contracts negotiated at the commercial level, thereby facilitating their successful operation.

From what has been said it is clear that both the Australian Government and the sugar industry have complementary roles to

play in the successful negotiation of long-term contractual arrangements designed to safeguard returns to the growers and the mills. It is disappointing that apparently this is not recognised in all quarters. It is regrettable that the Minister for Mines has spoken disparagingly of the successful efforts of the Minister for Northern Development in obtaining the agreement of the Chinese Government for long-term access of between 200,000 and 300,000 tons of Australian sugar annually, commencing in 1975, thereby securing permanent access to the Chinese market for our sugar industry.

Despite the fact that Dr. Patterson received for the Australian sugar industry what the industry requested him to seek prior to his departure for China, that is, permanent access to China, this achievement, of course, has not been welcomed by the Minister for Mines and Main Roads. If it had been a Federal Country Party member who had achieved such access, it would certainly have been lauded by him as a great breakthrough in marketing Australia's sugar crop. But Dr. Patterson's achievements were certainly welcomed by senior executives of the sugar industry who met with him in Brisbane on his return from China.

The Minister for Mines and Main Roads is still unaware, apparently, that for about two years the Colonial Sugar Refining Co. Ltd. had been trying to gain permanent access for large quantities of Australian sugar. Honourable members will recall my saying that the sugar stated by Mr. Camm to be sold to China by the C.S.R. Co. must have been sold long before the A.L.P. Government came to Canberra, because none was sold immediately before Dr. Patterson achieved this breakthrough, much to the jealous distaste of the Minister for Mines and Main Roads.

The sugar industry representatives thanked Dr. Patterson publicly for the initiative he had taken with the Chinese Government, which laid the basis for long-term access to the Chinese market for Australian sugar and set the stage for the negotiation of detailed terms of an agreement and related commercial contracts that are to be finalised before 1 January next year.

**Mr. Camm:** I will give you the full story if you like.

**Mr. BLAKE:** The Minister would certainly be more constructive if he gave the full story rather than the destructive picture he painted to this Chamber on the 24th of last month. We will be very pleased to get the full story.

I repeat that the sugar industry got what it asked for; this is what it wanted. The commercial negotiations were commenced early this year and delegations composed of senior Australian Government officials and representatives of the C.S.R. Co. have visited Peking on two occasions to discuss details of the long-term agreement and

related commercial matters. These discussions, including the pricing arrangements, are proceeding as planned and shipments for 1975 have been allocated already. If Dr. Patterson had attempted to do these things on his own, no doubt he would have been accused by the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, as he was by Mr. Anthony in the Federal House, of usurping the functions of the Sugar Board in the selling of sugar. He said that it was up to the industry to consolidate these things.

Moreover, it is recognised by all concerned that the installation in China of bulk-receiving facilities is necessary for long-term, large-scale exports of Australian raw sugar. Quite frankly I doubt whether we can supply large-scale exports to China until she has bulk-loading facilities, because we have changed over to bulk handling. It was at the specific request of the industry—and Government members may deny this if they care to—that Dr. Patterson invited the Chinese Government to send a technical team to Australia to study bulk-sugar handling and receiving facilities. Up to this point of time the sugar industry, through the C.S.R., had not been able to get the Chinese to come to Australia.

**Mr. Camm:** What a lot of rot!

**Mr. BLAKE:** The Minister may deny it.

The Chinese Government accepted Dr. Patterson's invitation and seven technical experts were shown all aspects of Australian bulk-handling facilities in the period from 10 to 28 July this year. The Chinese officials expressed their gratitude to the Australian Government for its sponsorship of this visit, which is expected to lead to mutually beneficial results. The Government and the industry co-operated very closely in making that mission the success it was.

I understand that C.S.R. was delighted at the response by the Chinese technical team. That is a constructive and positive example of the way in which the Australian Government is assisting the sugar industry in securing new marketing opportunities.

I note from their reactions that this galls some people opposite. If party politics are ignored and political history and sugar industry history are studied, it will be found that the foundations of the sugar industry were blown to shreds in 1914 and that in 1915, when a Labor Government assumed office, it introduced legislation laying the foundations for the sugar industry as we know it. The basic legislation has not been departed from since that time—at least, not to any great extent—except by this Government, when the industry itself said that, if an expansion of the size recommended was implemented without any guarantees, it could well happen that overnight sugar prices would collapse and lead to near ruin to the industry. How very true that was!

A Labor Government never departed from the established principles; nor did it dictate to the sugar industry. Take the actions of

men such as Hanlon. On his return from a trip to England he said, "There is a market over there. Do you want to produce for it? It is up to the sugar industry." Industry representatives decided what they would do. No Labor Government ever kicked the chocks out and jeopardised the security of the industry by forcing production for a market. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads said that he supported the last expansion of the industry.

**Mr. Camm:** My word I did!

**Mr. BLAKE:** Of course he supported the last expansion. I won't get personal about that. I have heard some of the reasons why you supported the last industry expansion. I saw a statement by you on, I think it was, the 16th. You have learnt a lot of lessons since then.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Would the honourable member address the Chair?

**Mr. BLAKE:** Through you, Mr. Lickiss, the honourable gentleman has learnt a lot of lessons since then. He has learnt enough to know that there must be some security of agreements and markets before the future of an industry as important as the sugar industry is gambled with.

**Mr. Camm:** I said that 20 years ago, when you were only a fledgling in the sugar industry.

**Mr. BLAKE:** You don't learn very quickly. Apparently you have learnt a lot since the last expansion of the industry.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Camm:** I have forgotten more than you ever learnt.

**Mr. BLAKE:** Yes. You have not remembered much at all.

That is a positive example of the way in which the Australian Government is assisting the industry and securing new market opportunities.

I presume that no-one would seriously challenge that China, with almost one-quarter of the world's population, will require increasing quantities of foodstuffs, including sugar, and will obtain these from countries with sufficient foresight to establish friendly trading relations with it.

The disparaging remarks of the Minister for Mines and Main Roads are, in my opinion, to be condemned. Doesn't he realise that, but for China's purchases over the last 12 years, the wheat industry of Australia would have been in a sorry mess? It would have been a very sick industry.

**Mr. Alison:** What do we get for wool?

**Mr. BLAKE:** I do not know, but the guarantee received from the Australian Labor Government in relation to the cost of production is a damned sight higher than wool-growers received at the bottom of the market

under the Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra. I have recently been to Longreach. Even though industry personnel there have listened to hymns of hatred from Government members, at least they realise that they will live under the basic structure that has been set up by the present Government in Canberra. However, many of them had to walk off and take jobs previously.

Furthermore, the Australian Government, with the full backing and gratitude of the Australian sugar industry, is further pursuing the development of friendly sugar trading relations with China at the commercial and technical levels by making provision for a sugar industry display at the major Australian exhibition in Peking later this month.

Presently a very tight supply-and-demand position exists for sugar throughout the world. The present London daily price stands at about £S365 a long ton; but, as it has scarcely varied recently, I doubt if any large tonnage of sugar is actually changing hands at this artificially high price.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.*]

**Mr. BLAKE:** Experts are stating that sugar production is not keeping pace with increasing demand. Some of them are predicting this will be a continuing situation. We have to remember that the same expert predictions and forecasts were made during the previous tight supply position in 1963, but increased production soon induced a disastrous slump in world markets and Australia still owes—and this is the point on which you interjected earlier, Mr. Wharton—\$15,333,816 of a \$23,000,000 interest-bearing loan that was borrowed from the Federal Government at that time to provide a mere subsistence price level in the sugar industry. I cannot say how much has actually been repaid, but if my memory serves me right the \$23,000,000 loan plus interest amounted to \$29,000,000 or \$30,000,000. This means in fact that although \$15,000,000 or thereabouts has been repaid, we are still only half way to liquidating the debt.

At that time, so many people said it would be impossible to supply the world's sugar needs. I must confess that sentiments are expressed now about competing land use in Brazil, costs of building infrastructure and other factors. And quite a number of people are still predicting that we will not catch up with the sugar demand in the foreseeable future.

I support what I believe to be the present industry and Australian Government outlook of requiring some secure market and price outlet structure before gambling with the future of the industry on unsecured major expansion. I emphasise "unsecured major expansion" because nowhere could anyone find me reported in "Hansard" since I entered this House almost six years ago as saying that I was opposed to expansion in the sugar industry.

Every time the Minister for Mines and Main Roads gets to his feet, he tries to impute that I was opposed to expansion in the sugar industry. A study would reveal that what I supported was the industry's own point, which was made in submissions to this Government at the time of the expansion, that it is the policy of the sugar industry to not depart from a structure of reasonably assured markets. It is not expansion itself that is to be feared; it is expansion undertaken on a fast and large enough scale to bankrupt what I might call the parent organisation or the foundation of the industry if it backfires.

At that time it was stated that negotiation of an international sugar agreement, which saved the situation, was teetering on the brink of hopelessness and, to use the claim of the then Liberal-Country Party Government, it was only the genius of Sir John McEwen that saved the world sugar industry from total collapse. I do not believe that this is the type of structure that we should rely on in the sugar industry. I do not believe we should go for the big throw, win or lose.

Some honourable members talk about depressed conditions. I could show them, from the files of city newspapers of that time, photographs of women, wearing coolie hats, cutting cane in the field, with their infant children lying in the shade under the stools in the cane fields. When the Minister for Mines and Main Roads says that he supported expansion of the sugar industry, I hope he supports the next one in the terms of his recent statement that any major expansion must be underpinned with reasonably assured markets.

The success to date of negotiations to obtain secure markets, and the additional prospects in view, point to a likelihood of security in the sugar industry, and the need for guaranteed production to fulfil the long-term contracts that are being sought. There is no better way to guarantee the stability of sugar production than to promote irrigation of soils that have proved their capacity for sugar production in areas that already have the infrastructure supporting our claims to extensive sugar markets. I therefore wish to take this opportunity of expressing some disappointment at the small increase in the funds allocated for irrigation and water supply in the Budget for the coming year. As honourable members know, Phase I of Stage 1 of the Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme is not yet complete. There have been escalating costs (that is no crime; everyone has had them) but they can still be justified when related to the increasing price of sugar. In fact, the whole project is perhaps even more viable relatively than it was before.

The Federal Government has lived up to its promise of providing an additional \$4,400,000 for the completion of Phase 1 of Stage II of the scheme. What I seek is State expenditure in keeping with escalating costs of construction for the distribution

system that will allow the reticulation of water stored in the Monduran Dam and the barrages on the Kolan and Burnett Rivers. As I have already said, the economics of the scheme have been proved and, when related to reasonably expected sugar prices, the scheme retains the priority accorded to it by the Government. It is a viable proposition in the sense that the water is available, and, the sooner it can be put to use, the more viable the scheme will be. I therefore appeal for accelerated expenditure by the State on the reticulation system so that stored water can be used productively as soon as possible, not only for sugar production but also to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population of Bundaberg and the surrounding local authorities that have been allocated water under the scheme.

Whilst I am on the subject of irrigation, I should like to mention the prospect of a barrage on the Mary River. I have sought this ever since entering Parliament.

**Mr. Jensen:** The honourable member for Maryborough has been taking all the credit for it.

**Mr. BLAKE:** I do not blame him for taking all the credit. As I was here first and mentioned it first, it is only natural that he should follow me. As long as he assists in having it provided, I shall bear him no ill will.

**Mr. Camm:** Are you going to give any credit to the Queensland Government for this?

**Mr. BLAKE:** I am going to give credit to the Queensland Government. I do not hesitate in doing so. I give the Queensland Government credit for establishing the priority of the Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme. Let it never be said that I am a nasty or vindictive man. I judge Governments and people on their merits. Provided a barrage is built on the Mary River, I do not care who claims the credit for it. All who have seen the Mary River from the air will realise the extent of its watershed, and how much water rolls down to the sea from it. There is plenty of good land bordering the Mary River in the vicinity of Maryborough. I understand the economic difficulties of the Government. Although the economic survey is not yet complete, there is no doubt in my mind that a barrage is warranted on the Mary River, not only for further agricultural production but also to provide opportunities for the establishment of industries based on the production of timber products.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Would you say the Mary River is very similar to the Amazon?

**Mr. BLAKE:** If I had an outlook as limited as that of the honourable member, possibly I would. In all seriousness, Mr. Wharton, I say that a barrage on the Mary River near Maryborough could meet the needs of a secondary industry related to the

extensive forests in the area. A check on my representations on file with Ministers and in this Chamber will show that I have said consistently that the greatest potential for expansion and prosperity in the Maryborough area is in the timber industry and in pasture development, and I hold to that opinion. Its geographical location relative to the pine forests being developed in the area would make it admirably suited to the establishment of a pulp mill or a chip mill, or something of that type.

It is a great pity to see so much water wasted. I have not had time to check with the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs to find out the cusecs of water that flow down the Mary River, but there is no question that there is a wicked waste of the natural potential of the lands not now being served by irrigation, which suffer greatly in time of drought.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** The honourable member for Maryborough cannot represent his area sufficiently well to—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wharton):** Order! The honourable member for Isis has the floor.

**Mr. BLAKE:** My speech time is running out, and I must tell the honourable member for Mourilyan that although the area about which I am speaking serves Maryborough, and I understand the interest of the honourable member for Maryborough in it, it is in fact in my electorate.

I appeal to the Minister in charge of irrigation and water supply to give urgent and serious consideration to the return that would come from construction of a barrage on the Mary River in the vicinity of Maryborough to serve the agricultural and industrial potential of the area at an early date.

According to the list of departmental Estimates to be debated this year, I see that there will not be an opportunity to debate either health or irrigation and water supply. A very urgent matter that I bring before the Committee, the Minister for Health, and the Premier, who recently visited the good but tiny hospital there, is that at Hervey Bay there is a hospital of 12 beds which was built to serve a population of about 4,000 to 5,000. The permanent population has grown to about 8,000, and peaks of holiday population in the area are between 30,000 and 35,000.

I have been told by the Minister for Health, no doubt in good faith, that we are taking the wrong view of health care at Hervey Bay when we ask for an enlarged hospital. I think he believes that we expect to have a base hospital, with all the specialist facilities, provided at Hervey Bay. That is not so. However, I am not prepared to accept that a 12-bed hospital is adequate to meet the needs of a permanent population of about 8,000 and a holiday peak population of between 30,000 and 35,000.

Hervey Bay is about 20 miles from Maryborough. The return trip is about 40-odd miles, and the road is low-lying in places. As a result, Hervey Bay is often cut off from Maryborough and isolated. I emphatically support the demand for an enlarged hospital at Hervey Bay, providing for both acute and geriatric cases and meeting the normal needs of the public for general hospital care.

I particularly ask for this because aged people represent a very high proportion of the population of Hervey Bay. It is largely a retirement area. It also has a large population of young people. I think the school enrolment in the area is between 1,100 and 1,300. The hardship of lack of hospital care is felt particularly by aged people. Many of them cannot use private transport even if they had it, and the system of taking people, urgently ill or otherwise, to the base hospital in Maryborough leaves much to be desired from the psychological point of view, quite apart from the strain placed upon the sick and the infirm, and the worry to aged relatives who have to travel to Maryborough and back.

Various officials have informed me that the situation is no different from that in a suburb of Brisbane in relation to the base hospitals here. This is absolute rot. The people of Brisbane have transport at all times from the outer suburbs into Brisbane for specialist treatment and they have it at times when it can be used with some convenience. There is no such reliable transport from Hervey Bay to Maryborough and, quite apart from not being reliable, in many cases it is not suitable for use by people without their own transport to visit the hospital and get back again.

