

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 31 OCTOBER 1974

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 31 OCTOBER 1974

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. E. H. Houghton, Redcliffe) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation (Queensland) Act Amendment Bill;

Superannuation Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2);

Government Loan Bill;

Land Tax Act Amendment Bill.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1973-74

Mr. SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor transmitting the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1973-74.

Estimates ordered to be printed, and referred to Committee of Supply.

VOTE ON ACCOUNT, 1975-76

Mr. SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services of the several departments of the Public Service for the year ending 30 June 1976—

From the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland (exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account), the sum of one hundred and ninety million dollars;

From the Trust and Special Funds, the sum of two hundred and twenty million dollars;

From the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account, the sum of eighteen million dollars.

Message referred to Committee of Supply.

FEES PAID BY CROWN TO PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ADVERTISING AGENCIES**RETURN TO ORDER**

The following paper was laid on the Table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 1 August last, on the motion of Mr. B. Wood, showing all payments made by the Government to public relations agencies or consultants and advertising agencies or consultants during the 1973-74 financial year, stating the names of the recipients and the amounts received separately.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

State Service Superannuation Board, for the year 1973-74.

Health and Medical Services of the State, for the year 1973-74.

Comptroller-General of Prisons, for the year 1973-74.

State Fire Services Council, for the year 1973-74.

Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, for the year 1973-74.

Beach Protection Authority, for the year 1973-74.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Report and Record of Interviews concerning the Samford Valley Development.

Proclamations under—

Fauna Conservation Act 1974.

Margarine Act and Another Act Amendment Act 1974.

Metric Conversion Act 1972.

The Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915.

Orders in Council under—

Racing and Betting Act 1954-1972.

Industrial Development Act 1963-1973.

The Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act of 1959.

The Banana Industry Protection Acts, 1929 to 1937.

The City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1967.

The Farm Water Supplies Assistance Acts, 1958 to 1965.

Fauna Conservation Act 1974.

Fisheries Act 1957-1972.

Meat Industry Act 1965-1972.

Plague Grasshoppers Extermination Act 1937-1971.

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1973.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1965.

Stock Act 1915-1973.

Sugar Experiment Stations Act 1900-1973.

Rural Fires Act 1946-1973.

Notices of Intention to make Orders in Council under the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1973.

Regulations under—

Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966-1972.

Fauna Conservation Act 1974.

Fish Supply Management Act 1972.

Foot and Mouth Disease Expenses and Compensation Fund Act 1958-1969.

Poultry Industry Act 1946–1973.
 Primary Producers' Organisation and
 Marketing Act 1926–1973.
 Stock Act 1915–1973.
 Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936–1973.
 Wheat Pool Act 1920–1972.

Notifications under the Fauna Conservation
 Act 1974.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

ORGANISATION, "CAMPAIGN AGAINST
 INJUSTICE"; ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
 AGAINST MINISTER FOR JUSTICE

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister
 for Justice) (11.13 a.m.): It is with some
 regret that I have sought leave today to
 make a statement, because what I am
 about to outline represents a most regrettable
 development in the political and public life
 of Queensland.

My attention has been drawn to the acti-
 vities of an organisation known as "Cam-
 paign against Injustice", which was formed
 yesterday with the expressed purpose of
 waging a vindictive and personal campaign
 against me because of actions that I have
 taken in my ministerial capacity to protect
 the interests of small investors and young
 couples in Queensland.

Because I have frequently, and fully,
 reported to this House on the actions that
 I have taken, I believe it is essential that
 I bring this latest matter to the notice of
 honourable members, and the people of
 Queensland.

The House will recall that some time ago,
 the Government instituted an investigation by
 Mr. Peter Connolly, Q.C., an eminent bar-
 rister, into the affairs and activities of a
 number of home loan funds and other com-
 panies operating in Queensland.

The investigation was ordered after a large
 number of complaints had been received by
 me in relation to the activities of these
 companies in their dealings with the public.
 Complaints were received from both sides
 of the House, and from the public.

Last year I tabled the report of the
 investigation by Mr. Connolly into these
 home loan funds, and moved that it be
 printed so that it could be circulated widely
 in the community. Copies of that report
 are still available, and are still being sought
 by citizens concerned about investing in these
 home loan funds.

Apart from a number of other matters the
 report recommended that action be taken
 to wind up these funds, which included
 Mutual Home Loans Fund and its manage-
 ment company. Subsequently action was
 taken to seek the winding up of the funds
 in the Supreme Court. That action was
 not successful. The reasons why it was

not successful have already been canvassed
 widely, and I reported to the House on
 the court's judgment and made available
 copies of the judgment. At no stage have I
 sought to hide or cover-up either the Con-
 nolly report or the Supreme Court judgment.

Before the proceedings began in the court,
 during them, and subsequently I have been
 subjected to a barrage of offensive and
 threatening letters from Mr. D. A. Reynolds,
 the principal of Mutual Home Loans. My
 wife has also been subjected to malicious
 telephone calls at our home from men who
 I believe are the agents of Mr. Reynolds.
 In addition, Mr. Reynolds has made scan-
 dalous and false allegations concerning me,
 and about Mr. Connolly, Q.C., at various
 public meetings which he has convened. I
 understand that, as a result, Mr. Connolly
 has sought independent legal advice and is
 pursuing a course of action.

To indicate further the extreme lengths to
 which Mr. Reynolds was prepared to go, I
 inform honourable members that both my
 private secretary and my press secretary
 were frequently telephoned by persons claim-
 ing to be shareholders in Mutual Home
 Loans. These people sought advice from my
 staff as to whether Mutual Home Loans was
 reliable.

As subsequent events revealed, these tele-
 phone calls were arranged in order to trap
 my personal staff into making comments
 adverse to Mutual Home Loans. The calls
 were made by people closely connected with
 the company with the clear purpose of gather-
 ing evidence of my alleged bias against the
 company. Unfortunately for Mr. Reynolds,
 my staff were a wake-up to what was happen-
 ing and the plan failed.

These things indicate the depths to which
 he was prepared to go, but events have taken
 a new turn, and have reached a new low.
 The time has now arrived at which I can no
 longer remain silent in relation to these
 events.

Regrettably, I have very strong reasons to
 believe that the honourable member for
 Rockhampton is personally involved in what
 is now going on, as I shall explain in a
 minute or two.

The House will recall that the member
 for Rockhampton asked me a question a
 couple of weeks ago concerning Mutual
 Home Loans. It is, to say the least, interest-
 ing to recall that one week before the member
 asked the question, Mr. Reynolds was able
 to state publicly that a question would be
 asked. The tone of the question leaves little
 doubt in my mind that the honourable mem-
 ber for Rockhampton has resumed his role
 as the spokesman in this House for Mr.
 Reynolds. As he and some colleagues well
 know, he was "warned off" by his own party
 last year when he sought to be the principal
 defender of Mutual Home Loans here. How-
 ever, he has taken up Mr. Reynolds' banner
 once again and I think I know why.

I have in my possession two documents under the name of "Campaign Against Injustice"—I am prepared to show them to the Leader of the Opposition at the centre table—and these documents list chapter and verse the basis and funding of a massive campaign to be waged against me during the coming election.

One document reveals that the total cost of the campaign will be \$10,000 at least!

Principally, it will take the form of newspaper advertisements in the Sunday press, and the relevant suburban paper, over the next five weeks, on the theme—"Let's Look At The Lawmakers".

Obviously the advertisements are designed to be an aberration of the highly successful "Let's Look At The Law" series produced by my department.

According to the document I have in my possession, the advertisements will carry the following caption—

"Let's look at the Lawmakers. Published in the interests of explaining recent abuses of the law, and miscarriages of justice to Queenslanders."

The document gives the following example of the kind of advertisement that will appear—

"Your Attorney-General. He's there to uphold the law. But does he?"

As I said, the campaign will cost \$10,000, will be run in the newspapers over the next five weeks, and will also include 250 posters, 10,000 campaign leaflets and 100 signs.

The document also outlines the service fee to be charged by the professional advertising and public relations agency to run the campaign. The service fee alone will cost up to \$1,250 and that should give honourable members some idea of the extent to which the campaign will go.

I understand that to run and finance the campaign against me, a committee was formed yesterday. I have a copy of its aims and objects. They are really quite hilarious.

As an example, objective No. B.3 says—

"This campaign can be followed by more sensitive or sectional causes as appropriate, but the committee should avoid becoming exclusively occupied with specific political matters."

Anyone who reads the objects, or the plan of action, could come to no conclusion other than that the campaign has only one goal—to defeat and silence Bill Knox on December 7.

I seek the permission of the House to incorporate in "Hansard" the two documents to which I refer, which have all these details in them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

CAMPAIGN AGAINST INJUSTICE

October 28 1974.

"A. Establishing the committee, its composition and operation, its aims and activities.

(1) The committee should be established by a small group of interested citizens, it should be properly constituted, and it should then be opened for general membership.

(2) The committee should be named 'Queensland Campaign against injustice', for short: 'Campaign Against Injustice'. The letters C.A.I. should not be used.

(3) The committee should have an office, open and staffed during normal business hours.

(4) Membership should be open to the general public.

(5) There should be a single class of membership.

(6) There should be an annual membership fee.

(7) The objects of the committee should be enshrined in the constitution.

(8) One of the objects should be to detect, investigate, publicise and attempt to rectify abuses of the Law and miscarriages of justice in Queensland.

(9) One of the first aims of the committee should be to publicise its existence.

B. Publicising the existence, aims, and activities of the committee.

(1) The existence of the committee should be made public through the publicising of a recent abuse of the Law or miscarriage of justice.

(2) A cause that will appeal to the general public—irrespective of political, religious or other affiliations—should be used to open the campaign.

(3) This campaign can be followed by more sensitive or sectional causes as appropriate, but the committee should avoid becoming exclusively occupied with specific political matters.

(4) A leaflet and poster should be printed for public distribution to publicise the aims and activities of the committee. The leaflet should include an application for membership.

(5) Advertisements should be inserted in appropriate news media, and leaflets and posters should be printed and distributed to publicise cases investigated by the committee.

(6) Such editorial coverage as may be able to be arranged in the press and television should be sought.

For the advice relating to the matters set out above, our fee would be charged on a time basis. A realistic budget for this work would be \$750-\$1,250.

C. Design of corporate standards, stationery, printed matter, signs, advertisements, etc.

The items listed below would provide the committee with the basic requirements necessary to establish itself and carry out a short term campaign.