I realise that the trend is to divide the population needing medical care into the acute and the aged or geriatric, and a recommendation has been made by the Health Services Investigation Unit—I think that is what it is called—that the area could well do with a 45-bed geriatric ward. The Maryborough Base Hospital Board has said that it possibly would not service the present needs and that by the time the plans are drawn and the unit is constructed the demands of Hervey Bay would be such that a geriatric unit for 60 people would be needed.

I notice in the Treasurer's Financial Statement the following paragraph—

"A feature of the capital budget is the advancement of capital works for health and hospital services where new capital funds of \$20,125,700 have been provided. This represents an increase of . . . 66.7 per cent on the 1973-74 provision."

I think it is fair and opportune to ask the Minister—and the Premier, who last week inspected this hospital and said that it was a nice little hospital—for a reassessment of expansion of hospital facilities at Hervey Bay in the very near future. We are not arguing that it is not a nice little hospital

but it is too small and it cannot accommodate all those who need hospital care. I do not think I am asking for too much in view of the statement that provision for capital works for health and hospital services is increased by 66.7 per cent over the previous year's programme. I urgently request the Minister—and the Premier who apparently is well informed since his visit last week—to give this matter their most urgent consideration not only because of the present needs but also because of the rapidly increasing population of Hervey Bay. The increase is among the highest in the State.

Mr. F. P. Moore interjected.

Mr. BLAKE: I agree. We would appreciate it if Hervey Bay were placed in an effective position on the waiting list; but I think a better assessment of the situation would be to place it in a position in keeping with the urgency of its needs. In that case I firmly believe that it would be placed near the top.

In the very brief time left to me I want to touch on a matter that I raised recently in the debate on Matters of Public Interest. It is one of great urgency to the economic and commercial activity of Hervey Bay. I refer to the need to carry out work at the boat harbour at Urangan so that it can be used at all stages of the tide. It has been in the course of construction for nearly 12 years, and it is hard to believe that after such a lengthy period the facilities that are provided cannot be used either by the commercial launch operators or the local air-sea rescue organisation at all times. Leases were granted by the Department of Harbours and Marine to both the Hervey Bay Boat Club and the air-sea rescue organisation. But imagine their astonishment when, on checking the surveys, they found that their leases covered only 13 feet of land on shore, the remainder being under water.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (7.36 p.m.): Instead of dealing with the effects of the Budget on his electorate, the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, like his colleagues who preceded him, talked about a number of extraneous matters.

Of course, this is to be expected; they would be reticent about commenting on the Budget. All that the honourable member did for 60 minutes was talk about sugar-cane, schools and hospitals. He did not even refer to unemployment. As I say, he spoke mainly about the sugar industry, which is being quite capably administered by the Queensland Government.

In making my contribution to this debate I first of all extend my congratulations to the Treasurer on presenting yet another successful Budget to add to the long list of successful Budgets that he has previously presented to this Parliament.

Mr. Bromley: Who wrote that for you—Chalky?

**Mr. HINZE:** Listen to this. I am sure that the sentiments expressed by me are shared by all honourable members, whether they sit on the Government benches or in the Opposition.

**Mr. Bromley:** I told you Sir Gordon Chalk wrote that.

**Mr. HINZE:** Nod your baldy head; you are in favour.

I believe that history will record Sir Gordon Chalk as being one of Queensland's most capable Treasurers, if not the most capable.

To these comments I must link the activities of his Under Treasurer, Mr. R. H. Fields, who has now been appointed to the position of Chairman of the Public Service Board. I wish him well in that position. I also extend my congratulations to Mr. Leo Hielscher.

**Mr. Bromley:** Not a bad bloke, either.

**Mr. HINZE:** Keep on crawling; you'll probably need to.

Mr. Hielscher has acted with great efficiency in his capacity as Assistant Under Treasurer, and he has been elevated to one of the most senior positions in the Public Service, namely, Under Treasurer. He is an extremely capable young man and I wish him well in the knowledge that he will occupy that position for many years to come.

Before dealing with the Treasurer's Financial Statement—which members of the Opposition have not done—and emphasising a number of aspects of the Budget, I wish to comment generally on the over-all economic position in which we find ourselves today. If anyone had said to me, in October 1972—only two years ago—when we were discussing the Budget, that we would in December 1972 elect a Federal Government that would wreck our economy and that would bring one of the strongest nations on this earth to its knees, I would have said that he was mad! I would have said that it was impossible; I would have said that the greatest economic bunglers in the world could not possibly accomplish such a disaster. How wrong I would have been! What do we find? Two years ago there was no mention of the nasty word “unemployment”.

**Mr. Jensen:** Oh, rubbish!

**Mr. HINZE:** There was none.

**Mr. Jensen:** Rubbish! You know that there were 10,000 unemployed.

**Mr. HINZE:** The honourable member for Bundaberg would not know.

And why should there be unemployment in such a young country with tremendous natural resources? Opposition members should recall a phrase used by Hawke. They will not like it when I rub it in, but I intend to remind them that he said that the unions and Labor would eliminate industrial trouble;

that they were more compatible. What a laugh! What a joke! Hawke himself now has to admit that Labor in Canberra is nothing but a complete failure—a colossal flop.

I return for a few minutes to December 1972. At that time a Labor Government was given a mandate to govern in the House of Representatives, a Labor Government with hatred in its heart—hatred for what it referred to as the “tall poppies and the fat cats”.

**Mr. Bromley:** That leaves you out. You are only tall in front.

**Mr. HINZE:** The honourable member need not look at me.

Labor had hatred for our long-established allies and hatred for most of the things some of us hold dear. Immediately after the election, Federal Ministers were abusing the United States and United Kingdom Governments. We had a Federal Government breaking its neck to jump into bed with the Comms, a Federal Government which hated the rural industries so much that it immediately set about carving them up one by one.

I know something about the dairy industry, and I know what Labor has done to it. At that time there were 25,000 dairy farmers in Queensland; now there are only 5,000. Labor has wrecked the dairy industry and a number of other primary industries. It even took free milk from the poor kids. What did it offer them in return? Whitlam's wafers! Labor took \$11,000,000 out of the dairy farmers' pockets, took the milk from the kids and, in return, offered them Whitlam's wafers. It is a pity it did not feed them to Whitlam himself.

What happened to the export assistance that had been given to rural industries in Australia by former Governments so that our export surpluses could be built up? Former Governments were proud of rural industries in Australia, but as soon as Labor got into power in Canberra it eliminated them for the very simple reason that it hated them. As the Federal Government gets its power from the urban areas of Sydney and Melbourne it said, “To hell with the rest of Australia!” The Federal Government has hatred in its heart for our great primary industries. As a primary industry man all my life, I am deeply hurt at seeing my neighbours leaving their properties and their sons and daughters unable to stay on them because of a rotten Government in Canberra that has done everything possible to drive them from their farms.

If a Federal election, a State election, a by-election or a local government election were held anywhere in Australia today, Labor with all its flimsy, centralist, Left-wing trimmings would be swept from office, never to be returned in our lifetime. That is my answer to the Leader of the Opposition,

who called for an election. He knows he was window-dressing. He knows he was putting on an act. I do not know whether the Q.C.E. told him to say it or not, but he knows as well as I do—

**Mr. Jensen:** He did it for Chalkie's sake. Chalkie wants it.

**Dr. Crawford:** Did you hear the result of the Canberra elections? Four members out of 18!

**Mr. HINZE:** I thank the honourable member for Wavell. There are only four Labor men left. I said that would happen. If an election were held anywhere in Australia—State, local, or Federal by-election—none of them would be left—and the sooner the better because Australia cannot tolerate them any more. We demand that Snedden and Anthony together go down there, get into them, and boot them out of office, because the longer they are in there the further we will slide.

**Mr. Alison:** The people have had a gutful of them.

**Mr. HINZE:** Of course they have had a gutful of them. As the saying goes, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time. Labor is sunk and Australia demands that Snedden and Anthony push this rotten crew in Canberra overboard, and then—and only then—will the confidence of the Australian people be restored.

**Mr. Jensen:** Why don't you do it, Russ?

**Mr. HINZE:** My friend and colleague the member for Bundaberg knows that we have lost the confidence of the people.

**An Opposition Member:** Who have? You have.

**Mr. HINZE:** Labor have. They have lost the confidence of the people. Honourable members opposite know as well as I do that once a person loses confidence he eventually reaches the stage when he is frightened to get out of bed in the morning for fear of breaking his neck. That is the position in Australia today; people have lost their confidence. It doesn't matter what that rotten Government in Canberra does. It has lost its credibility. There is no way in the world it will get it back. It has knocked the tall poppies off.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** Have you swum with Ramu the whale?

**Mr. HINZE:** Yes, and deflated it would look like the honourable member for Mourilyan. He should have a look at himself.

Who would have believed in December 1972 that by October 1974 we would witness a run on the banks such as some of us remember occurred in the 1930's? Who would have believed that unemployment would be getting out of hand? It has reached its highest level since 1946 and increased by

16.7 per cent to reach 130,000. They are not my figures. Hawke himself said that it is more than 130,000. He said that 130,000 were known, but of course the figure is higher than that.

The building industry is collapsing. My colleague the honourable member for Surfers Paradise and I are proud of the building industry in our electorates. We are very proud of the number of people connected with building high-rise buildings and homes for people to live in. Their businesses are now collapsing. With the position today, of course, they are out of work. Builders are out of work! I suppose honourable members opposite are happy about it. I suppose they will continue to back their mates in Canberra. What would be the position if we were in Government? Wouldn't they be giving us a bit of a tickle-up?

**Mr. Jensen:** Yes.

**Mr. HINZE:** I'll say they would. They can't take it. They know it is true. All this has happened through the mismanagement of the economic bunglers of Australia. I don't know how they came to be inflicted on the nation, but I hope it will not be too long before we put the skids under them.

Who would have believed that major undertakings such as Mainline and Cambridge Credit would have receivership forced upon them?

**Mr. Inch interjected.**

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wharton):** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** The member for Mt. Isa knows the position.

The whole sorry story is so sickening that it is indeed, unbelievable—yet what happens? While Rome burns, Nero fiddles. The prima donna of Australian politics, Gough Whitlam, pirouettes across the international stage trying for a come-back with our great allies the United States, while his deputy, the extreme Left-winger (and Prime Minister elect), flirts with the Chinese Communists.

Who would have thought that in days as disastrous as those we are experiencing not only the Prime Minister leaves the sinking ship but also his deputy (not to be outdone!) takes off and leaves us in the hands of none other than Queensland's greatest enemy, the Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr Connor). The Queensland Minister for Mines could tell us what Connor would do to Queensland if he had half a chance. What an affront to the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, to be told what our people could wear on landing in China. His air crew were not allowed to wear Australian uniforms in the city. What a shocking state of affairs not allowing our men to wear their official uniforms or whatever they wanted to wear.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Wharton): Order! There are too many interjections and I should like to listen to the honourable member for South Coast.

**Mr. HINZE:** Thank you for your protection, Mr. Wharton.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** Which Budget are you talking about—this Budget, the Federal Budget, or the Chinese Budget?

**Mr. HINZE:** It will not be long before the honourable member knows a lot more about the Chinese Budget. He will be getting paid in rice and that is all he deserves.

I dare say some measure of satisfaction can be derived from the relegation of the "Darling" of the television stage (the one with the "Z" rating) to the same time slot as the blue movies—from midnight to dawn. Ugh! Hoo-ha!

Because the Queensland Government and its Premier have had the temerity to stand up to the Canberra centralists, this State has been relentlessly attacked by one Minister after another on: First the Torres Strait issue; then education, then the Mines Department, then transport, and then hospitalisation. Now we are to have a proposal—and that is all that it amounts to—for another hospital at Mt. Gravatt, and so it goes on.

The Canberra bunglers, incapable of running their own affairs, meddle and try their darnedest to cut through State Government authority. Their hatred for the States is so intense that they bungle on from one catastrophe to another.

The worst possible feature at present, of course, is that the nation has lost its confidence and there is no chance of Labor's being able to restore that confidence. The only honourable thing that Whitlam could do would be to resign his commission and allow Australia to become once again the proud nation that it was prior to December 1972.

And now, to return to the Treasurer's Financial Statement, I refer to page 4, where it states—

"It is a matter of some considerable satisfaction to me personally and to the Government that, despite the difficulties of 1973-74 and the uncertainties of 1974-75, the economy of the State and indeed its financial standing are in a very sound condition. It is still threatened with many external influences but I believe the State will continue to prosper under the policies of this Government and that its people can look forward, as I do, with confidence and optimism to 1974-75 and beyond."

The Treasurer has stated that Queensland's exports continue to shoulder a large part of the burden of achieving a near balance in Australia's overseas transactions.

If ever there was a good case for secession, honourable members are about to hear it. I have here export and import figures to June 1974. If the Comms at Canberra continue

in their merry way, I am one who would secede tomorrow. To June 1974, Queensland's exports were valued at \$1,362,400,000, and Western Australia's were worth \$1,422,400,000.

**Mr. Tucker:** I wish to God we could export Joh.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** We have just heard the Leader of the Opposition say that the only way he could do anything would be to export the Premier.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will please direct his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr. HINZE:** I should love to, Mr. Lickiss.

Queensland exported goods worth \$1,362,400,000, whilst New South Wales exported goods to the value of \$1,513,200,000. However, New South Wales imported goods worth \$2,589,300,000. The figures are somewhat similar for Victoria; that State's exports were valued at \$1,596,300,000, and its imports were worth \$2,155,900,000. Queensland's imports were worth only \$542,700,000 and Western Australia's were valued at \$368,900,000. How proud we should be of our own State and our sister State of Western Australia! There is no doubt at all that these two States carry the rest of Australia on their backs. We will get sick and tired of it one day; we will not do it for ever.

These are the figures for the other States—

—	EXPORTS	IMPORTS
	\$	\$
South Australia ..	663,400,000	314,000,000
Tasmania ..	259,800,000	69,400,000
Northern Territory	87,000,000	38,400,000
A.C.T. .. ..	1,400,000	5,900,000

In all, exports totalled \$6,905,800,000, and imports \$6,084,400,000.

**Mr. Bromley:** Now tuck your shirt in. It's coming out again.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for South Brisbane.

**Mr. HINZE:** He can't help it, Mr. Lickiss.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** The Treasurer made mention of the most disastrous floods in history, and he stated that they cost the economy of the State many millions of dollars.

**Mr. Inch:** A lot of that was caused by the construction of the Mt. Isa railway line when you built a big dam that got washed out and that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Mt. Isa.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** He wouldn't have a clue.

**Mr. HINZE:** He should build himself a little dam and jump into it.

**Mr. Inch:** You built the dam.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Mt. Isa is being disorderly. If I have occasion to speak to him again, I shall deal with him under the provisions of Standing Order 123A.

**Mr. Inch:** And the Treasurer was Minister for Transport at the time.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I advise the honourable member for Mt. Isa that I am trying to hear the honourable member for South Coast. I now warn the honourable member for Mt. Isa under the provisions of Standing Order 123A. That is his final warning.

**Mr. HINZE:** I cannot understand the honourable member for Mt. Isa.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for South Coast will address the Chair.

**Mr. HINZE:** It is difficult to understand the honourable member for Mt. Isa, Mr. Lickiss. He represents an area in which there is a considerable labour force, and one would think he would be a little reticent in what he says. He has to talk about his area.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for South Coast will continue with his speech.