Our fees for the work itemised are shown alongside, together with estimates of the costs involved, based on our present understanding of the nature of work. The estimates are not to be taken as quotes:

Item	Fee	Expenses (including printing)
	\$	\$
1. Design of symbol and logotype selection of typography, selection of colours	500.00	20.00
2. Design artwork and production of 500 A4 letterheads and 500 DL envelopes, in one colour ..	100.00	140.00
3. Design, artwork and production of 1,000 four page committee leaflets and membership forms in 1 colour (copy supplied by the committee)	250.00	140.00
4. Design, artwork and production of 250 A3 committee posters, 1 colour (copy supplied by the committee)	150.00	140.00
5. Design of a concept for a series of newspaper advertisements ..	100.00	..
6. Copy writing, design and artwork of 5 newspaper advertisements, 30cm x 5 columns ..	500.00	180.00
7. Copywriting, design, artwork and production of 10,000 campaign leaflets, in 1 colour ..	500.00	350.00
8. Copywriting, design, artwork and production of 100 campaign posters 3" x 2", 1 colour, paper on hardboard	150.00	300.00
	1,750.00	1,250.00

* The cost of insertion is not included in this figure.

Rates are as follows:—

Sunday Mail—

\$3.70 per column cm
30 cm x 5 column \$555.00

Sunday Sun—

\$3.80 per column cm
30 cm x 5 column \$570.00

Northern Suburbs Express—

\$1.05 per column cm
30 cm x 5 column \$157.00

The above programme, including a series of 5 advertisements in the three newspapers, could be carried out within a total budget of \$10,000.

Series of Newspaper Advertisements

October 28
1974.

A series of five 5 colour x 30 cm display advertisements based on the 'Lets look at the Law' series, published by the Department of Justice.

Theme: 'Lets look at the Lawmakers. Published in the interests of explaining recent abuses of the Law, and miscarriages of Justice to Queenslanders'.

Insertion: 'The Sunday Mail' and/or 'The Sunday Sun' and local newspapers as appropriate.

Example: 'Your Attorney-General: he's there to uphold the Law. But does he? (refer to accompanying Department of Justice ad no. 70.)'

BY-LAWS

COMMITTEE FOR THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST INJUSTICE

Article I

Name—This organization shall be known as the 'Committee For The Campaign Against Injustice'.

Article II

Object—The object of this organization shall be to fight against all manners of injustice as determined by the members of the committee.

Article III

Membership—Membership of the organization is open to all persons, irrespective of colour, race, creed or political belief subject only to approval by the officers of this organization, over the age of eighteen years who are desirous of forming a body to fight against injustice.

Article IV

Membership is on a yearly basis for all financial members.

Article V

To be entitled to attend and vote at meetings, members must be financial members.

Article VI

A financial member is one who has paid his yearly subscription of \$2.00 and the said subscription is still current.

Article VII

Any financial member may resign from the association. Such resignation to take effect from the date of receipt by the officers of such notice.

Article VIII

Officers—(a) The officers of this organization shall consist of a President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer who shall be elected at the inaugural meeting for a

term of one (1) year. Thereafter the officers to be determined by the vote of a majority of members entitled to vote, at the annual meeting.

(b) The duties of the officers shall be as follows:—

President—He shall be the executive officer of this organization and shall preside over all meetings of the organization. He shall be an ex-officio member of all committees formed to carry out the object of this organization. He shall perform such other duties as usually pertain to the office of President.

Vice President—He shall fulfil in the absence of the President all duties normally carried out by that office. The vice-president shall also perform such other duties as usually pertain to that office, or as may be assigned by the President or the officers of the organization.

Secretary—He shall keep the records of membership attendance, and membership fees and minutes of all meetings of this organization. He shall present all bills to the officers for their approval and shall arrange for the payment of same. He shall collect all funds due to this organization and shall promptly turn the same over to the treasurer. He shall submit a report to the annual meeting of the organization and at such other times as the President may require.

Treasurer—He shall receive from the Secretary all funds paid to this club and shall be responsible for the safekeeping of same. He shall maintain proper books of account which shall at all times be open to inspection of the officers of the organization. He shall make a report at the annual meeting and at such other times as the President may require.

(c) The officers of the organization shall meet regularly at least once each month and at the call of the President.

(d) The officers shall determine the policies and activities of the organization elect and discipline members, approve all bills and have general management of the organisation.

Article IX

Public Relations—All announcements to persons outside this organization shall be made only by the President or one of the other officers acting with the authorisation of the President.

Article X

Amendments—Any amendment of these by-laws may be adopted by a majority vote of members present and entitled to vote at any meeting of this organization, provided that written notice of the proposed amendment shall have been given the members at least one (1) week prior to the meeting.

Signed by the foundation members of the organisation."

Mr. KNOX: This is a direct threat, by a vested interest, to me as an elected member of this Parliament, and as a Minister of the Crown, whose responsibility it is to exercise his duties without fear or favour.

In the nine years that I have been a Minister I have never seen a more blatant and shameful threat to any Minister of the Crown from a vested interest.

This kind of activity has long been deplored by all who respect the democratic and free parliamentary system, as reference to "Erskine May" will reveal.

Clause C. of the plan of action even refers to the need for only "a short term campaign"—obviously just long enough to last only until the votes are cast on December 7.

I can inform the House that the campaign is being financed by Mr. D. A. Reynolds. This is the same Mr. Reynolds whose agents have conducted a campaign against me, my staff and my family in the last year or so. That arch-user of phoney committees, Mr. F. R. Gardiner, the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Kurilpa, is one of the leaders of this phoney committee.

I do not believe, and I say this with some satisfaction and gratification, that the campaign has the support of the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labor Party or the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tucker. I do not believe they are involved.

However, on the basis of information that has been made available to me by several reliable sources, I believe that the honourable member for Rockhampton is fully acquainted with this campaign, has given it support, and is a party to it in exchange for financial support from the Reynolds interests associated with the "campaign against injustice" committee.

I am also informed that the A.L.P. candidate for Nundah is also aware of the campaign, and is to receive substantial financial support from a similar source.

I do not include other honourable members opposite in this, as I could not believe that a number of them would be associated with it. They have made representations and complaints to me about the activities of Mr. Reynolds's companies on behalf of their constituents.

I could not believe, for example, that the honourable member for Lytton would be associated with this campaign. I know that he has taken a very keen interest in the Connolly inquiry and in the protection of the interests of small investors.

To indicate the depth of public concern on this matter—the kind of concern that has made me totally determined not to be stood over or intimidated by Mr. Reynolds or his agents, be they election candidates or not—I can inform the House that the file in my office of written complaints and queries in relation to Mutual Home Loans,

of which Mr. Reynolds is the principal, is more than six inches thick and still expanding! I have it with me, and here it is.

I have had complaints from dozens of young people who have been told that they cannot get their money back, and in many cases lifelong savings have been at stake.

As just one example, I draw the attention of honourable members to an item which appeared in "The Courier-Mail" on 18 September 1973, under the heading, "In Tears over Lost Money".

I quote from the item—

"A young woman left a public meeting of Mutual Home Loans Funds in Brisbane last night in tears after claiming that she and her husband had lost money because a fund director had allegedly misled them.

"As the woman left the meeting while fund officials were attempting to explain the complicated financial deal she and her husband had been involved in, she yelled: 'Just send us back our \$700.'"

This is typical of the kind of complaint which I have received. As recently as a week ago a member of the Opposition made representations to me on behalf of constituents and action was taken to recover funds for them. I am glad to say that we were successful.

The member for Rockhampton and the A.L.P. candidates for Kurilpa and Nundah stand condemned for being associated with an organisation with such a doubtful record in dealing with little people in the community, and they have much to answer for.

But I want to assure this House—and the people of Queensland—and my own constituents in particular—that I will not be daunted, discouraged or silenced in my efforts to protect the rights of people by any campaign organised and funded by a vested interest with a questionable public record, whether it costs that interest \$10,000 or \$100,000.

I intend to continue to discharge the responsibilities that go with my ministerial office, as well as those of the elected representative of the people of Nundah, in the best interests of the State of Queensland and all its citizens.

This particular campaign is scurrilous, shabby and shameful, and I will see that it is exposed as such.

If the honourable member for Rockhampton persists in being associated with this campaign, then I will be obliged to go to Rockhampton, during the pre-election period, and explain to his electors the whole circumstances by which he came to be promised a four-figure sum from a Brisbane source for his own campaign.

But I am confident that he will be lacking in supporters and backers within his own ranks, as will the candidates for Kurilpa and Nundah, because I believe that not even

the bribe of campaign money would sway many members opposite to be associated with Mr. Reynolds in any way.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Queensland ought to know about the dirty and shabby, but costly, campaign now being plotted and planned against me.

I have not the slightest doubt that the people of Nundah will reject this campaign, and anyone who is associated with it.

I hope and believe that the responsible men in the Opposition, and the A.L.P. generally, will reject it and refuse to be associated with it as well.

We have long been fortunate in Australian politics to be free of the undesirable features of electioneering which so frequently are manifest in other countries. We are fortunate that candidates for all parties can be presented to the people fairly and judged on their merits.

The style of campaign outlined in these documents, and specifically designed ultimately to benefit Reynolds's interests to the prejudice of the interests of ordinary people, is foreign to Australian politics and electioneering methods.

I trust that the Leader of the Opposition, and responsible members of his party, will join me in condemning the campaign that I have today exposed, and will refuse to be associated with it in any way.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (11.25 a.m.), by leave: The honourable the Minister for Justice (Mr. Knox) has just made a number of extremely serious allegations concerning me and Mr. Frank Gardiner, a highly respected barrister, as to an alleged sinister type of campaign against him in which we are supposed to be involved. I can fully appreciate that the Minister is worried about the election campaign to be fought in the electorate of Nundah. It is well known that the Australian Labor Party has endorsed a very strong candidate in the person of Mr. Len Hingley.

However, while I accept the right of the Minister to use this Chamber for personal and party-political purposes, I take strong exception to what can only be described as a vicious attempt to smear and damage my character and reputation. I state, without qualification, that the allegations made by the Minister are completely untrue. I have never conspired, co-operated—

Mr. Knox interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister to listen. I gave him his chance. I have never conspired, co-operated or worked with Mr. Frank Gardiner or any other person to set up some type of committee or "campaign against injustice" aimed at attacking the

honourable the Minister for Justice, or any other member of the Government, as has been stated. Furthermore, I have never discussed any aspect of a campaign which might be waged in the Minister's electorate with Mr. Gardiner or, in the case of Mr. Hingley, in the last six months. I would add that I have never received any financial support from Mutual Home Loans or any related company, or from any individual associated in any way with that company. Nor will I personally be receiving any money to my campaign account in Rockhampton from the company or persons named by the Minister.