**Mr. HINZE:** For the first time in the State's history, Consolidated Revenue will exceed \$1,000 million. That is a wonderful effort, and something of which we should be proud; but nobody on the other side of the Chamber even referred to that. In anyone's language, Queensland is a major State, and the Treasurer is budgeting for a small deficit of \$760,000. In the language of honourable members opposite, that is peanuts.

Mining royalties have increased from \$4,100,000 in 1973-74—and the honourable member for Mt. Isa should know something about this—to an expected \$37,900,000 in 1974-75. The Government has been ridiculed and criticised over the years by members of the Opposition about the development of the State's mining areas and its coal exports. Honourable members opposite have never stopped whingeing, whining and crying about the towns that have grown up as the result of the development of the wonderful mining areas in Queensland. That development has been such that, when other States are in a hell of a mess and having great difficulty in balancing their Budgets, Queensland can take

advantage of its mining industries and increase revenue from them from \$4,000,000 to \$37,900,000 in 1974-75.

I am proud that the Treasurer told the Committee in his Financial Statement that there will not be any increase in rail fares and freights.

**Mr. Bromley:** Not down to the South Coast, anyway.

**Mr. HINZE:** I accept that, temporarily, there is no railway line to the Gold Coast. We will be getting one again shortly. I see that my colleague the honourable member for Albert recently met one of his mates, a Federal Minister, down there. Federal Ministers visit the Gold Coast every so often and spout about what they are going to do for Queensland. It is just a lot of poppycock, because this State has not received a brass farthing from them so far. All it has received is a lot of promises.

As I said, I accept that there is no railway line to the Gold Coast at the moment. You, Mr. Lickiss, have heard me speak about that many times. All I am saying now is that I find it a bit of a joke that my young friend the honourable member for Albert accepts the bedtime story told to him by one of his colleagues from Canberra that funds are to be made available for a railway line to the Gold Coast. When he has been here a little longer, he will understand that it is only piecrust and promises, like all the other promises that have been made from Canberra. Every Minister and head of a Government department who comes to Queensland makes promises, but that is as far as it goes. No matter whether it is in the field of hospitals, transport or local government, when it comes to saying, "Let us see the colour of your money", there is none. They are only idle promises. Of course, if any funds are made available, they have strings attached to them; the Federal Government wants a say in how they are to be spent. Incidentally, they are our funds in the first place, because the States granted the Commonwealth the right to collect them.

In keeping with the promise of the Country-Liberal Government, exemption from land tax applying to resident landowners under the Land Tax Act is to be lifted a further one-third from \$15,000 to \$20,000 for town land and from \$45,000 to \$60,000 for primary industry use. The number of people affected last year decreased from 7,016 to 3,777, and now it is intended to decrease it further to 2,936. The cost of the concession is expected to be, as the Treasurer said, \$200,000. It will not be long before complete abolition of this sectional land tax takes place. A responsible Country-Liberal Government told the people of Queensland that it proposed eventually to eliminate this tax, and it is keeping its promise.

The Treasurer in his Financial Statement made reference to T.A.B. distributions to race clubs. I refer to the Gold Coast area in particular and I thank him for the

contribution that the T.A.B. has made to the development of racing and trotting on the Gold Coast and adjoining areas. I know something about the clubs on the coast. The Gold Coast Race Club received \$180,000 and the trotting club \$99,000, and I understand from the Treasurer that a further \$20,000 will be allocated to the Gold Coast Race Club.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** Why didn't your horse turn up in New South Wales?

**Mr. HINZE:** Because the honourable member was on him. I told him not to back him.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** That's all right; my horse carried you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** I am congratulating the Treasurer, the Minister in charge of racing, on his administration of a major industry in Queensland today and on the distribution of T.A.B. profits to various clubs throughout the State. Every little club gets something. Even the little race track at Mt. Isa participates because of the fair and equitable distribution of funds through this Government. We could not expect it from a Labor centralist-oriented Government. They would put all their funds into one small area.

Not only are my friends in the Gold Coast Trotting Club and the Gold Coast Race Club providing a service for the area in which we live but they are providing a great tourist attraction in this leading tourist area. One reason why people come to Queensland in the wintertime is to see horses race for high prize money on tracks made attractive by the distribution of T.A.B. funds. The trotting club, of course, experienced financial troubles a few years ago but at the present time its funds are in credit because of the activities of our Treasurer, who made funds available first of all through the Racecourse Development Fund and now through the T.A.B. distribution. I think all honourable members in this Chamber should rise one by one and thank the Treasurer for what he has done. Why aren't honourable members opposite honest about this? Why don't they rise and give commendation where it is due? All they want to do is whinge, whine, cry and holler.

**Mr. Bromley:** Would you like to run over and kiss him?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** One department of which we would have to be proud is the Education Department the allocation for which has been lifted from \$189,000,000 to \$230,100,000, of which \$214,000,000 is directly provided from State sources.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** With the help of the Federal Government.

**Mr. HINZE:** Let us put the story in its true perspective. The honourable member for Mourilyan says the money comes from Commonwealth sources. I remind him that not much came from the Commonwealth. One would think, of course, that we were coping the lot from the Commonwealth.

The major additional cost in education allocations is in the provision for an additional 2,287 teachers, lifting teacher strength by 14 per cent from 16,348 in June 1974 to 18,635. Over the last four years numbers have increased by 37 per cent from 13,600 to 18,635. It is necessary that I dwell on education, because approximately 10 members of the Opposition left their positions in the teaching service to enter Parliament.

**Mr. Aikens:** And didn't the Education Department benefit from that!

**Mr. HINZE:** Of course it did. It does not have to put up with them any longer.

As to teachers' scholarships, the funds are provided to be taken up by 2,400 teachers, and the number of teachers in training under State scholarships is expected to reach 5,637.

Allowances paid to teacher scholarship-holders and other Government fellowship-holders will be increased retrospectively to 1 July 1974 from \$20 and \$21 per week for first and second-year at-home students to \$25 per week; for third and fourth-year students to \$30 per week; for fifth-year students from \$26 to \$35 per week; and for sixth-year students from \$26.50 to \$50 per week.

The away-from-home rates to be paid are as follows:—

First and second-year students	\$35
Third and fourth-year students	\$40
Fifth year students	\$45
Sixth year students	\$60

**Mr. Jensen:** We've heard all this before.

**Mr. HINZE:** Of course you've heard it before. At the beginning of my speech I said I would emphasise some of the achievements of which the Government is proud. Government members will continue to emphasise them; that is why we are here. The Government is doing a wonderful job not only in education but also in roadworks, hospital services and, for that matter, anywhere we care to look. This Government can well be proud of its achievements since 1957.

As from 1 January 1975 an allowance of \$200 will be paid to cover the cost of textbooks, union fees and incidentals. The additional cost in 1974-75 is expected to be \$1,900,000.

I shall deal now with a matter of which I am immensely proud, namely, assistance to non-State schools. In my early days in this Chamber, as the new member for the South Coast electorate, I played a reasonably important part in having the Government

accept the principle of assistance to non-State schools. My efforts are recorded in "Hansard" and no-one can take them from me.

The per capita payment to non-State schools will be increased from \$62 to \$81 per primary student and from \$104 to \$132 per secondary student. The new rates will apply from 1 January 1975, and are estimated to cost \$2,100,000 in a full year and \$1,100,000 in 1974-75. The total cost of these payments to non-State schools is expected to be \$8,300,000 in 1974-75.

I congratulate the private schools throughout the State, particularly those in my own electorate, on the fine work they are doing. I have attended many functions at schools in my electorate such as the Southport High School and the State high schools.

**Mr. Bromley:** I heard you were persona non grata down there.

**Mr. HINZE:** You would have to be a nut. You haven't said a sensible word all night.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

**Mr. HINZE:** Through you, Mr. Lickiss, the honourable member for South Brisbane is a nut.

Mileage rates payable to operators of school-bus services will be increased by 6c a mile on each scale from 1 October 1974. In addition, the special allowance paid for services that operate on a daily contract rate based on a two-way trip will be doubled from \$6 to \$12. The cost of school conveyance services in 1974-75 is expected to be \$7,300,000 compared with \$6,100,000 in 1973-74, or an increase of \$1,300,000.

**Mr. Jensen:** Gordon Chalk has told us all this.

**Mr. HINZE:** Of course he has. And I am emphasising it. Members of the Opposition just have to sit back and take it.

The total provision for health services has increased by 26.7 per cent from \$117,700,000 in 1973-74 to \$149,100,000 in 1974-75. These figures include an increased contribution to the cost of the State's hospital services from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of \$86,200,000 in 1974-75, compared with \$71,300,000 in 1973-74.

The programme instituted last year to build up nursing strength will continue. Provision has been made for an increase in the staff of our public hospitals from 17,645 to 18,436, and we know that a recruiting team has been active in Canada. Honourable members have an opportunity to attend the annual general meeting of the Blue Nursing Service. We are all proud of the contribution the State makes to this service. From 1 November 1974, the rate of subsidy is to be lifted from \$2,350 to \$3,100 per nurse.

The Police Force strength is to be increased. The Government is abused and criticised month in and month out on the inadequate strength of the force. However, it has recognised the position and is increasing the strength from 3,772 to 4,023.

**An Opposition Member:** How many did you get last year?

**Mr. HINZE:** I have made representations to the relevant Minister and the Treasurer on a number of occasions, seeking more police in my area. We now have 105, and we need an additional 15 or 20.

Everyone knows that the Gold Coast area is always in the news. A certain element comes into the area.

**An Opposition Member:** And you've got all those parlours.

**Mr. HINZE:** We have the massage parlours. That is where I saw the honourable member last week. He was in Orchard Avenue. When he saw me he ducked for cover. I said, "It's all right, I won't split on you." I would be the last to split on one of my colleagues coming out of a massage parlour.

It was reported the other day that someone shot Regan. At one time he was in my electorate. I do not know if he was on the roll.

**Mr. Hanson:** He voted for you.

**Mr. HINZE:** Probably he did. I understand that he was a knowledgeable gentleman.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Will the honourable gentleman please address the Chair.

**Mr. HINZE:** I am thinking about what to say next.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If the honourable member has to think for so long, possibly the Committee would be best served by his resuming his seat.

**Mr. HINZE:** My point is that in the light of our thriving tourist industry and the lack of police protection a criminal element enters the area. It was reported in the Press the other day that there had been an increase in S.P. operations in the area. If we cannot get the police protection that we are entitled to, the S.P. trade increases. I would not know what the term meant if I had not asked honourable members opposite, but a lot of people seem to be talking about it. An increase in S.P. operations brings with it the southern criminal element. That is why the honourable member for Surfers Paradise and I have been making representations to the Minister in charge of police to give us some of the extra police that he has provided for. I am pleased and proud that we have received advice from the Minister that the present police district is to be

divided into two divisions, one taking in the area to the Nerang River and the other covering the area from the Nerang River to the border, with headquarters at Coolangatta, which is in my electorate. I am proud that, at long last, the Minister has accepted representations I have been making for so long about extra police strength.

**Mr. Bromley:** Are you and Sir Bruce married, or are you just going together.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** Subsidies to sporting organisations are expected to cost \$750,000 and \$250,000 has been set aside for subsidies for youth organisations. An amount of \$266,980 has been set aside for the National Fitness Camp and \$125,000 for youth extension work. When the Treasurer's Financial Statement is studied, it is seen that all sections of life and activity in our State have been attended to. The grant to the Playground and Recreation Association will be increased from \$50,000 to \$80,000. A total of \$1,500,000 has been provided for sporting, youth and recreation services, compared with \$840,000 last year.

The special allocation of \$200,000 provided last year out of totalisator fractions that are paid into Consolidated Revenue will not be repeated this year. Instead a special sum of up to \$500,000 will be provided from the same source to be applied as a supplement to the T.A.B. distribution to clubs. That is the point I made a while ago when I said I was expecting that the Southport Club would receive a further \$20,000 from that source, as indicated in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. The total distribution to clubs this year will be \$4,900,000 compared with \$4,300,000 in 1973-74—an equivalent of 70 per cent of prize-money for galloping clubs, 70 per cent for trotting clubs, and 55 per cent for greyhound clubs.

The Queensland Government is unique in its assistance to local government through subsidies paid on capital works undertaken by them. Some of us have had experience in local government work. Some of us have been members of councils—chairmen or mayors. My colleague on my left has been Mayor of the city of Gold Coast, and I have occupied that most important of positions—Chairman of the Albert Shire. We have at all times recognised the Queensland Government's attitude to subsidies for local government. One only has to travel to any other State in Australia to realise how generous and benevolent the Queensland Government is in the way that it provides subsidy assistance to local government.

The total paid last year was \$20,000,000. It is expected that the amount this year will be \$22,000,000. It is proposed to institute a new grants scheme to local authorities and to provide financial assistance towards operating costs of council services. A further \$5,000,000 has been set aside.

In today's economic circumstances we find ourselves in the position that local authorities cannot raise their loan funds. To the end of August they raised only 16.5 per cent of their loan allocations. However, this benevolent Government, through the Treasurer, has said, "We will help you out." The Treasurer has allocated \$45,000,000 as debenture loans, greatly assisting the loan borrowings in these difficult times. It will also help the employment position.

We in Queensland have to recognise that assistance. Chairmen or mayors of the various local authorities, as well as town clerks, would readily acknowledge that it is of great assistance when the State itself provides from its own funds half of the amount the local authorities need, which they cannot get through the ordinary borrowing channels they go to every year for funds for development works. It was of great assistance to them when our Treasurer said that he would guarantee \$45,000,000 to local authorities. If he had not done that, of course, unemployment would have reached even higher levels throughout the State.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why are you polluting that area down there with a gravel pit?

**Mr. HINZE:** I couldn't refer to the honourable member as intelligent if I tried.

For the capital works programme the Treasurer has allocated \$535,400,000 as against \$453,300,000 last year. For education, provisions total \$85,300,000 as against \$63,100,000 last year. The amount for irrigation and water supply works is expected to reach \$26,800,000 in 1974-75. We are proud of the fact that the Advancetown Dam, presently being constructed, has received an allocation this year of \$2,967,000. This major undertaking in our area will provide sufficient water for the 100,000 residents and the additional 100,000 tourists who visit the area each year. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise corrects me. Over 2,000,000 tourists visit the area each year and we have to provide water for them.

The Housing Commission will utilise \$42,800,000 for its housing programme compared with \$33,500,000 in 1973-74, an increase of \$9,200,000 or 27.6 per cent. This indicates where we stand in the housing of our young people.

The allocation for roadworks will be increased by 11.3 per cent from \$72,200,000 to \$82,600,000.

**Mr. Jensen** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** For the benefit of the honourable member for Bundaberg, it proves that this Government, recognising its responsibility, has increased its allocation to practically every department.

After many years, the Government has allocated \$1,230,000 this year for the commencement of the multi-storey block for Southport Hospital, which is estimated to cost \$9,350,000. My colleague the honourable

member for Surfers Paradise and I take some of the kudos and accept the recognition by our constituents of the part we have played in these achievements, regardless of the attitude of the honourable member for Albert, the knocker from Labrador. He never enters the Chamber without knocking someone or something. We placed constructive arguments before the Government and the Health Department and we have been successful to the extent that a major hospital is being built in our area.