I was told yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that an effort was being made to expose an alleged injustice done to Mutual Home Loans by the Minister for Justice, and that advertisements would be published to that effect. This is the business of that company, and I have made no suggestions as to what form the advertisements should take. My involvement with Mutual Home Loans, as is recorded in "Hansard", has been as follows: firstly I exposed in this Parliament what I believed to be questionable practices of Queensland Home Loans Limited; I think that is the name of the company. I still stand by my criticism because there were criminal elements in that company. I have also challenged, however, by way of questions in this Parliament, the manner in which the Minister has tried to destroy the principle of this home loan scheme.

Unlike the Minister I do not intend to use this opportunity to launch a personal attack, or character assassination, on him because that would achieve nothing other than to destroy the importance of my personal explanation. I put it to honourable members that the test of the truth of the Minister's allegations will be whether or not he is prepared to leave the protection of this Chamber and repeat his statement outside. As one versed in law the Minister knows that truth is the basic defence in any action of defamation. If he believes his own allegations, if he has the courage of his own convictions as he has just indicated to this Chamber, he will not be afraid to repeat his allegation outside. I challenge him to do so.

Mr. Knox: I will repeat it outside and publish it.

Mr. WRIGHT: All right. I want the Minister to do that.

Mr. Hodges: And you do the same with Samford Valley.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, I will do that, too.

If the Minister does not accept my challenge he will prove to the people of the State what type of man he is, and it will place a serious question mark on his credibility both as Minister for Justice and as a member of Parliament.

Mr. Knox: I have told you what I will do.

Mr. WRIGHT: I repeat that the Minister's allegations are totally untrue and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.30 a.m.), by leave: The Minister for Justice has in his ministerial statement joined the Parliamentary Labor Party and me as well as the Queensland Central Executive with the Mutual Home Loans Fund.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: It would appear that he did.

A Government Member: Clean your ears out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask all honourable members to allow the Leader of the Opposition the same rights and privileges as the other two speakers have had.

Mr. TUCKER: If he did not specifically say that I was involved, he said so by innuendo. On behalf of the Parliamentary Labor Party and the Queensland Central Executive I say—

Mr. KNOX: I rise to a point of order. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is under a misunderstanding. Let me read what I said in my prepared ministerial statement—

"I do not believe—and I say this with some satisfaction and gratification—that the campaign has the support of the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labor Party or of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker)."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Leader of the Opposition accepts that explanation.

Mr. TUCKER: The moment this type of thing is published outside the Chamber connected with my name in association with the Parliamentary Labor Party and the Q.C.E., some of the dirt sticks. I intend to have my say here today.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: I say—

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: I ask Government members to make up their minds whether they will shut up and let me have a go.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will refrain from persistent interjections; I warn all honourable members that they will not be tolerated.

Mr. TUCKER: My party is certainly not in agreement with the tactics that have been outlined here today. For quite a considerable time we have received correspondence

from Mr. D. A. Reynolds. The executive of the party met, considered every aspect of what was forwarded to us and decided to do nothing about it. That has been the attitude of our party for a considerable period. Therefore, I dissociate the Q.C.E. and the Parliamentary Labor Party and all its members from the matter.

Further, I speak in defence of the honourable member for Rockhampton, Mr. Gardiner, our endorsed candidate for Kurilpa, and our candidate for Nundah.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: I do not see that they are in any way associated with this, either. I say that—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Leader of the Opposition that he is making a personal statement. This is not to develop into a debate.

Mr. TUCKER: I am making a personal statement, but surely as the leader of a party I am entitled as part and parcel of my duties to reply. I do not think that any of these people are associated with this, either.

I end on this note. The Minister is very worried about some vested interests attacking him and about a vendetta against him. He is in a position in which it is his business to fight these people, not to smear us.

The Minister used the words "scurrilous and shabby" and "nothing too low". I claim that the Minister's tactics on a number of occasions in calling us Communists and things of that sort have been shabby, and what is more—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: Surely it is a case of Satan reproving sin.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: It is Satan reproving sin.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A. If he does not obey Parliamentary Standing Orders and the Chair, he will be treated in the appropriate manner.

Mr. TUCKER: I say that surely it is a case of Satan reproving sin when the Minister stands up here shedding crocodile tears.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I said that the statement of the Minister was offensive to me and I asked that he withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There will be no further discussion upon it. I will not allow the matter to develop into a debate.

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. Statements have been made about me in the House this morning. The Standing Orders strictly state that if words used in the Chamber are offensive to a member, he may ask for them to be withdrawn. I ask that they be withdrawn, because the Minister has told untruths and his statement is offensive to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. Wright: The Minister is a liar. The Minister is a liar!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Sir GORDON CHALK: I rise to a point of order. I distinctly heard the honourable member for Rockhampton refer to the Minister for Justice, who is a member of my party, as a liar. That is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that you see that he withdraws it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will withdraw the remark.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not intend to withdraw it. The Minister told lies about me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will withdraw the remark in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders. There will be no discussion on the matter. He will withdraw the remark without reservation or I shall deal with him.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. WRIGHT: The statements made by the Minister are lies and I will not withdraw my statement.

NAMING OF MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member for Rockhampton.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.37 a.m.): The honourable member for Rockhampton has certainly acted in a very unseemly and unparliamentary manner. I therefore move—

"That the honourable member for Rockhampton be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the day."

Question put; and the House divided—
In division—

Sir GORDON CHALK: I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a person in the gallery who is leaning over the rail.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I inform all persons in the gallery that nobody is allowed or permitted to lean over the rail. Would the police officers in the gallery please attend to that matter.

AYES, 39

Alison	Knox
Armstrong	Lane
Bird	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	Miller
Camm	Moore, R. E.
Campbell	Muller
Chalk	Murray
Chinchen	Newbery
Cory	Porter
Crawford	Rae
Edwards	Scott-Young
Fletcher	Small
Gunn	Sullivan
Hartwig	Tomkins
Herbert	Tooth
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Wharton
Hewitt, W. D.	
Hinze	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hodges	
Hooper, K. W.	Frawley
Kaus	Lee

NOES, 25

Baldwin	Melloy
Blake	Moore, F. P.
Bousen	Newton
Bromley	O'Donnell
Burns	Tucker
Davis	Wood, B.
Dean	Wood, P.
Hanlon	Wright
Hanson	Yewdale
Houston	
Inch	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jensen	D'Arcy
Jones, N. F.	Leese
Marginson	

PAIRS:

Hooper, K. W.	Harvey
Ahern	Hooper, K. J.
Row	Jones, R.
Hughes	Jordan

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Rockhampton that he must show the utmost respect to the Chair even when leaving the Chamber. If before leaving the precincts of the House he behaves as he has just done, I will have much pleasure in dealing with him again tomorrow.

Whereupon the honourable member for Rockhampton withdrew from the Chamber.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (11.43 a.m.), by leave: I make this statement as a result of the detailed report which was tabled in the House this morning by the Minister in charge of police—a report which I welcome.

Several weeks ago in this House, in a personal explanation I made to the House following a personal attack which was made on me by the honourable member for Rockhampton, I stated that a person named John Wells who was mentioned

by him had been convicted of an offence of possession of a dangerous drug at Coolangatta some years previously. I gave this information in good faith at the time, and, I thought, in the public interest, based on information I had received hastily from the Police Department.

It is now clear from the Minister's report that the John Wells mentioned by the member for Rockhampton and the man convicted at Coolangatta are not one and the same, and I wish to apologise to Mr. Wells for my error, which was made in good faith at the time. I regret any harm that this information may have done Mr. Wells, and I ask him to accept my apology, which I hope will go some way towards clearing the public record in this respect.

However, I do not withdraw anything that I said about the conduct of the honourable member for Rockhampton, who I believe acted despicably in this matter by using the privilege of Parliament for sordid political purposes. It has been clearly demonstrated here this morning that the honourable member for Rockhampton is the leader of the dirty tricks department of the Labor Party in this State.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I seek your ruling on what occurred last night. I took a point of order on behalf of the honourable member for Archerfield who was not in the Chamber. The point of order was refused. Today you accepted a point of order from the Treasurer.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will be prepared to give that ruling tomorrow.

PETITION

PRESERVATION OF ANZAC SQUARE

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) presented a petition from 1,021 residents of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will do all things in its power to cause the Order in Council dated August 31, 1933, permanently reserving and setting aside the lands known as Anzac Square in Brisbane for park purposes, to be reinstated and adhered to.

Petition read and received.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

FREE MILK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN

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

(1) As indicated in the Estimates and Auditor-General's Report, what is the reason for an appropriation of \$15,807 from the Special Standing Fund for free milk for school children for 1974-75?

(2) To what deliveries and to what date did the expenditure of \$1.4 million refer in 1973-74?

Answers:—

(1) "An appropriation of \$15,807 was made in the Estimates under Special Standing Fund—Free Milk for School Children for (a) To meet any outstanding claims from firms for delivery or supply of milk during the 1973 school year; and (b) To enable the balance remaining in the fund to be repaid to the Commonwealth Government."

(2) "The expenditure of \$1.4 million in 1973-74 refers to costs of delivery and supply of milk to schools during the 1973 school year."

APPLICATIONS FOR HOUSING COMMISSION ACCOMMODATION, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) How many applications for rental accommodation and home purchase are presently held by the Townsville office of the Queensland Housing Commission?

(2) How many applications for rental accommodation have been received from pensioners and when will the first units be available?

Answers:—

(1) "For houses—81 with priority and 136 without priority. For flats—48 with priority and 130 without priority."

(2) "Single pensioners, 54; pensioner couples, 12. It is anticipated that the first units will be occupied in mid-November."

SUGAR AGREEMENT WITH CHINA

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

In view of the need by the sugar industry for confirmation of any new sugar agreements when determining the need for the expansion of production, has any information been received on the period of the contract and the price for the sale of sugar to China?

Answer:—

"The Minister for Northern Development made it clear, when announcing the result of his discussions with Chinese Ministers on a long term contract for our sugar, that the aspects of quantity, duration and price would need to be settled at the commercial level. The Sugar Board advises that such a commercial contract has not yet been negotiated. This result does not in any way reflect an unwillingness on our part to enter into the relevant negotiations. Indeed, the Sugar Board

has advised that our agents, CSR Limited, have been standing ready for some time to negotiate and hope to receive advice shortly as to when the Chinese authorities will be in a position to resume negotiations. It may be that a significant concern of the Chinese authorities relates to their need to adopt a system, suited to their own requirements, for the receipt of bulk raw sugar. It has been fully recognised by both sides that the Industry is geared to the export of sugar in bulk and that an expansion of China's ability to receive large quantities of bulk raw sugar was an essential pre-condition to a major increase in the sugar trade between the two countries. The Sugar Board, CSR Limited, and indeed the whole industry, have made major efforts to show the Chinese authorities our own bulk handling technology. Nothing has been held back. These efforts have been well received by the Chinese authorities who have reacted in a positive spirit. I hope that the bulk handling problem will soon cease to be a significant bottle-neck to our trade with China. Accordingly, I look forward to the negotiation of a commercial long term contract on mutually satisfactory terms covering a substantial quantity of Queensland's sugar exports to China."