Under various schemes of assistance to primary producers a total of \$28,200,000 has been provided in the following advances—

\$18,900,000 through the Agricultural Bank; \$5,500,000 from the Rural Reconstruction Fund; \$2,000,000 from the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Fund; \$67,770 from the Woolgrowers Assistance Fund; \$1,300,000 from the Assistance to Primary Producers Special Fund; and \$500,000 for farm water supplies.

A major debenture loan allocation of \$1,885,000 will be made to the Albert Shire Council this year. That area deserves it. It contains 520 square miles and extends from the New South Wales border to the boundaries of Brisbane and Beaudesert. It has continued to develop since its formation, with the amalgamation of the Nerang, Coomera, Beenleigh and Waterford areas.

And now, as this is the last time that I will have the opportunity before the election to refer to capital works completed in my particular electorate, I take this opportunity of thanking the Government, the respective Ministers, the Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council for works that I will refer to with some pride and satisfaction in their completion.

I refer to the tremendous success of the Kirra groyne built with a free grant from the State Government of some \$250,000 and completed approximately two years ago. At Coolangatta we now have the best beaches in Australia.

**Mr. Bromley:** How's the Hinze groin?

**Mr. HINZE:** What about the South Brisbane groan; never mind about the Hinze groin.

We have invited our royal visitor Prince Charles to witness a surfing carnival next Saturday. We are proud to invite royalty to our area. We will give this plenty of publicity. I was upset when I heard the Prime Minister being interviewed on television last night. I get the impression that people in the United States think that we are all Comms. Of course, we are not, and we are going to let the world know that we still accept royalty. Prince Charles, the future King of England and King of Queensland—

**Mr. Bromley:** And the King of Kingaroy.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** Prince Charles will be in my electorate on Saturday week, and he will see the best surf carnival that it would be possible to see anywhere in the world.

**Mr. Bromley:** Are you taking part?

**Mr. HINZE:** I shall be taking part, yes.

I refer now to the pumping of sand from the Tweed River to Kirra Beach. About 300,000 cubic yards have already been placed in position, and a further 200,000 cubic yards have yet to be pumped. The results have been excellent. This is one area in my electorate that is often subject to bad publicity. Every time there is a cyclone, newspaper and television cameras are rushed to the spot, and any damage sustained is given publicity in the southern States. These people seem to find great satisfaction in saying that the beaches have been washed away.

Of course, that is no longer the position. As a result of the constructive thinking, foresight, knowledge and ability of the Queensland Government, officers of the Department of Harbours and Marine, and the Gold Coast City Council, groyne are being built, and sand is being pumped back to the beaches. We are proud of the fact that this operation has been a success. All who care to come to the area next Saturday week will see the greatest carnival that it would be possible to see anywhere in Australia.

A small groyne is being built at Coolangatta Creek to assist in the build-up of sand. Protective work has been carried out by the Main Roads Department along the Kirra foreshore under a grant made by the department to the local authority. Thanks are also due to the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, who personally made inspections and took recommendations to Cabinet that funds be made available to the local authority. People living in the area now see that the Government has recognised their needs and protected them.

The groyne from the beach to Currumbin Rock has been under consideration for a long time, and it will not be long now before the old tin shed at Currumbin is removed. A deal was made with the Neumanns. They were going to shift it, but it is still there. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise and I made appropriate representations for the removal of this eyesore. After consultation with those who owned the shed, the Treasurer made funds available for its removal and the purchase of land, and for compensation for shifting. I hope that the company carries out its part of the deal and shifts the old tin shed as quickly as possible. It is an eyesore, and the sooner it is removed, the better.

We, as a Government, have played our part. We have made funds available. We now say to the owners of the shed that it is up to them to carry out their part of the deal. Incidentally, the right to put up the

old shed was granted by a Labor Government about 40 years ago. The same Government gave the right to mine the beaches for \$1 a year. This Government never repudiates deals. We have negotiated an agreement under which the shed is to be shifted. As I have said, we do not repudiate agreements.

**Mr. Tucker:** Why don't you tell Comalco that?

**Mr. HINZE:** This Government never repudiated any deal with Comalco. The Leader of the Opposition knows it; everybody knows it. I challenge any member to prove that the Government has repudiated any deal. I should know what I am talking about, because I have been involved in this matter for some time. I would have had the old shed at Currumbin knocked down years ago. However, I was told by the Minister and others in responsible positions that no deal could be repudiated. This has been drummed into me ever since I have been in this Parliament. This Government will not repudiate a deal, even if it is a crook and shady one made 30, 40 or 50 years ago by an A.L.P. Government.

The Currumbin groyne, which I inspected recently, is a great success. It cost only about \$80,000 or \$90,000. The sand is building up and the mouth of the creek is virtually permanently established. All I now ask is that R68, the area of Crown land adjacent to the new bridge at Currumbin, be made available and planned for recreational purposes by the Department of Lands and the local authority concerned. It will be a tourist attraction for people coming from New South Wales and crossing the \$2,000,000 bridge at Currumbin, which has almost been completed by two local contractors, Reg Schuster and Claude Sievers. Congratulations to them.

(Time expired.)

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If I have occasion to speak to any honourable member who is interjecting while I am on my feet, he will not stay very long in the Chamber.

**Mr. AIKEN** (Warrego) (8.36 p.m.): I have nothing but respect for the Treasurer in his presentation of the 1974 State Budget. It is the same type of respect that I have for any clever artist or showman, and no-one can deny that the Treasurer has ability in both respects.

As an economic genius, and from Budget to Budget, Queensland's Treasurer has demonstrated his toothless tactics as, with Dally Messenger dexterity, he has swerved and side-stepped the issue and the challenge of inflation and the well-being of the primary industries. His well-dressed balance sheets remind me of a beautiful synthetic blonde, nicely padded up and with plenty of glamour, making one search deep underneath to find out what is real and what is cosmetic. His

accountancy rules never vary and always follow the same pattern—never contentious, keep the primary industries quiet, and leave plenty of loop-holes for big business.

What has been the real contribution by this flag-waving, non-Advance Australia Fair, national-anthem-singing, internally-fighting, undemocratically-elected Government to the economic stability of the rural industries? This hypocritical Government for years sat idly by and watched the inland drown in a sea of debt and despair and, by its very inaction, condemned the primary industries as not worth saving. Now we find that same Government claiming the primary industries as its new-found friends, using the tactics of fear as it stirs this State against the worthy Federal Government.

The Government of Queensland has built a barrier between the urban dweller and the rural producer. I believe that the initials "C.P." only ever stood for City Party or Coastal Party, and the Country Party has never been anything but an inland division of the Liberal Party. If anyone likes to call the Country Party the National Party, the story is exactly the same.

For years the Government has been persecuting the wonderful producers of this State. Over the past years, Queensland showed itself as predominantly rural in population, production and thought, and the State prospered. We remember those days, but they are not with us now. For 18 years the stop-and-go and bust-and-boom policies of the Country-Liberal Government have flogged the people off the land and into the cities, to everyone's sorrow. Why now, I ask, do city people, the Liberals, and the National Party, as it turns its eyes towards the city voters, show contempt for the rural population?

People living in the Outback now refuse to be treated as living in isolation and as not being part of Queensland, and the National Party can only lose votes as it attempts to woo the urban voter, who would not want it at any price.

In Queensland as in Canberra since the passing of Menzies and McEwen, the Liberal and Country Parties have remained deep in strife with internal conflicts and, although they still use the flogged-out expressions of nationalisation and socialism when referring to Labor's policy, they are tending to move more and more towards similar policies of their own. But they cannot out-talk results or the respect of the world for Labor's policies of economic and social reforms, so they have resorted to stratagems of fear and stealth with tremendous spending of ready finance on propaganda, calculated to return to power the voracious wolves of big finance whom they unquestionably represent. I wonder how much "Watergate" money was spent to deny the people of this land the Government they twice demonstrated they wanted.

Despite the recent derogatory statements of the Minister for Primary Industries at the Rockhampton graingrowers conference, Federal Labor policy has made substantial gains for our rural industries. I am sorry the Minister is not here at the moment but, trying to be what I would call mischievous, and looking like a mad bull in a mob of steers, he insinuated that the Whitlam Government had deprived primary industries of \$1,000 million by the withdrawal of subsidies, allowances, concessions, the super-phosphate bounty and the petrol subsidy. But our worthy Minister did not go on to say that this \$1,000 million has not been lost to the nation and is still in existence, unlike the \$1,000 million that the primary industries of this State alone lost during the recent drought and period of crashing commodity prices, when this Government, in its sleep-walking way, blatantly refused to help when help was so vitally needed. People were ruined and millions of livestock perished.

Of course, there has been a significant silence from the Minister for Primary Industries, the Premier and his Government, on the merits of devaluation, so apparently they see this as a measure of benefit to the Queensland economy and to the nation generally. As the State is so dependent on export earnings, farmers and miners realise the competitive position devaluation has placed Queensland in on world markets. Our products can now be reduced in price on world markets without loss to Queensland producers. Wheat growers, sugar producers and dairy products exporters can now expect a better rate of return for their products and much greater world competition for them.

Devaluation should also eventually allow the Australian Wool Corporation to sell at a profit the large stocks of wool it has accumulated, proving the realistic thinking of the Whitlam Government on price stabilisation in a period of poor demand. Unfortunately, bans on the importation of beef into the markets of Europe and Japan and the slump in prices in the United States of America could slow the response to the Australian devaluation, but let us remember that there are 250,000,000 people in the Common Market countries and 120,000,000 in Japan and stockpiles could diminish very quickly. Of course, devaluation will undoubtedly bring some problems; but realistically it must be supported as an aid to the flagging current economic situation and must lead to increased production and greater export earnings. It will also undoubtedly lead to a lessening of imports and prove an instant stimulus to the many industries that are vitally affected. I refer particularly to the textile industry and the motor trade. With increased capital inflow, devaluation must inject money back into the economy and substantially reduce unemployment.

I believe, too, that there will be greater understanding and appropriate action from the Federal Government on the problems of

super tax, high interest rates and education allowances now that the flames of inflation have been substantially dampened down. However defensible devaluation may be in the interests of the Australian economy, we must realise that, although our exports become cheaper, our trading partners throughout the world sell to us now on a 12 per cent dearer market and it will not be entirely pleasing to them. We must take this factor into consideration. But this, together with the cutting adrift from the American dollar and establishing a day-to-day fresh rate for our currency, will lead the world to realise the importance of this nation in global competition and decision-making.

I believe devaluation is a gigantic step taken by the Australian Government in commanding greater world respect for Australia as a top nation. Already there has been a stimulating effect on producers, on stock markets and on trade unions. In terms of national accounting, devaluation has been a most appropriate move, one designed to restore our balance of payments to foreign reserves.

Devaluation has caused the Premier to bite back on his words about the Australian Government, as wheat stabilisation, wool stabilisation and other calculated measures of industry stability win more friends to Labor's cause.

To those honourable members who think I am flogging a well-worn subject tonight, namely, primary industries, I point out that it was the Queensland State Government that almost forced them out of existence and that has worn them to tatters. If the State has a successful Budget, it should give primary industries the credit for it because they have been the greatest force in bringing about the prosperity that we have enjoyed to date.

I ask: where is this Government's worthwhile consideration towards the control of inflation? Is it in this Budget or in any previous Budget over the past few years? Is it forthcoming from the Labor-criticising obstructionist Premier, or from any movement among the back-benchers, who feebly cry, "We are part of the Government"? They remain childishly happy because for them the situation is comfortable. Inflation is only a stink-bomb for them to throw at Gough Whitlam, Frank Crean, or Dr. Cairns.

As pointed out earlier today by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Isis, only the other day the Queensland Government, by substantially increasing its mining royalties, admitted to the world that it had allowed the State to be robbed for years. How can it, after almost 18 years of neglectful, pitiful management of the economy, be expected to resolve a world-wide problem?

The Government revels in the use of the expression "inflation", and for the Government, particularly for the Treasurer, it means easy financial management. For the Government's friends in big business, who use inflation as an excuse for earning higher profits, it means the jacking-up of prices to such an extent that today we see the worst profit plundering that this State has ever known. Despite a world glut of beef, Queenslanders are paying higher prices than ever before. The same applies to woollen articles, and bread can be thrown in for good measure. Prices charged are nothing less than scandalous. I pity the poor Queensland housewife as she battles to budget on her diminishing weekly income. With the price of wholesale meat down from 50c to 15c a lb. and bullocks down by \$200 and more, the meat industry now claims that benefits which should be handed on to housewives are being absorbed in higher handling charges. The same story is told by all, from the baker to the candlestick maker.

If housewives consider that food prices are scandalous, what a scandalous Government we have which rejected an opportunity to control prices, screams about wage increases and allows blatant profiteering to the detriment of those who are most vulnerable to it, the unprotected housewives.

The not-easy-to-forget rural recession that found so many cracks in the outdated policies of the National Party, and raised barely a Liberal eyebrow, sent many people bankrupt and chased country businessmen and rural workers to the city, and forced many people to diversify in beef production, at the same time driving them deeper than ever into economic strife.

Unfortunately some of our best sheep lands are now devoid of sheep and are producing only cattle. Generally, Queensland's inland economy, from land suitability to employment, is best adapted to wool. With inland processing works so necessary, there is a need to encourage greater wool production in the State. Unfortunately the thoughts of the Government do not run on these lines. It is more concerned with gerrymandering, working out who is to be elected to Cabinet or appointed as Agent-General in London, baiting Gough Whitlam or trying to work out how to kill off Clem Jones. No wonder Queensland is a claimant State. It should not be forgotten that Queensland can also lay claim to having the most undemocratically elected Government in the Commonwealth.

I turn now to wool—and what a wonderful subject it is! At long last a price stabilisation scheme has been introduced to cover the entire Australian wool clip. This has a tremendous effect on Queensland as its wool clip is almost entirely high-class Merino wool. The Whitlam Government has made history with woolgrowers now assured that wool will not be allowed to fall below a guaranteed

minimum price. The Government has guaranteed that 21 micron wool is assured of 250c per kilogram on a clean, scoured basis. If that is worked out, it means that the minimum greasy price for the whole clip is 133c a kilo, or 60c a lb. Growers agreed—they were not forced into it—to a 5 per cent levy on all sales, whether by auction or private treaty. This is designed to stabilise any Government outlay that could be necessary to meet the reserve price. The principle has thus been established where, with grower finance and Government guarantee, world wool processors are now fully aware that the huge fluctuations which, at times, spelt near doom to the industry, will be a thing of the past. Although the Federal Government has stated that a reserve fund of \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 could be required, no fixed limit has been established. In other words, the Whitlam Government has given an unqualified assurance to the wool industry that, regardless of the circumstances, it will stand behind it. The result, of course, has been most stimulating.

**Mr. Rae:** Who started it?

**Mr. AIKEN:** The Minister should get to London. He will be a success over there. He was no good here.

The result has been stimulating to the industry. Orders firmed sharply and the confidence of growers and speculators has now been restored. Although many woolgrowers have expressed disappointment at not achieving a reserve of 300c per kilo, the Government certainly has created a major breakthrough towards beating the bogey of price instability that has plagued the market since the foundation of the wool industry in Australia.

Nor does the matter end at a reserve price. The Australian Wool Corporation will continue with a flexible wool price even when wool is selling above the present agreed minimum of 250c per kilo. Now that the wool industry throughout the world is aware of a minimum price, a feeling of security and stability will be created amongst all sections of the trade, with growers and processors able to plan with confidence. Of course, this applies equally to the wonderful producer in our back country.