CEMENT QUOTA, GAYNDAH

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

In view of the acute shortage of cement for contractors of Government buildings, a Main Roads Department bridge and local government and private undertakings in Gayndah, will he take urgent action to arrange for a larger cement quota for Gayndah and seek permission to have these supplies made available by road transport, as apparently the Railway Department cannot meet the situation?

Answer:—

"I appreciate the Honourable Member's concern in this matter, and following his earlier representations I have initiated further discussions with the management of The Queensland Cement & Lime Co. Ltd. with a view to ascertaining whether it is possible in any way to alleviate the situation to which he refers."

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FOR GRAZIERS

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

Will he deeply research ways and means of providing financial assistance which could be made available, possibly through an amended rural-reconstruction scheme

or similar scheme, to assist primary producers who are in financial difficulties owing to the present depressed beef prices and who are finding themselves unable to service their bank interest and local authority rate commitments?

Answer:—

"I share the Honourable Member's concern at the financial plight of primary producers brought about by the disturbing reduction in beef prices over recent months. Funds available for debt reconstruction under the existing Rural Reconstruction Scheme are insufficient to cope with the situation which has now developed but I shall look closely into the matter to see what can be done to provide additional assistance."

REORGANISATION OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY INDUSTRY

Mr. Marginson for **Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) Will only four local government members be included as elected representatives to the Cairns Regional Electricity Board under the future provision for the reorganisation of the electricity supply industry? If so, what other representation will constitute the operating boards and how will they be appointed?

(2) Under the new arrangements, how and on what basis will the seven distributing authorities gain representation on the central generating authority and/or ultimate administrative authority?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The Honourable Member is aware of the details of the proposals for reorganisation of the electricity supply industry. A copy of the report outlining these proposals was sent to each Member of this House. I emphasise that it is the Government's intention that all these proposals be fully discussed with the existing electric authorities and the views of these authorities taken into account before any legislation is introduced."

DREDGING, CAIRNS HARBOUR

Mr. Marginson for **Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Conservation,—

(1) Is he aware that two Burns Philp ships, "Iron Branbury" and "Mundooro," cannot enter the Cairns Harbour due to the lack of water and the unavailability of a dredge to clear silting in the channel and, if so, are these vessels carrying bulk fertiliser needed for use in the sugar-growing areas of Far North Queensland?

(2) When will dredging allow these ships to enter the port?

(3) Will these ships and others be delayed and for what periods and what effect will the delays ultimately have on costs to primary industry in the Cairns district?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "I am advised that the vessels 'Iron Branbury' and 'Mundooro' are due to arrive at Cairns Harbour on November 7 next and are expected to enter the harbour without restriction. Regarding the reference to possible restrictions and future dredging at Cairns, I would refer the Honourable Member to my Answers to his Questions on October 22 last."

VISIT OF SENATOR CAVANAGH TO WEIPA ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY

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

(1) Is he aware of the present visit of Senator Cavanagh to Weipa?

(2) What is the nature of the visit and is it causing further disruption and unrest among Aborigines?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "From Press reports and a telegram two days ago from Senator Cavanagh, I understand that he is visiting Weipa at the end of calls at a number of other centres. There is no doubt that the visit is designed primarily to endeavour to create unrest and disharmony amongst Aboriginal people, and I would forecast also for party political purposes in view of the election, but especially as a result of a particularly vitriolic attack on him and his department by a group of Aborigines in North Queensland. I have a copy of the message sent to him, but at this stage must respect the privacy of those who told him they have no trust in him or his department. I am sure that the whole exercise is most embarrassing to Senator Cavanagh and must have been aggravated by yesterday's efforts in Canberra when the people his department has been financially sponsoring for so long, finally turned upon their masters. I very much regret having to foreshadow his intent as I have at all times endeavoured to encourage both the Commonwealth Government and others to refrain using Aborigines as political 'footballs' and political 'pawns'. My information on the so-called Weipa conference conveys that it is a determined attempt by radical people in North Queensland, as a result of manipulation by Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs' officers and others, to create distrust and

unrest amongst former residents of Mapoon. The vast majority of these people over many years have established themselves in conventional urban society in many towns in Queensland and are raising families of whom anyone could be proud. The Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs through its various agencies, has gathered together numbers of the former residents from Silkwood, Townsville, Cairns, Normanton and other northern centres. Senator Cavanagh, with an entourage of Canberra officers, is visiting Weipa today in a V.I.P. aircraft, but also there have been at least three special aircraft charters, at public expense, including a DC3, to convey people from Cairns, Normanton and northern centres. There is no doubt that a preliminary meeting at Weipa yesterday, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joe McGuinness of Cairns, who is well known for his radical left-wing attitudes, is nothing more than designed to tear at the heartstrings and the emotions of such people, who are well adjusted, and are bringing up their children as normal and conventional Queenslanders. It can do nothing more than create further emotional and family disruption and probably destroy the painstaking work of years on the part of the families, the Presbyterian Church and my Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, who have done all possible to assist in the transitional stage of urban living which the people voluntarily undertook. I can only express my extreme sorrow that a Minister of the Crown would be associated with such a project. There is no doubt in my mind that the whole exercise is a deliberate attempt designed to force upon Queensland's citizens, the recommendations of the Woodward Report in the Northern Territory and the objectives of the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs, which are to create 'black' States inhabited only by Aboriginal people in an apartheid situation, to the overall detriment primarily of the people themselves and secondly Australia as a nation. I must emphasize that the site of the former Mapoon Mission has been preserved by the State Government as a holiday area and people encouraged to visit there from time to time as they would wish and numbers have done so. I have no doubt that the majority of the former Mapoon people are wise enough to see through the obvious manoeuvres of this diabolical attempt to subvert them from being citizens of Queensland and Australia and reject it with the contempt it deserves. I am informed that last night at Normanton, the Minister's response to a simple request by the local authority (the Carpentaria Shire Council) for a few thousand dollars to improve the water supply, to permit extension of services to more Aboriginal homes, was a threat to virtually annihilate the town by fostering a separate 'village' of Aboriginal people. Surely apartheid in

the extreme! Yet at the same time, he must be aware that his department's secretary, Mr. B. Dexter, and the chairman of his Advisory council, Dr. H. C. Coombs, have stated that the rehousing programme for Aboriginal people at Normanton is more than satisfactory and proceeding at a rate within the absorption capacity of the Aboriginal people and the town itself. After his tour of the west and visits to some selected centres, including border camps of refugees from his Northern Territory policies which he himself has described as a national disaster, he claims neglect and underspending. Until he became Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, he probably was never out of a city or into the spinifex and seen Aborigines in real life. I must refute such allegations by this despicable dealer in despair of his own creation. The facts are that contrary to his claims, his own actions have virtually condemned hundreds of families to despair by his diverting to other States more than three million dollars, allocated by the Commonwealth Treasurer to Queensland in his budget. Surely he will recall his approval of one million dollars, as advised in the following telegram of March 22:— 'Your telegram re housing funds stop Minister has just approved of your being authorised to undertake additional commitments up to one million dollars during current financial year against additional funds of this amount being included in next years allocation stop This course being adopted because release of additional funds now would require appropriation by Parliament and would take time stop If however you have savings on other sections which could be utilised for housing this could be authorised with ministerial approval stop Should you favour this course as well please provide details.' He further gives the lie to his words of underspending by his own letter of May 26, 1974, which reads: '... I refer to your letter of May 1, 1974 detailing the anticipated carry-over of funds as at June 30, 1974 and recommending a further commitment against the 1974-75 program of \$1,271,000 to be used to continue the housing program. I am now pleased to inform you that I have approved a further commitment, making a total of \$2,271,000 of additional funds available to continue the 1973-74 housing program. My department will adjust the 1974-75 request to include the additional commitment . . .' How can anyone have confidence in a Government comprised of such persons! I am sure Honourable Members would be interested in hearing the attitude of a number of Aborigines as conveyed in a telegram on October 22 to Senator Cavanagh, a copy of which has been made available to me:—'. . . So far you have done nothing to help Mapoon people except promises stop Yesterday police and DAIA threatened Jerry Hudson in Weipa not to return to Mapoon stop Transport

is needed now supplies are needed now stop We are busting our guts to keep supplies going to keep police and DAIA away from Mapoon while your useless mistrusted office 'boys' in Cairns write you false reports stop In our books you are just as bad for your braggadocio false promises and time-wasting tactics while the people with the guts are now being threatened and intimidated and you have the gall to say you are waiting and considering a further report stop Just where do you stand? If you stand at all stop Whose side are you on anyway? You shot your mouth off saying you would fund Mapoon as soon as people moved back stop They trusted you and your promises but you have let them down very convincingly stop You have had one month to put your money where your mouth is but again you have failed miserably stop Meeting must be held in Weipa or Mapoon where the real people are where the action is taking place stop Restrictive boycott with the Press and T.V. and the people will be put on any such meeting in Cairns stop Also this meeting must be organised by one of our North Queensland representatives who is trusted by the people not Grimwade nor Wallace stop Give us Joe McGuinness to organise this meeting stop We won't accept any other of your stooges stop By the way we used our own money for this telegram.' A report just to hand from Cunnamulla advises many complaints from the Aboriginal people there about the visit of Senator Cavanagh and more particularly members of his party, who invaded their homes and their privacy for photographic purposes without prior permission or approval. A petition of objection has been delivered to the department's officer who says the people are particularly irate over the photographing of a young lad standing outside a toilet door. They consider this a gross invasion of personal privacy and are seeking legal advice on possible action against the offenders. I sympathise with the people of Cunnamulla who have been subjected to such intolerable circumstances as a result of the Senator's visit and can assure them that whatever action my department can take to redress their wrongs will be readily available."

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES— FIFTH ALLOTTED DAY

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

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1974-75

DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS

CHIEF OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister
for Development and Industrial Affairs) (12.1
p.m.): I move—

"That \$2,312,277 be granted for 'Department of Commercial and Industrial Development—Chief Office'."