Provision has also been made for the Australian Wool Corporation to release wool for sale to ensure an even flow to the market, with power to trade independently of the market should the occasion require it. The grower contribution of 5 per cent is a continuing tax. Growers do not seem to mind paying the tax either, and it will be levied even if prices far exceed the reserve of 250c. Thus, the Australian Wool Corporation should soon be a commercially viable marketing board.

In the present uncertain economic climate, I believe a wool reserve price is completely necessary. Although growers might argue that 300c would have guaranteed the sale

of wool at a profit, at least an example has been set. Without doubt, a renegotiable price could be available for the 1975-76 season. Twelve months ago woolgrowers would have been happy with a reserve price of 300c per kilo and set it for years ahead. However, with the current rising costs and charges, next season's reserve of 300c could perhaps not be a paying proposition. So the opportunity for renegotiation remains open.

It appears that the United Graziers' Association is not so united—really it is disorganised—in its attitude towards wool-marketing reform and acquisition. A referendum has now been requested on the matter. In fact, ballot-papers are now circulated in the West. It appears that woolgrowers are happy to call on Government assistance when in trouble but seek to prevent any Government participation in how public money should be applied in guarantees, loans, or grants. Today, in view of the world's troubled areas, no industry can stand in isolation. Whether the wool industry likes it or not, at least some participation by a Government interested in its affairs is completely necessary.

I harp on the subject of wool because wool and its future are so fundamentally important to the nation generally and to this State in particular. I believe that total acquisition is necessary to protect growers and the nation from unscrupulous market manipulators, whose avaricious ruthlessness has resulted in a scared and now scarred industry.

Clip disposal, of course, whether by auction or other means is another matter entirely, but it must be accepted by all sections of the community that Government assistance to rural industries, irrespective of the political party in power, will in future be related to the national interest.

I believe that greater awareness of primary industry living conditions must be made available to Governments and the urban community. In this way tolerance and understanding of the true circumstances will enable justified assistance measures so often associated with our accident-prone primary industries. Assistance related to need and every thought towards effective income stabilisation are paramount primary industry needs, but no mention is made of this in the Budget.

I believe that by firmly handling the stabilisation of wheat and wool values and by its ability to act quickly when necessary, as was demonstrated by the recent devaluation, the Whitlam Government surely has refuted any claims of rural bias. The serious economic situation inherited by the Australian Labor Party has naturally limited its capacity to respond to the balanced natural development that Australia vitally needs. Thus I am at a loss to see how the Federal Opposition and the Government of this State can truthfully substantiate their claims of a Labor rural bias.

Long-term low-interest—and in some cases no-interest—loans to finance rural purposes have been provided. A farm incentive reserve fund is to be established. The Federal Government has examined and will implement methods to create greater income stability. Long-term trade deals with overseas countries have been sought and found. Wool marketing and wheat stabilisation schemes have been implemented and it is certainly not my fault that local wool processing plants have not been created in Western Queensland. Nobody has worked harder and achieved more than Labor's Dr. Patterson in helping to settle the problems of our sugar industry, as was well demonstrated today by the honourable member for Isis. Wheat research was recently granted \$1,100,000 to finance a programme into wheat matters.

Do I have to tell honourable members how the Royal Flying Doctor Service battled for so many years under the inadequate recognition of the past Federal coalition Governments and this State Government? Now, with full understanding, it will receive over \$2,000,000 in operational subsidies from the Whitlam Government.

**Mr. Hanson:** It's a wonder the honourable member for Gregory didn't do something.

**Mr. AIKEN:** That is right. He wouldn't know.

As flying angels the Royal Flying Doctor Service, covering hundreds of thousands of square miles of the Outback, has battled like billy-o to maintain its service, with little recognition from this Government. Never was one word spoken in support of its efforts when recently it announced it would have to cease operations unless instant support was available. This support was provided by the Whitlam Government. Apparently this so-called, self-styled National-Party-dominated Government, which is so interested in self-preservation and in working out the date of the next election, could not care less whether the Royal Flying Doctor Service or its associated School of the Air lived or died.

Nor in the interests of the people he claims so strongly that he represents did the Premier offer the use of his luxury official aeroplane should the Royal Flying Doctor Service look like closing down. This State-owned plane has been the greatest medium of blatant, one-sided political campaigning ever devised. It is reserved for the Premier and his Ministers. It is never offered to the Opposition; nor are alternative fair measures available to the Labor Party. In fact, severe restrictions in limited State air-travel availability make sure that Labor's programme is kept well confined. I am positive that Gough Whitlam will receive full marks from those in the back country for making funds available to keep the Flying Doctor Service in the air and the School of the Air in business.

Many industrially oriented people in the cities believe that rural industries are of minor importance. They do not realise that it is the primary industries that have made their industrial progress possible. Unfortunately, too many academics engaged in completely unproductive work see fit to criticise and condemn those who are producers, with the result that the image of the farmer is severely tarnished. It is obvious, of course, that today a great wave of concern and discontent is sweeping the farmlands of Queensland, and an ugly mood has developed in the rural areas. Many rural leaders are talking of marching, of withholding stock and produce, and of taking other forms of direct action against Federal Labor Government policies.

Until recently, buoyant incomes had to a significant extent cushioned the impact of the generally changing economic situation and the effects of inflation, but the deterioration in the meat and wool markets has come about so swiftly, and with such savage impact, that producers and speculators have been caught in a serious economic embarrassment. This has left producers feeling the impact of high inflation, tight rural loans, high interest rates, and a general slowing of demand. These factors naturally have added heavily to farm input costs and have severely affected the competitiveness of Queensland's rural commodities on world markets.

With inflation the nation's and the economy's greatest enemy, it appeared that contraction policies were necessary, with fiscal, monetary and exchange measures specially designed to control and break-down the harshness known as inflation now being forced upon the community generally and the rural section in particular. I believe that with the continuation of sensible economic policies, the acceptance by the community of general restraint, and the recognition that the fight against inflation will have to be a national effort and a hard one, Australia will weather the difficult period that lies ahead.

Farmers on the march and farmers in an ugly mood are features reminiscent of a time only three short years ago when there were demonstrations against the economic policies of the McMahon Federal Government and the present State Government. Such demonstrations were common, and some of the loudest protests came from the area represented by the Minister for Primary Industries, who today cries wolf at the Federal Government. What a pity the Minister, his Government and his colleagues in the National Party were more provocative than protective. Instead of concentrating on the destruction of the Whitlam Government, it is a pity that they did not attempt to help those who so badly need assistance today.

I do not know whether Mr. Whitlam now regrets his famous saying that farmers had never had it so good. In reality, however,

there was a great deal of truth in what he said. In actual fact, 1972 and 1973 were the first years since World War II in which there was any appreciable reduction in the gross debts structure of Australian farmers, which resulted in the highest liquidation of debts in farming history. A remarkable feature of this period was the increased capital spending by farmers. Without doubt this would have increased further but for the shortage of labour and materials. This shortage was most unfortunate.

But we must consider that, in addition to being important in production, the rural population has a high consumer demand, and when goods and services become available normally, the farmer will be an important employer and, with the rural work-force, an important purchaser of goods and all types of services. So farmers must be considered not only as wonderful producers but also as big consumers.

Here, I say, is the proof, backed by statistics, that Mr. Whitlam was quite right in his statement that farmers have never had it so good. Or has the Liberal-Country Party political hypocrisy become so unbearable that they fail to face the truth and fail to tell the truth?

Remember, too, that it was the Liberal-Country Party Government which only two years ago did not care whether the country dweller was here or was not here. Now it sheds crocodile tears because the Labor Party has withdrawn certain concessions and asked the rural producer to assert his professed independence and really show that he can stand on his own two feet. I am proud of the results, because the farmer is showing that he can fight and the demand for land proves that the farming industry is viable and that the farmer wants to expand.

For many years the wonderful farmer has been used and abused by the uncaring Government of this State. Now that his true worth and his ability to fight back and to produce have been demonstrated, he needs every protection. He must be assured of his rightful place in a modern community and treated as the State's greatest collateral for community health and prosperity. We need the farmers as the nation's greatest profit earners. So I say to the Government, "For goodness sake, look after them, protect them and preserve them."

With a great dependency on beef exports, Queensland has been heavily affected by changes in overseas currency rates, and, of course, that applies to all types of trading. But who will deny that today's high cost of living is associated with food prices occasioned by shortages? This has really accelerated inflation to such an alarming degree that it now threatens the future of millions of people throughout the world. As the caretakers of the State's greatest income earners, the Treasurer and the Government presided over the near ruin of the States primary industries and undoubtedly contributed heavily to the insidious evil of

inflation. In contradiction of the Treasurer's Budget statements, one finds a mountain of facts attesting to the poor performance of this shambles of a Government on behalf of primary industries in their time of need. By its indifference, it allowed production to slump, and the resultant shortages have caused the high prices of today.

Last year the Premier of this State, flying a State-owned aeroplane and using public money, whipped around Queensland influencing people to vote against the prices referendum. It is now well established that the National Party, as the friend of big business, used the Premier as a positive leader and a willing tool to the most corrupt and destructive forces to a fair go for all people that have ever been known in this State. By obstruction of the referendum, the means have been made available to big companies, corporations and cartels to blantly fix prices, push up values, and exploit the consumers of this State—and that means you and me, Mr. Wharton. And whether it is a loaf of bread, a piece of cake or a block of land, there is the smell of big money, and that money is not for you and me but for the chosen few—the friends of the Premier.

No-one could ever object to a fair margin of return on capital but the big companies of today compete not in quality but in profit return. As an illustration, I cite Broken Hill Pty. Limited, the great friend of the National Party and probably Australia's only semblance of a multi-national company, with a possible profit of \$100,000,000 or more this trading year. So the Premier of this State has by craft become a super salesman and has sold himself to the electorate as a guardian of the country people. He inveigled himself into a position of acceptability and then promptly sold the people down the drain to big business. Whether the people of Queensland like it or not, they have been cheated and conned. Who wanted to be cheated and conned? But they have been, by their own Premier.

Despite the statements of our Premier, the Treasurer and national leaders such as Mr. Snedden and Mr. Anthony, their claims of interest in the common man cannot possibly be true. Allowing for the inflation rate, there is an accepted 7 per cent growth rate in the national economy. Where is this money going and where is it lodging? Is it going to the common man or into the widely heralded, massive profits, dividends and bonuses being recorded by companies represented by the Premier, the Treasurer, Mr. Snedden and Mr. Anthony—the real repositories? Is this another classic example of the rich getting richer and the people—you and I—getting touched? The old Australian saying, "Give them a fair go, mate" certainly does not apply to the money-hungry sharks who control Australia's major companies today in their wild scramble to produce record profits.

It is not a matter of the common people getting a go; they are being got at, and how much worse off would they be but for the efforts of the Labor Party, which, despite the frustration of an enemy Senate, has demonstrated that it is capable of marvelous reform. May it continue in its programme of reform and of assistance to the little man!

Despite the pressures of a mounted programme of hate, smear and fear, I sincerely hope that the little man remains solid in the knowledge that for him it is a Labor Government or nothing. Otherwise, he will finish as nothing. It is now apparent that those who refused in the recent referenda to give control of prices and wages are now highly alarmed and are growing vocal. I hope they realise how they were conned by Queensland's Premier who was anti-everything with a Labor flavour.

Regardless of his destroying tactics towards Labor, he is now causing bitterness to many people in the knowledge that they were positively conned. Apart from pulling faces and waving his hands, what has this State's leader—or should I say "bleeder"?—really done to help control inflation in a situation where he claims he has this State's solid backing? That need not be answered. In spite of all the rantings of our aspiring secessionist Premier, Australia has been one of the few countries able to build up imports and use huge overseas reserves to overcome many shortages, and the Australian dollar commands great respect in overseas countries. In fact, while Britain and most of the established countries of the Western world have received a terrible buffeting economically, the Australian dollar has remained remarkably sound.

Inflation all over the world is forcing all nations to tighten their belts, with balance of payments a major problem particularly in oil-starved countries. In this respect, Australia is the lucky country, having 70 per cent of its petroleum requirements and unlimited coal. Unfortunately, we in Australia cannot remain in isolation from the world, and world inflation, and world economic and currency problems become problems that we are forced to share.

There is no academic cure to inflation, nor is there a set of rules that can be applied to control it. Although the Premier is fond of pointing out the causes of inflation, he has not moved to provide a legislative panacea in any shape or form. Living in a make-believe world, he cries "Wolf! Wolf!" and makes other noisy scary sounds that are not designed to help the Government or to control inflation.

Where are the disincentives to inflation in this Budget, which the Treasurer boasts is so good for the State of Queensland? It is typical of the National-Liberal Government, in its hypocritical way, to accuse the Federal Labor Government of fostering inflation and promoting unemployment while

it conveniently forgets its own spate of inflation to a level of 20 per cent in 1960 when there was mass unemployment and many small businessmen faced financial ruin. Are we forgetting the 1970 so-called deflationary Budget of the Gorton Government, which really set the pace for the present national inflationary spiral? Have we forgotten the "crash" Budget brought down by McMahon and Snedden, which forced unemployment to misery levels with the result that the people called for a Labor Government in 1972? Do Government members think that inflation can be solved in Australia while other nations are disrupted by inflation and while Great Britain is bankrupt and Japan's economy is in tatters? Is it possible perhaps that Mr. Whitlam and Dr. Cairns are really handling the situation fairly well?

Foreign investment, which is held to be so necessary to so many of this Government's developmental projects, has now been exposed as a greedy, rapacious, enveloping monster seeking only to rape and swamp our State and to take over our reserves and our land while enticing the inland population to the cities and coastal areas. Our rural labour force has been ignored by this Government and is now disenchanted with it because of the lack of school and medical services. It has been forced to move to the cities and coastal complexes, thereby creating a seemingly unstoppable drift. An embarrassing urban situation has been created, one in which there is a tremendous shortage of rural help to gather our many harvests.

Is it any wonder that in this Government's so-called understanding of rural problems it becomes a matter of dialogue with dunces? The situation has taken nearly 18 years to develop and grown worse each year—particularly in relation to the dunces.

Whilst inflation is undoubtedly the major issue in our economic stability, and forms the springboard for the National-Liberal Government's attack on Labor's fiscal and monetary policies, the simple truth is that the policies of the Liberal and National Parties offer no solution.

I ask: how could a voluntary freeze on prices and incomes be achieved when such fantastic demands are made on goods and services, thereby forcing the cost of these items sky high? This is just not logical economic thinking. Of course there never has been any logical economic thinking from this Government or from its Treasurer. Whilst Mr. Anthony and Mr. Snedden might claim that the coalition Government had a lower rate of inflation, the truth is that they also brought about stagnation and perpetrated severe social injustices on pensioners and others in their health and education needs.

I wonder how much the tremendous outflow of capital from the oil-consuming countries to the oil-producing nations has influenced inflation. A great deal of Middle East money has flooded into investment

markets, particularly in Europe and the Far East. Eventually this will bring about worldwide manipulations of international currencies, which have already caused Australia embarrassment in trade. I wonder how much embarrassment has been caused to Japan, our greatest customer, as it still reels from its oil difficulties and other problems.

The Australian Industry Development Corporation has been promoted by the Whitlam Government with the intention of providing Government money for Australian business projects. It will fill the role of a development financier and act as an investment backer, with the specific aim of limiting the former heavy shovelling into Australia of overseas finance which, through indiscriminate Government, threatened the very existence of our nation and established foreign seizure of our State's mining and other resources.