By way of preamble I point out that I have condensed my remarks so that as many members as possible will have an opportunity to speak in the time allotted for this debate.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CAMPBELL: In the process of Queensland evolution, the importance of many Government departments has risen or fallen, depending on the needs, or pressures, of an era. Two departments for which the future can hold nothing but increasing responsibility and contribution are those of Commercial and Industrial Development and Industrial Affairs, and it is with pleasure that I present their Estimates, happy in the knowledge that, while I expect and will welcome constructive criticism, the Committee, I am sure, will see fit generally to endorse policies of proven success and record its thanks for the sustained dedication of the departmental officers.

I should like to develop a little the twin themes of policies and performance, and to thank, at the outset, Sir David Muir and Mr. Harold Muhl and their staffs for an imaginative, expert and progressive approach to areas of service vital to Queensland. The two departments are well teamed, of course.

As our State expands and further decentralises and diversifies its industrial base, largely through the efforts of the Department of Industrial Development, so will the charges press more heavily on the Department of Industrial Affairs and its constituent sections of industrial law enforcement and adjudication, occupational safety, apprenticeship, vehicle roadworthiness and safety, weights and measures, and so on.

One result of what we have already planned and introduced is a network of industrial estates stretching from Cairns to the Gold

Coast and west to Mount Isa, and a regionalised—and in cases, mobile—service in all aspects of industrial affairs.

I enlarge on the activities of each department later, but at this stage I want more clearly to limn the picture of two expert organisations operating separately yet complementarily. The Queensland Government has laid down guide-lines for the attraction of industry which offer the best inducement of any State in Australia. I state this as a fact because of the number of industrialists who have “shopped around” the other States before making their decision to come here. And it is not only the physical standards of our industrial estates, the terms of occupancy, the opportunity to freehold or the concessions, particularly to non-metropolitan entrepreneurs, which attract them. It is the back-up in expert advisory service and promotion which sometimes tips the scales.

We must remember that all States are in intense competition for industry and that, on many occasions, just that little bit more than climate and print-outs of growth and market expectations is necessary. It is this field of service—on top of all other factors—that I feel gives us the edge.

Honourable members would be interested to know, for example, that we comb the world for types of manufactures for which we feel there is a market outlet here and help to arrange licensing agreements. Conversely, we have been successful on many occasions in organising the manufacture overseas of Queensland products. I quote only these two facts to demonstrate that the Department of Industrial Development is international, not parochial, in outlook and action and that we should debate its Estimates in the several lights of its spectrum.

So, too, with the Department of Industrial Affairs. There would be few, indeed, who would query the growth in power of the trade union movement and the increased incidence of industrial disputation, the requirement of added apprenticeship skills in an increasingly technical world of work, the need for occupational safety to become a habit not an instruction, or the growing complexity of industrial law.

Add to these services to the public on road-worthiness in second-hand vehicles and inspections for safety of passenger buses, building safety construction codes, fire prevention and precautions in public buildings, the appointment of training advisers to go into industry, the construction of mobile classrooms for despatch to areas of industrial growth and a constant quest for uniformity among States on matters of great importance, such as the marking of degrees of flammability of children's nightwear.

I mention here only a few of the activities of the Department of Industrial Affairs which have, in my mind, made it one of the most

important—and highly volatile—of all Government departments. But I should like to stress one thing at this juncture. The Department of Industrial Affairs could not function so successfully without the backing of management and labour.

I am intensely proud of the contribution made by our tripartite committees on industrial advice, apprenticeship and safety in the meat, land, transport and building construction industries. I feel we have established a wonderfully common ground because there is trust, there is objectivity, there is certainty that nobody seeks to score a political or other point. It is an example of living well together which I only wish could be applied to all facets of industrial life, and I should like to record my personal and official thanks to those gentlemen who give so willingly of their time and experience.

Now I should like to deal with each department in more detail, look where they have been and are going and draw some conclusions on the facts, figures and portents which will pattern the future of our still great State.

Department of Commercial and Industrial Development

During the last ten years we have witnessed industrial growth on an ever-widening front, greater utilisation of natural resources (particularly minerals) and a general strengthening of the non-primary sector of the State's economic structure. The structural changes which have occurred over that period have indeed given Queensland a more balanced and stable economy than at any time in its history.

As a result, more people and capital have been attracted to Queensland. In the twelve months to December 1973, population increased by 2.5 per cent, or almost twice the rate for the rest of Australia. Net migration contributed more than half of the increase because of the growing volume of employment opportunities being generated here.

By 1973-74, Queensland had clearly emerged as the most rapidly developing State in Australia in terms of population growth, employment, production and income levels. This is naturally a source of much satisfaction to the Government, and as Minister I am proud of the role which the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development has played in aiding such growth. When I look ahead, however, I must confess that I have grave misgivings about our economic prospects in the immediate future. Clearly my apprehension is shared by many others—including members on both sides of this Chamber.

Queensland, of course, operates within a national economic policy framework. In principle there is nothing wrong with that. But what concerns me is that the policies

being pursued by the present Labor Government in Canberra are seriously affecting the interests of States such as Queensland which are so heavily dependent on the utilisation of natural resources for their economic development.

Again the Commonwealth Government's policy of active discouragement of private investment, and its mistaken belief in the alleged virtues of Government control and ownership, must inevitably work to the disadvantage of this State. The attraction of overseas capital investment is an anathema to the Labor Party, but in pursuing this aspect of ideology the socialists overlook the undeniable benefits of know-how and markets which accrue from such an investment policy.

For a decade to 1971-72, Queensland benefited substantially from a high rate of investment, particularly in the development of large-scale undertakings using natural resources. The cumulative impact of the growth so generated induced further investment. As a result we became the most buoyant State in Australia.

In company with the rest of Australia, Queensland suffered from a recession in investment. Until 1974-75, however, the dampening effect was cushioned by record levels of expenditure on new buildings. Unfortunately, this year the building component of capital expenditure has also declined.

It cannot be overemphasised that private investment is the basic factor in achieving any improvement in productivity. Productivity, in turn, is the key ingredient in raising living standards. Clearly then, an adequate rate of private investment is a prerequisite for the restoration of stability and growth in the national economy. No-one wants idle plant or labour capacity.

The fundamental objective of the State's developmental policy is balanced and integrated regional development of its primary, secondary and tertiary industries. Within this over-all policy framework, the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development has in many ways actively assisted in accelerating the process of regional development. In fact, each year it is becoming increasingly better-equipped to perform this vital function.

The concept of regional growth is not new to Queensland. The State has long recognised the advantages to be derived from a more even distribution of its population and industry. Indeed, virtually from the very day it was established this department has undertaken regional analyses.

Appraisals of the natural resources and industries of the various regions of the State are carried out regularly. This is sometimes undertaken in conjunction with other instrumentalities such as the Commonwealth Department of Northern Development or institutions of advanced education.

One of the early studies undertaken by the department conjointly with the Northern Division of the former Commonwealth Department of National Development, related to Central Queensland. There is no doubt that this analysis in large part led to a favourable decision being taken to construct a major power station at Gladstone to supply the needs of power-intensive industries.

A survey of the resources and industry of the Mackay region, prepared in conjunction with the Department of Northern Development, has just been released. Utilisation of natural resources will undoubtedly continue to provide the growth catalyst for the development of many regions of the State. Invariably, resource utilisation involves substantial capital investment. As a result it is usually undertaken by large-scale organisations well equipped not only to determine the feasibility and viability of such projects, but to carry them through to fruition. In practice, the department's primary area of concern will continue to be the development of the smaller-scale type of industries.

Over the years, the department has maintained a close liaison with industrial management in regional centres. It has actively encouraged local interest and participation in the promotion of regional growth and as a consequence it enjoys a high reputation amongst the business community in the various provincial areas of the State.

As I have already indicated, the department is well equipped to provide technical support in the evaluation of specific proposals, whether it be in terms of industrial assistance or advice to those contemplating the location or extension of a business in Queensland. It is also well equipped to undertake the continuing research which is necessary into manufacturing opportunities. This type of work, of course, must inevitably increase in volume as the State progresses towards industrial maturity.

The growing sophistication of industry in the future must also give rise to increasing opportunities for industrialists to diversify into new products and to acquire new technologies and processes. The department gives every encouragement to manufacturers, particularly in provincial centres, to take full advantage of the opportunities for expansion and diversification which accrue from the negotiation of licensing arrangements and joint-venture agreements with manufacturers in other parts of the world. The department has indeed been singularly successful in facilitating a number of arrangements of this kind.

With every State in Australia, and indeed most regions of the world, endeavouring to achieve growth through industrialisation, the search for new industry has in itself become a highly competitive operation. And it is destined to become even more so.

While the impact of promotional activities cannot be readily measured, I am convinced that the department's efforts in this field have made, and will continue to make, a significant contribution to the State's progress. Publicity has not been limited to Australia itself. Eye-catching and informative advertisements inserted in publications in the United Kingdom, Germany, U.S.A., Canada, Japan and the Far East have resulted in many inquiries being received. The department's principal publication, "Investment Queensland", enjoys a well-earned reputation as an up-to-date and authoritative source of information on the State. The current issue has been highly commended not only interstate, but also overseas.

The department has recently initiated a series of regional "industry and small business" seminars for the purpose of bringing local manufacturers up to date in latest developments, not only in the technological sense but in the related fields of management and accounting. The first was conducted in Rockhampton, and two more will be held shortly—one in Townsville and the other in Cairns.

The progressive extension of the Crown industrial estate network and pioneer factory-building programme has played a key role in the Government's policy of encouraging the establishment of new and expanding industry throughout the State. Presently, the department administers a total of 4,529 hectares throughout Queensland for Crown industrial estate purposes, of which only 1,377 hectares are located in Brisbane. In provincial areas, serviced sites are available in 21 centres. Additionally, land is held in 15 provincial centres for future development.

In view of the positive action being taken by the department, it is not surprising that the trend towards decentralised industry establishment has continued to strengthen each year. It is, indeed, significant that projects seeking to establish in provincial centres accounted for almost 65 per cent of the total number of applications processed by the department during the past financial year.

Undoubtedly, a major factor contributing to decentralised industrial growth has been the outstanding success of the department's rental factory-building scheme for pioneer-type operations. Since the inception of this programme in 1970, 23 buildings have been completed for rental to pioneer projects. Of these, only five relate to metropolitan undertakings. A further eight factories and two major extensions are under construction. In addition, nine buildings have been programmed for construction this year. All of these are located in provincial centres.

The high level of activity prevailing in the various provincial centres of the State is no less in evidence in the metropolitan area. Virtually all sites in the original Wacol estate have now been allocated. In fact, the stage has been reached where the demand

for land in the new Wacol extended area is almost outpacing our ability to provide completely serviced sites.

Increasing emphasis on landscaping and beautification has resulted in a substantial upgrading of the department's estate maintenance programme. This policy will be continued.