As a result of the Australian Government's backing of national resources, a hard line of resistance is now being maintained, with the insistence that 51 per cent of Australian equity be established in all business projects. This will ensure that Australia remains in Australian hands. No further sell-outs will be tolerated. How vastly different is this concept of honour and national pride in Australian ownership from the contemptuous, rotten sell-out of our national resources by the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government and this Government for a lousy 30 pieces of silver. How inspiring and warming were the recent words of Mr. John Valder, the Chairman of the Sydney Stock Exchange, who said that he thought it was a good thing to have a Labor Government in power.

The Treasurer of this State, of course, objects to the formation of the Australian Industry Development Corporation and the principles behind it, because A.I.D.C. seeks a more direct role, as our leader pointed out, in the investment of life insurance funds and in securing greater finance to buy back Australia and put the farm together again. What a blow-out our Treasurer has had in splurging at will among his corporate mates, State Government Insurance funds to the tune of thousands of millions of dollars, with never one cent going to the real stalwarts of this State in our primary industries. These huge resources, representing the funds of the people, could be put to no better purpose than by being channelled into Australian-owned development and Australian resources handled by an Australian Government having a conscience and being willing and able to work for its people.

Labor demands development and the people demand development of natural resources with a more rationalised and diversified allocation of the resources, with every thought directed to obtaining benefits from our national and natural advantages and increasing our own efficiency to cope with overseas competitors. That is what Australia and Queensland have lacked and been denied. It is what Australian businessmen want; it is why the common

people elected a common people's Government to act for them in this way. Unfortunately, even with sound Labor guidance, the nation has been unable to escape the paralysing effects of world-wide inflation occasioned by shortages of food, basic fuel supplies, steel, paper, and chemicals, coupled with a general world monetary system that has gone haywire, seemingly with little prospects of any improvements in the near future.

Until the advent of the Labor Government, this nation was being bought up wholesale by foreign capital, which engulfed our economy and appropriated our resources. It is the duty of the people of the State to hold at bay the plundering, voracious wolves of the resource-investment world who seek, for personal gain, to strip and rape our country, which formerly was so vulnerable but is now protected by the Australian Labor Government. May God give it greater strength. I ask this Government to carefully consider the "get bigger or get out" tactics still being exercised in take-overs—tactics still being perpetrated in other than the best national interests.

It is a shame that in the interests of this State generally and the rural industries in particular this Government has not instituted overseas trade centres, where a watchdog staff could follow market trends, watch cattle population, and forecast accurate future prices and demands for grain and wool in particular. If the State Government does not act along these lines, we can expect nothing better than traditional periods of sudden boom and bust in our primary industry fortunes.

I admit I have taken every opportunity to acquaint honourable members with the enormous problems of the maintenance of our most important revenue-earning industries. I have attempted to point out the value of these industries to our State and the ignorance of this Government to these obvious problems. Now, tonight we have a debate on the great Passover—the 1974 Budget.

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumba) (9.32 p.m.): We have just had the misfortune of listening to the greatest load of tripe that has ever been delivered in this Chamber. For the past hour the honourable member for Warrego has spent most of his time denigrating the State Government, the Premier, the Treasurer, and any other Minister he could think about, but lauding the efforts of the Whitlam Government.

It would be true to say that this Budget has been prepared in the shadow of inflation. It is a credit to the Treasurer and his staff that a Budget such as this has been introduced, at a minimum cost in taxation and services, to provide the maximum benefits possible to Queenslanders.

The economy of Queensland is in a very sound position—something which honourable members opposite must acknowledge. However, the economy of Australia as a whole

is not very encouraging. One would imagine that in these times the Federal Government would show some financial restraint, yet it is spending money as if it is going out of fashion. After wasting \$1,300,000 on a ridiculous painting known as "Blue Poles", the people controlling the National Gallery have shown how irresponsible they are by proposing to purchase another abstract painting for \$646,000 from an American art dealer.

There is no doubt about it: the Americans must be clapping their hands about the fact that this Government is in power in Canberra, because they are making more money out of it than they have ever made out of any Government. The chairman of the Australian National Gallery Interim Council should be asked to resign over this, and the other members of his council should be dismissed.

Perhaps the members of the A.L.P. Government are the only people who think that inflation is not real. Mrs. Whitlam said it was all hoo-ha. She can afford to say that on \$700 a week, with the Prime Minister earning another \$56,000 a year as his share. It is interesting to learn that Mrs. Whitlam has a private secretary, whose salary of \$12,000 a year is paid by the Australian people, to help her earn her salary. That is not a bad effort!

The Prime Minister has contributed his share to inflation. In his first 19 months in office his overseas trips have cost this country \$500,000. His latest trip to the United States will cost God knows how much. I have a list here of overseas trips by Federal Ministers for the past 12 months. Senator Willesee heads the list with seven trips; Mr. Crean, five; Dr. Cairns, four; and Mr. Whitlam, only four this year. He must be slipping!

**Mr. Gumm:** What about the one with the Murray Grey bull?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I will tell honourable members later about his trip to Japan in October 1973, when he took the Murray Grey bull to present to the Red Chinese. I know he took the honourable member for Lytton. It is debatable who was the biggest bull on the aircraft. I know who was the heaviest one, but who represented the biggest load of bull? There is no doubt about it: that 707 flight should go down in history.

When one sees the complete list I have of overseas jaunts by Federal Ministers, it is amazing to think that people in this Chamber should complain about the Premier's aircraft.

The Leader of the Opposition complained bitterly today during his Budget speech about the use of the Government aircraft by the Premier. In a State the size of Queensland fast transport is necessary to enable the Premier and other Ministers to visit any area of the State as quickly as possible. The aircraft is not for the sole use of the Premier,

as the Leader of the Opposition tried to make out; it is for the use of Ministers of the Crown in the administration of their portfolios.

During the disastrous floods last January and February the Premier was able to visit many areas, see at first hand what damage had occurred, make a quick assessment of the problem, and authorise whatever help and assistance he thought was necessary. Imagine trying to assess flood damage in remote areas by the use of a commercial aircraft! The time-table may not even suit.

An interesting sidelight of the flood was the trip to Mt. Isa by the Leader of the Opposition, ostensibly to examine flood damage in Mt. Isa and surrounding districts and to show his concern for country people. As we were told by one other honourable member, the real reason was to heal a split that had occurred over the selection of a candidate for the next State election. We know that the honourable member for Mt. Isa is retiring. The Leader of the Opposition was entertained at chicken-and-champagne dinners while people on the outskirts of Mt. Isa could not even buy a loaf of bread.

While complaining about the Government aircraft, the Leader of the Opposition conveniently forgets the facilities he enjoys that Leaders of the Opposition under A.L.P. Governments did not enjoy. When Sir Francis Nicklin was Leader of the Opposition he was denied the use of a car, a driver and a Press secretary. Under the National-Liberal Government, the Leader of the Opposition has been supplied with a car, a driver and a Press secretary. I have no quarrel with this. I agree that he is entitled to those facilities. But when he complains about the use of the Government aircraft, he should remember that the facilities he enjoys have been granted by a Government whose leaders, when in Opposition, got nothing from Labor Governments.

**Mr. Lee:** The Q.C.E. has instructed members of the A.L.P. not to interject on you. That is an absolute fact.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The Q.C.E. is terrified of me because it knows that while I am here I will expose it for what it is—a Communist-dominated body dedicated to the destruction of this State and to giving the State away.

All members of this Parliament have been given facilities designed to assist them in their electorates. I agree with this. I refer to the secretaries and electoral offices which have greatly improved the service that members of Parliament can give in their electorates. I did not realise the value of a secretary until mine went on holidays last week. People sometimes have great difficulty in contacting members, particularly those who do not sit on their backsides during recess but move around. A secretary is usually available during normal office hours. People can refer their problems to the secretary and

have some of the minor ones attended to almost immediately. The Government realises its responsibilities to the people and continually endeavours to improve the quality of service given by members on both sides of the Chamber to their constituents.

I register a strong protest against the Leader of the Opposition being given the opportunity to ask the first three questions without notice each day. I do not mind if he is given the opportunity to ask the first question—that is fair enough—but after that he should take his turn. The Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Leader of the Government, the Government Whip and the Opposition Whip are not given special preference, nor are back-benchers. I think that the Leader of the Opposition should be given the first call to ask one question, but then he should take his chance. He uses his privilege by ranting and blustering, and glancing anxiously all the time at the Press gallery to see if he is going over. Of course, 90 per cent of the questions he asks are handed to him by the Trades Hall. This also applies to the briefs handed to members of the Opposition. They are also handed questions of no constructive use, which are merely designed to embarrass the Government and Ministers.

One of the most heartening features of the Budget is that rail fares and freights are not to be increased. As the earnings of railway employees have increased it must be realised that the railways will again record a deficit. The 1973-74 operations resulted in a loss of \$38,000,000. Wage increases of \$11,000,000 played a part in this. Prolonged wet weather was also responsible for a further drop of \$5,000,000 in estimated receipts.

I have heard would-be A.L.P. politicians in my electorate bleating about the inadequacies of public transport and claiming that people do not care about the cost as long as they get decent facilities. That is absolute rubbish. People do care what they pay for transport, and, whether it is good or bad, they do not want to pay through the nose for it. We have heard members of the A.L.P., both inside and outside this Chamber, complaining about the electrification of the railways. Expenditure on electrification and associated works from 1949 to 1957 inclusive, under an A.L.P. Government, was \$3,199,318. From 1958 to 1974, under this Government expenditure has been \$4,086,000.

**Mr. K. W. Hooper:** They do not like to hear that.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course not.

On quadruplication of railway lines, the A.L.P. spent \$5,723,939 from 1951 to 1957, whilst this Government spent \$11,000,000 from 1958 to 1964. It must be obvious to all members on both sides of the Chamber that before any electrification of the railways can be carried out, it is very necessary to

have quadruplication of lines. I believe, however, that before the electrification of the railways is fully implemented, we should consider those areas that do not enjoy a railway service at present. I refer particularly to the Redcliffe Peninsula. For many years there has been talk of a rail link to Redcliffe, and successive Governments, both A.L.P. and National-Liberal, have not taken any positive steps to extend the railway to the Redcliffe Peninsula.

Various people have put forward many ideas and plans for the location of the line, and some even have plans showing the positions of stations. One proposal is that the railway line should run along Hornibrook Esplanade on the foreshores of Clontarf, extending from Sandgate and crossing Hayes Inlet. This would be ideal except for the very high cost of resumptions for right of way in both Sandgate and Redcliffe. In fact, it would be astronomical, and the construction of a railway line in this area would require unlimited millions of dollars.

I believe, as do many others, that a route from Narangba through the industrial estate, where provision has already been made for a siding, linking up with Deception Bay, then on to Redcliffe through Kippa-Ring, is the ideal plan. In the first place, when the Narangba Industrial Estate is fully developed, a fairly large work-force will be required, and the surrounding area will, I believe, supply that force. In addition, people from Redcliffe and Deception Bay who work in Brisbane and now travel by public transport would certainly welcome the opportunity of using a fast, efficient rail service.

The parking situation in Brisbane is fairly acute, and the stage will soon be reached at which people will have to park in the suburbs and use public transport that is now available to visit the centre of the city. Redcliffe is a fast-growing city of approximately 39,000, with that figure expected to increase to 56,500 in 1987. At the present time, the citizens of Redcliffe are totally dependent upon a bus service for public transport, both inside and outside the city. It is interesting to learn that 90 per cent of bus trips outside the Redcliffe Peninsula terminate at the Sandgate Railway Station, where the journey is continued by rail.

When the population of Redcliffe increases to the expected 56,500, public transport beyond the peninsula will need to at least double the present number of trips. Consequently, a public transport system providing a streamlined service will be a necessity. Of course, a rail link, using either electric or diesel trains, could provide such a service.

Whilst I am dealing with rail services, I might say that I hope that any proposal to electrify the railway system north of Brisbane includes the town of Caboolture. I have heard that Petrie is to be the terminus for electric trains on the north side of the city. I know that there has to be a start

and a finish somewhere when the first electrification takes place, but I hope that electrification of the railways at least as far as Caboolture will be carried out as soon as possible.

Before continuing my remarks on the Budget, I should like to make one or two observations. The Leader of the Opposition stated in Cairns recently that the A.L.P. will make unemployment in Queensland a major issue at the next State election. What he did not say was that his Federal colleagues were largely responsible for the unemployment that exists today, not only in Queensland but throughout the whole of Australia. Last August, the unemployment figure for Australia rose by 13,565, and people are now losing their jobs at the rate of 4,000 a month. The growth of unemployment is due to a combination of factors—the large rash of strikes, the continuing wage increases, and the credit squeeze.

The Federal Government is unable to handle the economic problems that confront Australia today because of its policies of deliberately creating an intolerable rate of inflation and the high interest rates that have led to economic dislocation. When the Federal A.L.P. Government took office in December 1972, inflation was approximately 4.6 per cent and falling. Now it is rising rapidly and could even reach 25 per cent, or perhaps even higher, by the end of the year. This has been brought about by the Federal Government's blundering mismanagement of the economy.

Mr. Whitlam apparently believes that everyone should practice restraint except the Federal Government. He proposes during this session of Federal Parliament to establish eight commissions, two boards, one council, an Australian Government insurance office, an export bank, a curriculum development centre, an academic salaries tribunal, a pharmaceutical corporation and an Australian development assistance agency, each one, of course, with a few places reserved on it for the boys. This is in addition to the multitude of boards and committees that have already been set up since the A.L.P. took office in 1972.

Just who is governing this country—the Federal Parliament, or these boards that have been set up? They have all been staffed with a couple of Labor stalwarts to make certain that any decisions reached are in favour with the A.L.P. Even the Leader of the Opposition in this State is nothing more than a mouthpiece for the Federal Government. I almost said "mousepiece", which he is after allowing the 3½ per cent to be taken out of his salary as a result of the decision of the Labor-in-Politics Convention in Cairns.

The honourable gentleman is constantly pushing the Federal Government's policy of confrontation with the States. Moves to centralise control over roads, railways, public transport systems, education, hospitals and

housing are all supported by the Leader of the Opposition, and it is quite clear that the Federal Government intends to pursue these centralist policies and create more power for Canberra.

The attack on the electoral system confirms this. When the Labor Government's electoral reforms were recently put to the people by referendum, they were defeated overwhelmingly. So now a back-door attack has begun. Members of the Opposition in this Chamber and members of the Federal Parliament have claimed continually that the electoral boundaries in this State have been gerrymandered by the National-Liberal Government. The A.L.P. should know a fair bit about gerrymanders, because in 1949, here in Queensland, it perpetrated the greatest electoral fraud in the history of not only Queensland politics but also Australian politics. It was known as the Electoral Districts Act of 1949, and it was a scheme devised to keep the A.L.P. in office, despite a large swing in public opinion against it. It was carried out so thoroughly that the A.L.P. won 42 seats with 46.5 per cent of the votes, while the Liberal and Country Parties won 31 seats with 49.7 per cent of the votes. I challenge any member of the Opposition to deny those figures.

Briefly, the quotas of western seats were lowered considerably to 4,600 because the A.L.P. had numerous A.W.U. organisers in the West. They had organised the pastoral and mining industries, and they acted as A.L.P. agents. Of course, the A.L.P. won nine out of 10 western seats as a result of that frustration of democracy. Now the Leader of the Opposition—

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Which one?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The new Leader of the Opposition accuses this Parliament and the Premier of becoming the Opposition to the Whitlam Government and neglecting this State. That is completely untrue, because the Premier, by opposing the Whitlam plan to destroy State Governments, is protecting the rights of Queenslanders.

In place of the States, it is planned to have a system of regions with administration based on combinations of local governments. One such region proposed is from Caboolture in the North to the southern boundary of the State, embracing the Redcliffe City Council, the Pine Rivers Shire Council, the Albert Shire Council, the Ipswich City Council, and the Gold Coast City Council under the one administration, with the final decision coming from Canberra.

That is only the beginning of the move to turn Australia into a republic, and the Opposition in this State is committed to abolishing the post of Governor of Queensland. The honourable member for Archerfield made that statement, in addition to some others, in his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate. They showed exactly where he stands. He has already said that the

sooner Australia becomes a republic the better. Of course, he also advocates the abolition of the monarchy and all that it stands for. He did not pledge his loyalty to the Crown.

**Mr. Lee:** Only two of the whole tribe did.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** As a matter of fact I have a list of those who did not pledge their loyalty to the Crown. Most Opposition members are centralists, and they are quite happy to place the State of Queensland under Federal control. Recently at the A.L.P. conference in Cairns a motion was put up by the Murrumba A.L.P. Electoral Council for a referendum to abolish the State Government and to make Queensland a Federal territory. I do not know whether that motion was carried but, if it was, it shows the absolute stupidity of the A.L.P. If that is the attitude of the Murrumba A.L.P. branch I cannot understand why it should even run a candidate at the next State election, unless it hopes to get him elected as a Kamikaze to join the other group dedicated to destroy this Parliament.

As I have said before, there are plenty of Communists in this Opposition, and they are committed to assisting the Communist-dominated Whitlam Government in its plan to socialise not only this State but the whole of the country.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** They would not be ticket-carriers.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No, they would all be secret members.

Communism is a really diabolical conspiracy; it is an evil religion and the deadliest enemy Christianity has ever faced. The Communist has to be an atheist. In fact, he has to hate Christianity and Christians. The Communist god is the Government. Christianity and Communism are enemies, and they cannot co-exist. If a person is loyal to one he must be a traitor to the other. Communists know that their main enemy is Christianity, which is the reason they are insidiously attempting to undermine it. For example, the Whitlam Government has already commenced by disallowing as a deduction for income tax purposes any contribution made to a church building fund. The object of this is to hinder and prevent the building of new churches.

An interesting sidelight to this occurred in Cairns recently when Labor members of State Parliament were told by the conference that they had to hand over 3½ per cent of their gross salary. On a salary of \$14,500 it will mean a levy of just over \$500. It is interesting to note that the taxpayers are footing a substantial part of this levy through the tax deduction. The compulsory levy made by the A.L.P. will be a taxation deduction. What a shocking situation it is when a forced contribution to a political party is a tax deduction while somebody who gives money, say, to the Freedom from Hunger Campaign, cannot have his contribution treated as a

tax deduction. Equally outrageous is the shocking reduction in the Federal Budget of the education expenses allowance from \$400 to \$150. This will not matter much to some people but the people who choose to send their children to private schools will be hard hit. It is shocking to think that such a situation exists.

Another one of the conditions that the Whitlam Government laid down before it would give direct assistance to local authorities was that local authorities should rate all churches which are at present exempt from rates. This is another means of making things tough for the churches, which are already finding it difficult to exist on collections and cannot afford any increase in expenses. If the property of the churches ever came under Government ownership, how long would freedom of worship last? The 16 nations that have fallen into slavery under Communism could best answer that question.

Similarly, if the Government owns the property of the Press, radio and television, how long could people be assured of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and the other rights which are dependent upon a free Press?

**A Government Member:** Look at what they did to the Baltic countries.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Yes, look at what they did to Lithuania.

The right to own property is the keystone of the arch of freedom, but under Communism all property belongs to the State and the individual possesses exactly nothing.

**Mr. Lee** interjected.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Wharton): Order! The honourable member for Yeronga is not in his usual place.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** As I said before, many members of the A.L.P. Opposition did not affirm their allegiance to the Queen during the Address-in-Reply debate. Actually, there were 16 of them. I do not intend to embarrass them by reading out their names, but I have a list and the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader are on it.

**Mr. Lee:** Name them.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I have the list here for anyone to read, but I do not want to embarrass them. I have too much Christian charity in me to cause embarrassment by reading out the names of anybody disloyal to the Crown.

We are endeavouring to have Her Majesty declared the Queen of Queensland. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition is trying to ridicule us for taking this move to prevent Australia being declared a republic by the Federal Government, which hopes to do so without obtaining public approval. The Appeals and Special Reference Act, which was passed in Queensland

last year, enables the Queensland Government, through the Attorney-General, to apply to the Queensland Supreme Court for a declaration that a matter is of sufficient importance to be referred to the Privy Council.

Since December 1972 the Premier has continually trumped the moves of the Federal Government to take away the rights of Queensland. One of his most notable achievements was to ensure the future of the Torres Strait islands by irrevocably linking them to Queensland. That was done at a time when the Federal Government wished to give them away to New Guinea.

Senator Georges, a well-known A.L.P. senator and a strong supporter of the Communists—incidentally, the Communists paid his fare to Greece so that he could act as an observer at the Greek military trials—tried desperately to give away the Torres Strait islands. Many members of the Queensland Opposition did likewise. However, they were foiled by this Government. Senator Georges also tried very hard to have the whereabouts of Mr. and Mrs. Petrov—two Russian spies who defected to Australia in April 1954—made public. What a shocking thing to do! Mr. and Mrs. Petrov had been in hiding for many years, and Senator Georges asked questions in Federal Parliament designed to disclose their whereabouts. It is now common knowledge that the Petrovs have been living in hiding in Victoria, and only a couple of weeks ago their address was made public by the publication "Nation Review". As recently as last week Mrs. Petrov was being hounded by a camera crew from "Four Corners".

Without doubt one of the lowest and filthiest attempts by the Federal Government to gain control of the Senate was the appointment of Senator Gair as Ambassador to Ireland. But of course the Queensland Premier effectively nullified any political advantage that might have been gained from such a move. I have heard the Premier mocked and described as the "flying peanut". There is no doubt, however, that he made a monkey out of Gough. Senator Gair's appointment was an act of bribery, and one without parallel.

Only a few months ago Senator Townley, the independent Senator from Tasmania, claimed that a Labor member of Parliament had offered him a bribe to vote with the Whitlam Government on the Restrictive Trade Practices Bill. The bribe was a larger office and a secretary. Senator Steele Hall, the Leader of the Liberal Movement in South Australia and the only member of his party in the Senate, has been given a special office as well as secretarial facilities, no doubt in an attempt to gain his support. We are left to wonder how many more members of the House of Representatives and senators have been approached with offers of privileges in return for seeing things Labor's way.

When we examine closely the methods of the A.L.P. in both the State and the Federal sphere we see the use of bribery and corruption to further the aims of the party. For example, the Seamen's Union paid for the printing and distribution of 100,000 phoney bills that denigrated the McMahon Government. Each bill had printed on it, "This bill is as phoney as the McMahon Government". We know, of course, which Government is phoney.

The Seamen's Union is Communist dominated and demands large sums of money from shipping companies in return for permitting the movement of ships around Australia. As much as \$70,000 has been paid into the Seamen's Union, and as the secretary, Mr. E. B. Elliott, is a member of the Socialist Party of Australia—a pro-Soviet break-away group from the Communist party—we do not need to be particularly smart to realise where most of the money ends up. The sum of \$5,000 went to the Federal A.L.P. as a donation to its election funds, and I have a photograph of Senator Murphy and Senator Mulvihill being presented with a cheque for that amount by the Seamen's Union. Apart from this contribution the union not only paid for and distributed 100,000 phoney \$3 bills but also met the cost of two three-quarter page advertisements in "The Sydney Morning Herald" and "The Australian". Advertisements in those newspapers cost a fair amount of money. In return for this the Seamen's Union assistant secretary, Pat Geraghty, was to be appointed by the Whitlam Government to the National Materials Handling Advisory Committee. Over the past six years the Communist-dominated Metal Workers' Union has donated \$75,000 to the Australian Labor Party's Federal election campaign.

Members of the Opposition squeal about donations made to any other political party, yet they conveniently forget the donations that are made to their own party. Just prior to the most recent Federal election, the Seamen's Union gave \$30,000 to the Australian Labor Party—the largest single donation made by any trade union. It would be very interesting to know just what assurances were given to this Communist-dominated union by Mr. Whitlam.

Nearer to home we have the decision—I have referred to this before—of the A.L.P. conference in Cairns that, in future, all State, Federal and council A.L.P. members will pay 3½ per cent of their salaries into the A.L.P. That is straightout blackmail, with the threat hanging over the heads of any who refuse to pay that their endorsement by the A.L.P. to contest the next Federal, State or council election will be withdrawn. Fancy having to pay 3½ per cent of gross salary to obtain endorsement to contest the next election! I prophesy that Opposition members will be known as "The 3½ per centers."

The honourable members for Lytton, Everton and Archerfield all voted in favour of this blackmail payment because they hold confirmed A.L.P. seats which could be won by anybody who received A.L.P. endorsement. I could even win the seat of Lytton if I were endorsed by the A.L.P., and heaven knows that the people there know my politics!

**Mr. Lee:** You wouldn't want to, though.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I would want to take it away from the present misrepresentation it is getting.

The fact that these three men hold seats in this Parliament when they could not hold a respectable job is proof of what I say. If further proof is required, I emphasise that the majority of A.L.P. members—I do not say all A.L.P. members because there are some good men on the Opposition side of the Chamber—are now completely dominated by the Queensland Central Executive of the A.L.P. If some people do not believe that, the blackmail motion carried at Cairns by the A.L.P. State conference, which is binding on all members, should convince them.

I refer now to the attempted bribery of four members of the Botany Council in Sydney who were threatened that A.L.P. endorsement would be withdrawn for the recent municipal elections in Sydney—I do not know whether they lost their seats or not—if they voted against the deferment of an interim development plan for industrial land in Botany. They all signed a statutory declaration that they were invited to the home of one of the State Labor members of the Legislative Assembly who told them that if they could have the land in question zoned as industrial land \$20,000 would be tossed into Labor funds, and \$5,000 would be given to them to fight the campaign. I have here the news sheet setting out all the statements. They claimed that they were threatened with losing their pre-selection. I shall not mention their names as I do not want to embarrass them. Their names have already appeared in the Press. They had just returned from a meeting with the Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales and John Ducker, a well-known Communist. They were told that if they did not give a satisfactory decision they would receive telegrams next day withdrawing their endorsement. It is shocking that that sort of thing should go on. It does not occur in the National or Liberal Parties. Nobody on this side is ever threatened with loss of endorsement if he does not make a certain decision.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** It is shocking that that should happen.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The Treasurer, as usual, has made a brilliant observation, for which I thank him.

I can easily understand why, in the old days, ordinary Queenslanders battling for a fair living for themselves and their families under A.L.P. leaders like the late Ned Hanlon, a man whom I greatly admired—I am not afraid to say that—could look up to the A.L.P. as a fairly good party under good leaders. Today the A.L.P. is a playground for lawyers, academics, ratbags, radicals and Communists—people well versed in theory, but with little common sense. I naturally think of the many union bosses who exhibit a vicious paranoia of class hatred using good rank-and-file members to help them further their own political ambitions.

**Mr. Lee:** Are you talking about the member for Pine Rivers?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No, I am not. I promised him that I would be nice to him tonight and would not embarrass him.

Certainly many union bosses and A.L.P. members of Parliament do not practise Labor ideals and principles. Like any other section of the community the Labor Party has its share of fat cats. Jack Egerton is one, but he is continually charging politicians, including A.L.P. members, with being greedy and grasping. So far he has not told the truth about his earnings. As the State president of the A.L.P. he gets \$10,000 a year, and he gets \$3,500, not \$2,600, as a director of Qantas. He claims that he is not paid for any of the other jobs he holds, but he omits to tell anybody about his expense allowances.

Four of the fattest cats in the A.L.P. are in this Parliament. The member for Port Curtis is one of the fattest cats in the Labor Party—a wealthy hotel-owner in Gladstone. I do not begrudge him his hotel, but what gets me is that members of the Opposition rise in this place to denigrate Ministers and other people holding shares in companies. Why should anyone disclose what money he has invested? I have money invested from the sale of my business. Why should I have to stand up and tell the world what I have? That is my business. I did not rob anybody to get it.

The member for Lytton is another fat cat. As I said before, his wife is a marriage celebrant. With her earnings he is picking up more than his parliamentary salary. The member for Albert is not doing too badly. His wife is a high-school teacher and performs marriages at nights and week-ends, so she is not on a bad wicket. Last, there is the member for Barron River, who is one of the biggest land speculators in this Parliament. I have named there four of the fattest cats in the A.L.P.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** What about Tucker? What has he got?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Nothing. He hasn't even got anything between his ears.

In this Parliament we hear many questions and innuendoes about shareholdings of Ministers, and the Premier in particular, so it is about time we brought into the open some of the dealings of the members of the Opposition. The member for Lytton was offered the same number of shares in Comalco as Ministers were offered. He did not avail himself of the offer. He got them to give the shares to his father! That is not a bad effort.

The member for Everton had his way paid to Bangladesh. The member for Albert was the guest of the Communists in East Germany, where he was recently wined and dined. The member for Toowoomba North, who stands up and rants and raves in this Chamber, has had a few trips to Russia as a guest of the Communists. Many others in the Opposition are on a few extra lurks and perks, but I will save them for another time. There is no sense in telling all I know at once.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It must be true, because no-one has taken a point of order.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am noted for telling the truth here. As I said before, some members of the Opposition—and the Q.C.E.—are absolutely terrified that I will expose them before I am finished in this Parliament. I venture to suggest that I will be able to do that.

An Honorable Member interjected.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** They are all listening in their rooms, taking down notes as fast as they can, anxiously waiting for the daylight hours and the "Hansard" transcription so that they can get somebody to have a go at me tomorrow. I have no doubt the midnight oil will be burning at the Trades Hall while a few more briefs are prepared to be sent down here.

I avail myself of this opportunity to sincerely congratulate the members of the Caboolture Shire Council for refusing an opportunity to quarry Saddleback Mountain off the Old Gympie Road at Elimbah. Ready-mix Concrete made an application to quarry 139 acres. Fifty-seven objections were lodged with the Caboolture Shire Council. Those objections came from a broad cross-section of the community, who evidently cared enough to object to the proposal, which would have resulted in lowering the crest of Saddleback by 30 metres and destroying, in the name of progress, an environment which I believe should be preserved for future generations. I do not know whether many members are familiar with Saddleback—it is just outside Caboolture—but it is an area that supports much bird and animal life and contributes a great deal to the environment. It is part of the Glasshouse Mountains, named by Captain Cook during his voyage off the east coast of Queensland. It has considerable historic value, because Saddleback was a

landmark beside the old Gympie Road, along which Cobb & Co. coaches used to travel many years ago.

The Caboolture Shire Council decided that Saddleback should be retained as an environmental park and intends to take steps to ensure its retention as such. I heartily support the council in this matter and will do anything I can to assist it to implement its plan.

The council is also to be commended for its decision to assist Readymix Concrete to locate a more suitable area for a quarry in the Caboolture Shire. After all, quarries play a very important role in the development of the State through their provision of the material necessary for roadmaking. It is to the credit of the council that it recognises this and is prepared to help. Far too many councils knock back development applications and then do not assist the company or the person making the application to find an alternative site.