Let me turn now to migration—another aspect of the activities associated with the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development. Again this is an area which has suffered as a result of inconsistency of Federal policy. Because of the recent drastic decline in job opportunities, and the resultant increase in unemployment on a national scale, the Commonwealth Government has in effect given migration the axe. For my part, I hope this situation will be short-lived, because if we are to maintain the growth rate to which we have become accustomed in recent years, we will certainly need all the skilled workers we can muster.

Reverting to the point I made at the outset of my speech, I earnestly recommend to the Commonwealth Government that it review its present economic policy and provide some encouragement to private enterprise to enable it to increase its productivity, to provide further employment opportunities, and generally to contribute to the nation's well-being.

Department of Industrial Affairs

As I mentioned in my introductory remarks, highly volatile industrial attitudes and actions, and greater involvement in services ranging from protection of second-hand car buyers to on-job training advice for apprentices, have led to the emergence of the Department of Industrial Affairs as an arm of increasing importance to the Government.

Of all its activities, industrial relations are, of course, the most delicate; but I feel that here, too, considerable advances have been made. Indeed, I think I can go as far as saying that I believe initiatives I have taken have laid the foundation for better communication and understanding in an area vital to productivity and pay packets alike.

There will always be strikes, of course—some of them political. But I have never been able to conceive of anything more useless than management and labour sitting in opposite corners and speaking with one another only in court. So I revived, after a lapse of many years, what is known as the Industrial Affairs Advisory Council. It comprises Trades Hall and Combined Industrial Union delegates and representatives of commercial, industrial and employer organisations, with myself as chairman. I believe that its freewheeling, candid discussions have done more towards greater understanding of viewpoints than would ever be achieved in court. I believe it has dissipated many grey

areas which could have darkened into disputes, and helped consolidate what I believe to be, over all, the best industrial climate in Australia. I would therefore like to record my thanks to the members of this committee and to the members of the State Industrial Commission for their contributions and adjudications in the cause of greater industrial peace and added respect for the impartiality and expertise of a tribunal.

I will not have time to canvass in depth the many activities of the Department of Industrial Affairs, but even an encapsulation will give honourable members a greater appreciation of the scope of its activities.

Industrial

I have sponsored legislation during the present Parliament to—

Require the labelling of children's flammable nightwear;

Strengthen rules relating to eye and ear protection for workers;

Extend trading hours for small shops and the list of goods permitted to be sold;

Remove, under certain circumstances, the protection of unions from civil action;

Make it a right for employees to retain accumulated sick leave credits when their employers' firm changes ownership.

The Industrial Commission has—

Increased sick leave entitlements from five to eight days a year; increased annual leave by one week; prescribed a 17½ per cent loading on annual leave payments; and granted "accident pay" so that for 26 weeks after injury an employee receives the award rate of pay while receiving compensation.

The Government is examining whether casual workers can be given long service leave.

I have originated industrial relations courses, and expanded apprenticeship opportunities.

Occupational Safety and Weights and Measures

Roadworthiness certificates required before sale of second-hand vehicles have been effective in improving the standard of vehicles on the road. Almost 200,000 vehicles were inspected last year, and this figure is expected to be equalled this year.

For the first time in Australia, a scheme has been introduced, initially in Brisbane, Gold Coast and Ipswich areas, requiring the display of safety inspection windscreen stickers on buses. It is hoped eventually to extend the scheme to cover all commercial vehicles inspected.

A new tripartite council, the Land Transport Industry Occupational Safety Council, was formed during 1974. It joins safety councils for the meat and building-construction industries.

Expanded occupational safety activities include a new safety film on the meat industry.

More sugar industry management safety seminars are planned, as are courses for project safety officers.

Portable rigger-training units have been introduced for the first time in Australia. Initial classes are being conducted at Townsville and Gladstone, and the units will be moved to other developing industrial areas after 12 months.

Apprenticeship Executive

Block-release training continues to be extended, and eventually it will cover all apprenticeship callings. Apprentice training advisers have now been appointed to country as well as metropolitan areas.

As a result of promotional activities, Queensland has a higher ratio of apprentices to population than any other State. A total of 6,705 apprentices were allotted in the year to 30 June, compared with 5,709 in the previous year. This rates an increase of over 17 per cent, and the total of 20,000 undergoing training is an all-time record.

I must stress again the point I made in relation to the Industrial Affairs Advisory Committee. The success of the apprenticeship system depends upon the co-operation of employers, unions and, on this occasion, parents.

State Fire Services Council

The Fire Safety Act 1974 was introduced in the interests of public safety. Its implementation awaits the preparation of regulations and the training of officers. This is now being done.

Complementary legislation for uniform building by-laws is planned for next year.

Regional fire-safety officers have been appointed to Brisbane and country areas.

The ever-increasing cost of maintaining fire brigades is a matter for concern. Budgets for the boards have risen from \$11,900,000 last financial year to an anticipated \$17,500,000 this year. Salaries alone will increase by \$3,500,000 this financial year.

Factories and Shops

I mentioned in my introductory remarks action in connection with protection from tort, portable sick leave credits, and flammability of children's nightwear. But there is a most basic aspect of this division, which deals directly with employers and employees, to which I must refer.

For example, in the course of inspections to ensure that industrial laws are being observed, wages adjusted in the year to 30 June amounted to \$296,174, comprising \$232,429 in the country and \$63,745 in Brisbane.

During the year 413 prosecutions were launched, representing 361 actions under awards and breaches of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

In-service training courses and appreciation courses in industrial relations have been so well patronised that they may be extended to country areas.

The division now has six industrial cadets, and will engage three more this financial year.

Conclusion

In conclusion, perhaps I should comment generally on where we are going in matters industrial.

Honourable members will have noted during my remarks that Queensland leads Australia in considering long-service leave for all, including casual workers; in insisting on buses carrying safety-inspection windscreen stickers; and in establishing mobile instruction courses for riggers.

It is this progressive, imaginative approach to all aspects of industrial affairs which will ensure that Queensland will continue to lead, and others will follow.

In the broader sphere, the inflationary trend has been reflected clearly in the work of the Industrial Commission. There has been a tendency over the past few years for many major industries to negotiate on wage rates, and in doing so the negotiators have been obliged to assess the probable or possible upward movement of the inflationary spiral for the duration of the wage agreement. In most cases they have not been successful, and this has resulted in more frequent negotiations and consequent rapid changes in wage levels. The Commission has thus been obliged to determine wage rates for various industries to ensure wage justice to employees in an inflationary period.

It is also noted that the move towards equal pay for females has resulted in the phasing-in of this concept in many callings, and it appears that the majority of female employees will be receiving the male rate of wages from 1 January 1975.

Finally, I should like to mention one case of interest heard by the commission, concerning preference to union members. The Full Bench of the commission refused an application by the Federated Clerks' Union for an extension of the preference clause in one award. This was treated as a test case. An appeal from this decision has been lodged, and it will be heard later this year by the Industrial Court.

I thank honourable members for the attentive manner in which they have listened to my accounting of the activities and ambitions of two departments of which I am very proud.

I commend their Estimates to the Committee.

Mr. BROMLEY (South Brisbane) (12.28 p.m.): The Minister's portfolio includes the responsibility and control of some 13 varied interests and associated subdepartments. Of course, this entails quite a lot of work and, as the Minister said—and I agree with him—each and every one of these departments is of tremendous interest because every one of them deals with people. His departmental officers administer about 24 Acts.

Whether the Minister's administration is completely efficient or humane enough it is not for me to say. He has been telling us for the last half hour that he thinks it is. Whether his attitude towards his responsibilities is conscientious enough is again a matter for him. Whether he is dictated to by the Premier and his Government colleagues, only he would know. But I know one thing for certain—if we judge him on some of his ministerial statements in this Chamber, on some of his Press statements and on some of the answers he has given here to Dorothy Dix questions asked by one or other of his crawling colleagues about the Australian Labor Government, he is succumbing more and more every day to the tactics of the Premier, who knows only two words anyway, and they are "hatred" and "non-co-operation". It seems to me that the Premier has conditioned the minds of his National Party (should I say "Nationalist" or "Nazi" Party?) colleagues, and is apparently succeeding in his attempt to do likewise with the members of the Liberal Party.

Psychologists and psychiatrists have told me that the Premier is becoming obsessed with his hatred for the Australian Government. They have also said that obsessions of this type tend to make a human being a very dangerous person in that his reasoning goes and eventually his mind explodes. I realise of course that the Minister is not undergoing as drastic a personality change as that; nevertheless I suggest that his feelings towards the Australian Government have clouded his judgment. I would of course, be sadly disappointed if he allowed his attitude to be influenced unduly.

Many members of the Liberal Party, including some I was speaking to at a recent public meeting, have told me that they are sick to death of their party's continual carping against Canberra. They fear the possibility of such criticism rebounding against them. Of course, if this happens it will suit us; nevertheless, I feel it my duty to warn the Minister not to be taken in by the Premier's attitude.

Mr. Davis: He wasn't a bad bloke last year.

Mr. BROMLEY: The Minister is still not a bad bloke.

I have read with interest the reports submitted by the Minister's departments, including the two that were printed this morning.

I was able to glance quickly through them, thanks to the Minister's courtesy in furnishing me with them. At the outset, I congratulate those officers responsible for their compilation, and I express appreciation to all the officers under the control of the Minister for their meritorious and conscientious performance of their duties. Naturally some departments are more important than others; nevertheless all play a major role in government.

It is impossible to mention each officer individually, so I shall content myself with paying a special tribute on behalf of the A.L.P. to Sir David Muir, Harold Muhl, Chas Ingram and Arthur Byram. Indeed, I would invest them with the medal of the four C's—co-operation, courtesy, competence and compliance. It is good to know that officers of their calibre work in close co-operation not only with Government members but also with those on this side of the Chamber.

Unfortunately, some Government departments are short of staff and others are short of finance. Worse, however, some are short on good government policy. An A.L.P. Government would rectify the anomalies that exist under the coalition Government. I do not have to spell all of them out. The people and the Government know of them but unfortunately, the Government turns its head hoping that they will disappear completely.

When the Minister started to outline in his introductory remarks what has happened, what is happening and what he thinks will happen in his department, I thought his remarks smacked somewhat of a Liberal Party policy speech. Perhaps the Minister was getting in practice for when he starts campaigning in the forthcoming election. At the risk of being criticised by him for not dealing directly with the Estimates, perhaps I should take advantage of this debate to present some of Labor's industrial policy, which we will be presenting to the public.

On the important matter of industrial relations—one of my committee members will deal with this in detail—we will make sure that emphasis is placed on fundamental principles of human dignity and the removal of discrimination whether for race, creed, colour, sex or politics.