From the time the application was submitted by Readymix Concrete to quarry Saddleback, both the Minister for Local Government and I were subjected to a great deal of pressure to prevent this development by exerting whatever influence we may have had over the Caboolture Shire Council. However, members of Parliament (I hope) and Ministers (I know) do not interfere with the proper planning and decisions of any local authority.

Councillors of the Caboolture Shire Council were quite capable of arriving at a decision which they thought would be correct. Local Government is autonomous and should not be subjected to any undue interference from State Governments. If any council makes a decision which people feel is not in the best interests of the area, there is provision under the Local Government Act for appeal to the Local Government Court, but at least the council should be given an opportunity to make the decision without anyone presupposing what the decision should be.

I have had a lot to do with the Caboolture Shire Council. I represent part of its area and I am happy to say that I work in co-operation with the council. The chairman was my opponent at the last State elections but he and I have great respect for each other. We have both decided that we are working together for the benefit of the electorate that I represent and that he represents in part.

This council was much maligned by Ian Gall in an article in "The Courier-Mail" entitled, "Look out, dollar bird." I believe that he did this unintentionally. I have read many of his articles with great interest and gained a great deal of enjoyment from them. Part of the article which I believe showed the Caboolture Shire Council in a bad and untrue light read—

"Could you imagine a shire council having the nerve to plan to vandalise one of this popular group and hope to get away

with it? Believe it or not that is exactly what the Caboolture Shire Council has planned to do.

"And like all such plannings it had hoped to perpetrate its wrecking before the public and even the residents of the area were fully aware of its intentions."

At no time did the Caboolture Shire Council ever plan to establish a quarry at Saddleback Mountain. Any landholder in the shire is entitled to make application to the council to develop an area, to subdivide it, or establish an industry such as quarrying on it. This application, together with any objections, is considered by the councillors, who make a decision which they believe to be in the best interests of the shire. In my opinion and that of many other people, the Caboolture Shire Council made the right decision to protect the environment of Saddleback Mountain and the council deserves to be congratulated on this decision.

The \$5,000,000 which has been set aside in the Budget for a new grant to local authorities in special need to supplement their revenue, together with the fact this Government intends to assist local authorities to the tune of \$45,000,000 in the raising of debenture loan programmes for the coming year, is further proof that the Government is deeply conscious of the problems facing local authorities. But making the \$45,000,000 available for debenture loans does not mean that the councils can fall back on the Government. They still have to exhaust every avenue to raise the money and prove to the Treasurer or the Minister for Local Government that they have done this before becoming eligible to any of the \$45,000,000 towards their debenture loan programmes.

I should like to record my personal thanks to the officers of the Co-ordinator-General's Department for allowing local authorities affected by floods to submit amended claims when the full effect of the damage is determined. The Caboolture Shire Council, through no fault of its officers and in all honesty, made a claim for flood damage which was well and truly below the damage actually recorded. In fact, they received \$54,000. When it became apparent that the damage was well in excess of what was estimated at first, the council lodged an amended claim with the Co-ordinator-General's Department. This resulted in a very fair grant being made. I agree that a lot of this money was Commonwealth money made available through the Commonwealth-State flood relief grant. The Caboolture Shire Council received approximately \$315,000 towards flood relief and I understand it will receive another \$14,000 for some more work that had to receive further consideration.

At present, local government in the State is finding difficulty in coping with the demands for more and more services. The only way to cope with this is to increase rates. Councils have to borrow more money and their loan indebtedness has doubled over the past 12

years. There has been a marked increase in local government activity in the field of cultural and social services. It is to be hoped that local government does receive increased grants and subsidies in the future, especially towards library services.

Recently some of the shires experienced a rate rise. Rates went up in the three areas I represent—Redcliffe, Caboolture and Pine Rivers. Many ratepayers experienced a rate increase that some claimed was caused by high valuations. However, rate rises are brought about not by high valuations but by increases in the rates levied by local authorities. Over the past few weeks I have received many complaints from ratepayers in the Caboolture Shire about the increased rates that have been levied this financial year. It might be as well to trace the history of these increases from the very beginning.

Notices of valuation in the shire of Caboolture were issued on 29 October 1971, and the new valuations increased the existing rateable value from \$9,156,380 to \$22,174,780. This was an increase over all of 142 per cent. The new valuations were scheduled to come into force on 30 June 1972. However, because the amount of undetermined objections or appeals exceeded 10 per cent of the valuations at that date, the effective date was postponed to 30 June 1973. Subsequently, for the same reason, it was again postponed to 30 June 1974.

Incidentally, Australian Paper Mills, which own 54,346 acres or approximately 9 per cent of the land in the shire of Caboolture, have been largely responsible for holding up the implementation of the valuations. They are entitled to do this, because they objected following the increase in valuation of their 54,000 acres from \$373,000 to approximately \$2,000,000. Their rates this year would have been between \$20,000 and \$30,000. Actually the valuation of their land at approximately \$36 an acre is quite reasonable when one considers the total value of the shire, and also the fact that a few years ago A.P.M. sold a 48-perch block at Buringary to Total Oil Company for \$20,000.

The date fixed by the Valuer-General for the new valuation was 31 December 1970. The Valuation of Land Act was amended by this Parliament to increase the 10 per cent to which I previously referred to 15 per cent, and, although the undecided objections and appeals still exceeded 10 per cent, they represented less than 15 per cent, and the valuations are being used at the present time. All objections have been heard and decisions in most cases have been issued, but there are still a number of appeals to be determined by the Land Court. In this connection, I should like to point out that a selected number of appeals involving A.P.M. were heard some months ago, but decisions have not yet been pronounced.

Section 12 of the Valuation of Land Act provides that the Valuer-General's valuation for rating and land tax purposes shall be the market value of the land more or less assuming that improvements do not exist. It is emphasised that "unimproved value" does not mean the value of the land at the time of the first white settlement, but rather the unimproved value of a particular parcel of land assuming that it was unimproved but that all the surrounding land was developed.

However, there are some exceptions, and the one that chiefly concerns this area is that land used exclusively for the purpose of a single dwelling-house or for the purpose of primary production can only be valued on the basis that any enhancement in value because the land has a potential use for industrial, subdivisional or any other purpose shall be disregarded, irrespective of whether or not that potential use is lawful when the valuation is made. In other words, and putting it simply, after section 12 was amended, land currently being used for primary industry could be valued only in respect of the industry for which it was being used. Land that is ripe for subdivision and is being used for primary production cannot be valued on the assumption that it is prime subdivisional land.

**Mr. Gunn:** In other words, it cannot be valued for potential.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** That is exactly the position. I thank the honourable member for Somerset for his interjection.

It must be emphasised that the Valuer-General has no say whatever in the total amount of rates that any local authority levies on valuation. That amount is determined by the local authority, and it has the new valuations before it when it makes the rating levy for the year. When a local authority wishes to collect only the same amount of rates as it collected in the previous year, it decreases the rate payable in the dollar by the same percentage as the increase in the total valuation.

**Mr. Gunn:** Some use it as an excuse to increase rates.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** That is right. Many councils take the opportunity to increase their rates and place the blame on increased valuations. The only way in which the true rating position in any shire can be judged is by ascertaining the total amount of rates expected to be raised in one year and comparing it with the total amount raised in the previous year. If there is a substantial increase, it must be concluded that that is the intention of the council, irrespective of whether or not there is a new valuation.

One feature of the new valuation of the Caboolture Shire is that rural lands—

**A Government Member:** They must have a crook council.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No, it is not a bad council.

**Mr. Gunn:** Didn't it get \$250,000 more in revenue as a result of the new valuations?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The Caboolture Shire Council budgeted to raise \$256,000 more in rates this year than it raised in the preceding year.

**Mr. Hartwig:** That is crook.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No, it is not as bad as it sounds. Even though the council has struck differential rates and the rural rate in the dollar is lower than that in the urban area, rates in rural areas will probably be increased. The Valuation of Land Act provides a comparatively cheap method of objecting to a valuation, and if they so desire, all landowners are granted an interview with the Valuer-General or one of his officers to verbally present their reasons for believing that the valuation is too high.

**Mr. Lee:** The member for Pine Rivers reckons you are talking a lot of rubbish.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** He would not say that about me. He is a good supporter of mine.

**Mr. Lee:** You ought to hear what he says behind your back.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** He has promised to support me at the next election. He knows that I am giving Murrumba far better representation than any A.L.P. member could give it. The difference between A.L.P. members and me is that they are under the domination of the Q.C.E. and have to do what they are told. I do what I think is best for the electorate.

The period of valuation of any shire or city is usually between five and eight years. However, the amending Act of 1971 provides that if the local authority makes application to the Minister and the Minister so recommends to the Government, a valuation of an area can be made when the existing valuation has been in force for less than five years. However, because of the expense involved, the position would have to be very serious for a Minister of the Crown to recommend action of that nature. Similarly, valuation periods can be extended beyond eight years, if so desired.

The amount of rates levied is a matter for the local authority itself. If the total amount of rates levied is increased, that is in no way the responsibility of the Valuer-General. Rate revenue depends solely on whatever increase a council makes.

The Valuer-General has informed me that he has inquired of the district valuer who supervised the valuation of the Caboolture Shire and has been informed that there was no shortage of registered valuers. However, I am prepared to lead a deputation from the Caboolture Shire Council to the

Acting Minister for Local Government and Electricity and present a case for the Caboolture Shire to dispense with the Valuer-General and hire private valuers to carry out the next valuation of the shire. If that case was successful, the control of the valuers would be in the hands of the council then in office, and I do not know whether that would be better or worse than the present system.

In my opinion, the Caboolture Shire is fairly highly rated; but in all fairness to the Caboolture Shire Council, I should point out that over the past 12 months salaries, wages and other expenses associated with running a council—not only the Caboolture Shire Council but also the Redcliffe City Council and the Pine Rivers Shire Council—have increased greatly.

**Mr. Gunn:** Laidley Shire Council has reduced its rates by 1c in the dollar.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am pleased to hear that. I did not know that the Laidley Shire Council had reduced its rates. It must be the only shire council in Queensland that has managed to do that.

**Mr. Gunn:** It shows it can be done.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Yes.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** They cannot be carrying out any work there.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The fact that the honourable member for Somerset was the chairman of the Laidley Shire Council may have had something to do with it.

The recent grant of \$54,000 from the Federal Government to the Caboolture Shire Council, on the recommendation of the Grants Commission, certainly did not assist to any great extent. It was a shocking contribution. The Redcliffe City Council received \$100,000, and the Pine Rivers Shire Council \$180,000.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** How much did Caboolture receive?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** It received only \$54,000, but other councils farther north received exactly nothing. I have a complete list of what was received by all the councils, and I have no doubt that other honourable members have a similar list.

I notice that my time is getting fairly short, but before finishing I should like to mention something that occurred in January and February this year.

**Mr. Hartwig interjected.**

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The honourable member for Callide reminds me of the big flood. I am pleased to hear some Government members interjecting tonight. Normally Opposition members interject but they have been

instructed by the Q.C.E. to lay off me. They know how nasty I can get and they do not want me to get stuck into them again.

**Mr. Lee:** They know you tell the truth.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I always tell the truth. That is exactly right. I am not usurping the duties of the honourable member for Somerset in speaking about Kilcoy; the flood affected people in Caboolture also. On Friday, 25 January the level of water in the Somerset dam rose as floodwater poured in and reached a height of 350 ft. above sea level, which was far in excess of the previously accepted level of 340 ft. Honourable members must forgive me for continually harping on this matter, but I cannot resist an opportunity to show what little concern the Brisbane City Council has for people living outside its area. There are no votes in it for the Lord Mayor and his cohorts, so to hell with the people outside Brisbane! He looks after only those places where he can get the votes.

The back-up of water flooded the bridge at Marysmokes Creek. For the information of honourable members who have never been outside of Brisbane and who get lost if they cannot find a tramline, Marysmokes Creek is near the border of Murrumba and Somerset. In fact, the Marysmokes Bridge is in the electorate of Murrumba. The high flood level was caused by the Lord Mayor, who refused to open the floodgates of Somerset Dam, although his engineers told him it would not make any appreciable difference to the levels downstream in the Brisbane River. The back-up of water created a flood situation and raised the level of Marysmokes Creek to 14 ft. above the bridge, completely isolating the town of Kilcoy and adjacent areas until Tuesday, 5 February.

When it was obvious that this high flood level was being held, local residents organised trucks and eight local boats. The Moreton Bay Boat Club of Redcliffe lent some of their boats and a total of 15,000 gallons of milk, which would have been lost, was saved. In addition, a tanker had to make a round trip of 400 miles via Ipswich to pick up 3,380 gallons of milk and a further 6,900 gallons was picked up by outside tankers and taken to Booval, Nanango and Murgon.

**Mr. Lee:** Members of the A.L.P. Government took the milk away from the kids.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** They took the milk away from the kids and gave them Whitlam wafers. In fact, they were not even wafers; they gave them dog biscuits.

In spite of this magnificent effort by the people of the area, the local boat club and the Moreton Bay Boat Club, approximately 29,900 gallons of milk worth about \$1,200 was lost through the inability of the tankers to cross Marysmokes Creek. All other tanker services were maintained during this period. Mt. Mee suffered a temporary setback when there was a landslide at Ocean View between

Mt. Mee and Dayboro, but it was soon repaired. I must congratulate the Pine Rivers Shire engineer for the work he did. He and I did not see eye to eye on this at first, but he did his job quite well and got the tankers through to Mt. Mee via Dayboro.

The holding of the dam level at 350 ft. was the cause of the problem. Somerset Dam was built as a flood mitigation scheme. Last week I was corrected by the honourable member for Stafford, who assured me that it was designed two-fifths for storage and three-fifths for flood mitigation. I thought it was three-quarters for flood mitigation, but the honourable member for Stafford was fair enough to put me on the right track. If the Lord Mayor had kept Somerset Dam for the purpose for which it was originally intended, that is as water storage for the cities of Ipswich and Brisbane and as a flood mitigator, the problem would never have arisen. To avoid any more serious loss to dairymen and to reduce any inconvenience to the people of Kilcoy, the normal maximum holding should be kept at 315 ft. above sea level, which would provide an ample reserve on holding capacity for normal water needs.

**A Government Member:** What is the maximum during flood?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The maximum is 350 ft. I think it can reach 353 ft.

**Mr. Hinze:** Why is it that A.L.P. members are not interjecting on you?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I think it is because the honourable member for South Coast wore them down. I must congratulate him on the stirring speech that he made tonight in spite of the numerous interjections from members of the Opposition. He is a credit to this Government.

The maximum flood-holding level of the Somerset Dam should be set at 340 ft., and the Marysmokes Creek bridge and approaches should be raised above flood level to keep the D'Aguilar Highway open and ensure that milk deliveries between Kilcoy and Caboolture are not delayed. Delays result in serious losses to dairymen, who are already suffering at the hands of the Whitlam Government.

**Mr. Hinze:** There aren't many left.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course there aren't. The dairy farmers are going out of production all over the State. In fact last year 16 went out of production in Caboolture.

Finally, I again congratulate the Treasurer on the introduction of yet another successful Budget. I prophesy that in years to come, when the history of Queensland politics is written, a special chapter will be reserved for the Treasurer, who is an excellent Deputy Premier and one of the best Treasurers Queensland has ever had.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.