Mr. Muller: That was part of your policy in 1971.

Mr. BROMLEY: Because it is humane, it is still our policy.

We will examine the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act with a view to improving the general powers of the commission on disputes and conciliation so that all concerned may benefit. I emphasise the word "conciliation". The Minister, in his opening remarks, quite rightly said that he has found that as a result of some round-table conferences people get on better together in

the industrial movement. Labor will do that in the industrial sphere—within the Industrial Court and the commission and in employer-employee relations generally—to ensure that agreements are honoured by all parties concerned.

Labor will bring up to date the working conditions of all Crown employees, whether they are classified as public servants or not (including employees of hospital boards, dental clinics, the prison service, the Education Department and so on). All will enjoy better conditions in all facets of employment.

We will deliberately and particularly pursue improvements for Public Service employees who are too ill to work, but must wait until their long-service-leave entitlements expire before receiving superannuation payments to which they are justly entitled. The health of workers is not improved by having to worry about whether they will live long enough to collect superannuation payments or other entitlements. Quite naturally they worry about their families.

Temporary employees, who, through infirmity or for other reasons cannot join the permanent staff—and there are quite a number of them—will receive permanent-staff entitlements after a certain qualifying period.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: I repeat that we will co-operate and conciliate with all sections of industry, public and private.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: You will conciliate before you take them over.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is a rather foolish interjection. I have already expressed my feelings on the actions, thoughts and sayings of chairman Joh and the members of his Government in their continued attacks on the Australian Labor Government. If the honourable member for Chatsworth had been in the House earlier, he would have heard what I had to say on that. However, I have other important matters to raise.

I restate that it is our intention to legislate to provide long service leave for all workers. The Minister touched on this; but he has had plenty of time to introduce legislation. We will ensure that all workers, irrespective of their occupations or callings, are entitled to those benefits. Because of their calling many people in industry today have never received and will never receive long service leave—building workers in particular but itinerant workers, rural workers, and so on as well.

The Minister spoke with a degree of feeling about apprentices. Because of the co-operation between the Minister and the committee of which he spoke, apprenticeship conditions have improved. The Minister referred to the second Apprenticeship Executive Annual Report. Modestly, I claim some credit for

the initiation of those annual reports. Till two years ago there had never been one. For some time I pressed for an annual report, and this year it is tremendously interesting. We will continue to improve the opportunities available to young people, particularly apprentices, in the employment field.

Mr. Miller: Do you believe in an alternative training scheme to overcome shortages of young tradesmen?

Mr. BROMLEY: I believe there should be some training in which they can receive experience in various organisations and firms to further improve their knowledge.

Mr. Miller: Full-time training of apprentices?

Mr. BROMLEY: I think they should continue to be taught through the present apprenticeship training system. I agree with the expressions contained in the report, and echoed by the Minister, that education under the block-release system is superior to day-release or correspondence arrangements.

The Minister had a crack at the Australian Government on assistance for apprenticeship training. I have with me a Press release, which unfortunately I do not have time to read to honourable members. However, it reveals that the Australian Government has increased financial assistance for apprenticeship training. In fact, the system of training—the national apprenticeship assistance scheme—is mentioned in it.

Before leaving the subject of apprentices, I congratulate all members of the Group Apprenticeship Committee on their excellent attendance at meetings. A tremendous number of meetings of all groups has been held during the year. The record of attendances is in the report for all to see.

I shall now deal with a subject that is close to my heart. I know that one or two factories or organisations are encouraging the use of creches or kindergartens at factories. One of them is a boot factory at Wacol. Unfortunately, although I have had an invitation to go there, I have not had time to look at it. It has a marvellous set-up and this type of activity should be encouraged.

That brings to my mind something else I intended to say about apprentices. I believe that a technical college should be established at the Gold Coast. There is a great need for one down there. I hope that the Minister will confer with the Minister for Education and explore the possibility of establishing a comprehensive technical college there.

A lot has been said in this Chamber about a standard fire safety code. The Fire Safety Act does not really mean much because the Government fiddles while buildings burn and lives are lost. For some considerable time a motion has appeared on the Business Paper dealing with a Bill to have been introduced

by the former Minister for Local Government and Electricity in respect of structures as well as Government and private buildings. Had that legislation been introduced, possibly a standard fire safety code could have been incorporated in it. That code would have assisted in preventing fires and saving lives as well as moved towards a uniform standard throughout Australia.

About 12 years ago all Ministers for Labour met in Adelaide. They said they would come up with a standard fire safety code. Unfortunately, this has not happened in Queensland. New South Wales has a very good one. I will say that the Government is not delaying once I see a motion listed on the Business Paper to this effect.

Although we have a good Fire Safety Act—and it could still be improved—it will not do the job we hoped it would, that is, assist in controlling or even preventing fires, the latter being the main aim. I should like to say more on fire safety, particularly as summer is approaching but I have not the time.

I shall now deal briefly with the Minister's remarks on migrants and migration. He had another shot at the Australian Government. I released a Press statement that we should not import unemployment by bringing more migrants into the country. But migration cannot be shut off like a tap, because arrangements were made some time ago. We cannot simply cut it off. The Minister said that the Federal Government was not giving assistance to employers to employ migrants. It definitely is giving that type of assistance.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (12.49 p.m.): During his speech, the honourable member for South Brisbane warned Government members about their continual criticism of the Federal Government. He suggested that we should stop criticising it. I wonder if he telephoned Mr. Egerton this morning and warned him about continually criticising the Federal Government. Over the past few months Mr. Egerton has, on a number of occasions, criticised the Federal Government over its policies. This morning's newspaper contains another example of such criticism; the Federal Government is accused by Mr. Egerton of flitting from policy to policy. I agree wholeheartedly with what Mr. Egerton has said. But has the honourable member for South Brisbane warned Mr. Egerton, and other members of the union hierarchy? After all, Mr. Egerton has not been alone in his criticism of the Federal Government. Numerous executive members of unions have continually criticised the Federal Government for its policies.

Honourable members on this side of the Chamber will continue to criticise the Federal Government because we believe that that Government, having created insecurity and doubt in the business world, having created unemployment through its tariff policies and

its attitude to foreign money, is now facing the greatest decision that any Federal Government has had to face since the years of the depression. Having created a situation in which it is admitted that unemployment could reach 200,000, what will the Federal Government now do to create stability in industry and a faith in the future that will overcome the highest level of unemployment since the depression? Having forced certain industries to close their doors, for no reason other than that it believed it could reduce inflation by flooding our markets with cheap goods, will the Federal Government now encourage these industries to again open their doors so that people can be gainfully employed? Or will it endeavour to direct manpower into certain industries to achieve its ultimate aim of a socialist State?

We have witnessed the failure of the importation of goods from overseas in reducing the price of Australian goods on our markets. The community is not benefiting from the decision of the Federal Government to reduce prices by importing overseas goods; but it is suffering the soul-destroying effects of unemployment. People everywhere are asking, "Where will it all end? What is going to happen next?"

"The Australian Worker" is also concerned, and I wish to quote from the issue of 30 September 1974. It is a newspaper published by a union brought up in the ranks of the A.L.P., and it states unequivocally that it is concerned about the effects of the Federal Government's policy. The article is headed, "Red scheme should not become neat way to bring back 'the dole'". "The Australian Worker" is as concerned as are honourable members on this side of the Chamber that it is the aim of the Federal Government to direct manpower into certain areas. It has said openly in the issue of 30 September that the Federal Government is introducing the dole, and it is very critical of its action.

The situation that Australia is now facing does not come as any surprise to many leaders of industry, who, as early as July 1973, told the Federal Government what would happen if it continued its policies. Let us have a look, Mr. Bird, at some of the things these leaders said—and I ask the Committee to remember that this was in July 1973, not October 1974. We have not seen any direct action by the Commonwealth Government to create more industry, and to retrain people for new industries and get them back on the labour market in a short space of time. All we have heard is a lot of words.

In 1973, Mr. R. G. Fry, spokesman for the Metal Trades Industry Association, said—

"We are staggered that a decision having such far-reaching consequences should be taken without any consultation with industry especially since consultation was promised before the election.

"We believe that when the effects of the tariff cuts are analysed they will be quite devastating on employment prospects and business investment."

That is what he said then; his words are very true today.

The chairman of Dunlop Australia Limited, Sir Robert Blackwood, said in Melbourne—

"A cut without reason or looking at the costs seems inconceivable. If they are going on this way they will cut the throats of industry."

The Director-General of the Associated Chamber of Manufactures of Australia, Mr. W. Henderson, called the Government's action "a drastic indiscriminate slash across the board", and forecast considerable unemployment. I have no intention of quoting any more, but I could. What I have read indicates that industry warned the Federal Government in July 1973 just what was going to happen in the future. Yet we see very little being done. It has been a Government blunder. The Federal Government stands condemned for its actions.

Dr. Cairns was reported as saying that the Federal Government would stand or fall by its action to create more employment. Truer words have never been spoken. What Dr. Cairns has said will be demonstrated here on 7 December. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition try to blame the Queensland Government for the unemployment situation in this State.

Mr. Newton: You have to accept your share of responsibility.

Mr. MILLER: We will not share any responsibility. In January of this year the Premier of this State warned the Federal Government. At that time the Premier and the Minister for Justice openly attacked the Federal Government and warned it of the consequences if it continued with its present policies.

I have no doubt that this scheme has been introduced by the Labor Party to initiate its policy of "democratic socialism", which was spelt out in detail at its 1971 convention and strengthened at its recent convention in the North.

Mr. Newton: You are playing party politics.

Mr. MILLER: Not at all. I am surprised that the honourable member for Belmont should say that I am playing party politics.

Industry has been closed down. A small company on the North Coast that was making clothing had to close down. That small company, which was employing girls in Nambour, had to close down because of the tariff policies of the Federal Government. That is one of thousands that have had to close down. But have we heard the Federal Government say, "We will immediately remove the tariff reductions."? No.

There has been no action by the Federal Government. All it says is, "We will retrain these people." The manager of the company I referred to asked the employment service what he would be retrained as. He was told, "We will retrain you as a manager." He asked, "You will retrain me as a manager of what?" The reply was, "We don't know, but we will retrain you as a manager."

Surely the honourable member for Belmont must realise that in order to put people back to work we have to open up the factories, not retrain people in something they know nothing about. The honourable member for Belmont says that I am playing politics. Dear, oh dear! Let us get down to the nitty-gritty of the problem. Let us get people back into employment. The only way that can be done is by the Federal Government increasing tariffs. At the present time we even have the threat by the Federal Government that it is going to further lower the tariff protection. It is suggested that under its present scheme it is going to further reduce the tariff protection in 12 months' time and two years' time. This will only aggravate the situation. As Mr. Fraser has pointed out, we are seeing people seeking retraining through the latest re-employment scheme who should not be eligible for retraining.

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

Mr. MILLER: Prior to the luncheon recess, I was referring to unemployment and the retraining schemes that have been implemented by the Federal Government. By way of interjection, the honourable member for Belmont said that the Government had to accept part of the responsibility for the unemployment situation in this State. I remind him that it was the Premier of this State who set up a committee in which he included the President of the Trades and Labor Council. That committee was geared to handle the unemployment situation in this State, but what was the outcome of the move? The Federal Government completely ignored the work done by this State Government. It is our responsibility, as the Government of the State, to give consideration to this problem. But the Federal Government refused to co-operate in any way with this committee.

In answer to the honourable member for Belmont, I want to make it quite clear that we were prepared to play our part in overcoming unemployment in this State. Unfortunately, the Federal Government would not co-operate with the State Government and, as a result, we have seen no action at all taken in Queensland. The employment situation continues to deteriorate, and the Federal Government sits in Canberra refusing to do anything about it. I repeat: we were prepared to do something about it, but the Federal Government would not allow us to do so.

Mr. Newton: You tell the people of Queensland that you cannot do anything about it.

Mr. MILLER: I know this hurts the honourable member for Belmont because all that the Federal Government talks about is retraining. There is nothing practical in their suggestions for getting people back to work. I remind the honourable member for Belmont that retraining takes time, and that the current situation requires an immediate remedy—not something long term as suggested by the Federal Government. We need encouragement for private capital expenditure to keep factories open and create more jobs. We need a lift in productivity. Does the honourable member for Belmont suggest that the scheme implemented by the Federal Government will increase productivity? In fact, factories are closing down. It is suggested that people return to college. How would that help to increase productivity? How are we going to decrease inflation in this State unless we have increased productivity? Yet the whole aim of the Labor Party is to take people out of the work-force and put them back into schools.

I therefore suggest that the honourable member for Belmont look well and hard at the policies of the Federal Government before saying anything about unemployment in this State. I believe that the Federal Government has a duty to tell the people of Australia exactly where they stand.

Mr. Newton: You are still part of Australia?

Mr. MILLER: My word we are still part of Australia! I want the Federal Government to state in clear and precise terms whether it intends to encourage industry to recommence, or whether it intends to use these schemes to retrain workers for certain industries. For instance, are textile workers to be trained in the building industry? Which industries are envisaged as being able to absorb the unemployed in Australia? I have not seen any scheme proposed by the Federal Government that has taken this aspect into consideration. I have no doubt that the Labor party is tied to democratic socialism. It was spelt out in their 1971 policy, and again in the policy emanating from the convention that has just concluded.

Mr. Davis: Rubbish! Were you there?

Mr. MILLER: I think I should quote from the Labor policy of 1971 because the honourable member for Brisbane says "Rubbish"—that his party does not believe in democratic socialism.

Mr. NEWTON: I rise to a point of order. I did not say that the Labor Party does not believe in democratic socialism. We certainly believe in it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bird): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member for Belmont is wasting my time. I did not even mention him. I referred to the honourable member for Brisbane.

Mr. Davis: No, you didn't. You said "Belmont". I don't know how I have become involved in this discussion.

Mr. MILLER: I cannot hear the honourable member for Brisbane. I read the following extract from the Labor Party's policy—

"Worker Participation

"Labor ideals and generalisations about democratic socialism to be put into some practical effect, particularly at the Industrial level.

"As the A.L.P. is based broadly on the industrial sections of our society, and as our vast complex of factories and machines supplies the very essentials for life and living, then the A.L.P. should show to the great masses of people who supply their labour and knowledge to this complex, that we stand for their eventual collective control and ownership of it rather than being servants to it as now applies."

There it is spelt out quite clearly that it is the Labor Party's intention to take over industry. This has not been denied.

The Federal Labor Government, on the other hand, has not clearly defined its policy, and I challenge the Labor Party to state what its intention is. Is it democratic socialism, as set out in the Labor Party's official policy, or is it the Federal Government's intention to help industry to reopen? It is no use pursuing tariff and exchange-rate policies that are designed to sack employees from industries that are regarded as non-productive or inefficient, unless the workers are reabsorbed into more productive fields developed through private enterprise.

Which industries will be able to absorb the unemployed persons who have been thrown out of work by the Federal Government? Unless real growth is improved, Australia will continue to be plagued by inflation.

This is the area of economic mismanagement in which the trade unions are being asked to co-operate. Mr. Egerton cannot be blamed for his outspoken criticism of the Whitlam Government. As a dedicated member of the A.L.P., he has made certain claims that have been substantiated, for each one of us is aware of the chaos that has arisen from the actions of the Federal Government in flitting from policy to policy.

I have with me a Press statement released by Mr. Cameron dealing with the national employment and training system that the Federal Government hopes to introduce. Nowhere in the statement is reference made

to the areas in which this retraining will occur. Perhaps the honourable member for Pine Rivers, who will follow me, might enlighten the Committee on what the Federal Government intends to do about the present high level of unemployment.

(Time expired.)

Mr. LEESE (Pine Rivers) (2.24 p.m.): The honourable member for Ithaca has clearly shown the people of Queensland where the State Government stands on this issue of unemployment. It uses it, as well as any other issue that vitally concerns the people of the State and of the nation, merely as a political football for its own devious ends.

The honourable member referred to comments made yesterday by Mr. Egerton. Mr. Egerton does not need me to defend him; nevertheless I feel bound to point out that, whereas his remarks amounted to constructive criticism, by contrast, the comments made by the honourable member for Ithaca were a typical example of the Queensland Government's paranoiac attitude towards the Federal Government.

Mr. Chinchin: You are scared of him, aren't you?

Mr. LEESE: No member on this side of the Chamber is scared of Mr. Egerton. To be candid, I think that Government members are scared by his remarks, which prove that the Australian Labor Party is aiming at democratic socialism and that the A.L.P. can be critical of itself when it thinks it should be.

All workers—indeed, all people in Australia—should be concerned about unemployment. But I doubt the sincerity of Government members who have sat back and done nothing whatsoever to assist. They have refused to co-operate in any way. In fact, the Queensland Government has welcomed unemployment—in the same way as it has welcomed health aid—and uses it as a political football. Government members sit back and do nothing for Queenslanders. Although unemployment is a scourge, some of them are prepared to use it for their own devious, political ends.

If at this time Australia had been unfortunate enough to have a Tory Government in Canberra, the present unemployment figures would long since have been doubled. But there would have been no retraining scheme; it would have been a matter of back to the soup kitchens and the pawnshops. Without the co-operation of the State in solving this problem, the Australian Government has tried to ensure that, if there is to be unemployment and redundancy, people will be retrained.

At times I question the rate of redundancy. Government supporters are using the alleged redundancy to suit their own ends.

They are saying, "We will sack a few people and that will probably make the others pull their belts in and work harder."

The Australian Government will ensure that adequate unemployment benefits are available. That would not have been the case under any Government other than a Labor Government. Honourable members on this side of the Chamber are dedicated to working towards full employment so that all families in Queensland and Australia may live in dignity. That is the difference between the political parties in Australia. The A.L.P. is geared to ensuring that people can live in dignity. We are working towards that end and we will achieve it with the support of the people which, I have no doubt, we will receive on 7 December and when the next Federal election is held.

On a lighter note I say it is very pleasing to see the increase in the number of apprentices allotted to employees this year. Training of apprentices is of paramount importance if we are to ensure that Queensland is guaranteed a competent, skilled work-force in years to come. Without the skill of qualified tradesmen there is little chance of developing industries in Queensland.

I congratulate the departmental officers responsible for promoting apprenticeship training, particularly those who promoted Apprenticeship Week, which was wonderfully successful this year. It was one reason for the upward turn in the number of apprentices. However, much more needs to be done. Many more employers should take on apprentices. At this point of time it is obvious that we have not got through to all employers on the urgency of taking on apprentices in the various trades. One of the main causes of the increase in the number of apprentices—and our shadow Minister touched on this—was the leading role that the national Government played in promoting apprenticeship training. I refer to the Australian Government's subsidy for apprenticeship training, which, as our shadow Minister said, has been increased. The new subsidy for both metropolitan and country employers is to be \$450 per annum, which of course was the old rate for country employers.

It has also been announced that off-the-job training subsidies are to be increased by \$4, bringing that amount to \$20 a week. Living-away-from-home allowances also are to be increased, from \$10 to \$12.60. So it can be seen that the National Government is placing a very high priority on apprenticeship training, which is as it should be. The promotions department in Queensland is also giving this matter high priority. I again offer my congratulations to the officers on a job well done.

While I am on the subject of apprentices, I direct the Minister's attention to what I believe to be the necessity in the very near future for an apprentice training college in the Pine Rivers district, which as all

honourable members would be aware is one of the most rapidly developing areas in the State. Already the Education Department has an excellent site. When consideration is given to the development taking place in that area and the fact that, predominantly, the local people are young families with children beginning to grow up, there is definitely a need for training college facilities in the district.

I will now touch briefly on the report of the State Fire Services Council. Our shadow Minister alluded to the fact that earlier this year a Fire Safety Bill was passed by the Parliament. However, that is where it has stopped. A Bill has been passed, but so far it has meant nothing. As the honourable member for South Brisbane said, a Bill dealing with a uniform building code for the whole of Queensland has been on the stocks for ages. Evidently nothing will be done until the Fire Safety Bill is complemented.

In the meantime, the position remains as it was. In other words, many buildings in Brisbane and the outer suburbs are nothing less than fire traps. Nothing has been done in any way to implement fire precautions in those buildings. Our retail stores are fire hazards to shoppers yet the Fire Safety Bill, introduced as it was years and years too late, still has not been implemented. We are waiting for some action on it. If the Government does not act swiftly to see that fire safety officers are appointed and that our buildings are brought under some control, I forecast that we will have a disaster on our hands. It will take only one disaster. It is not as if this is something new. For years the Government has known of the hazards that exist.

In its report the council discusses the transportation of volatile flammable liquids. Just when is legislation to be brought down on this? For a long time we have had the problem of giant road tankers travelling through the city and over the Story Bridge. Present controls are anything but adequate. This week a lack of fire hydrants and other fire-fighting equipment on freeways was reported. One can easily conjure up terrible thoughts of the type of disasters that could happen in their absence. I suggest that the Minister use his good offices to see that strong legislation is introduced at the earliest possible moment to cover the transportation of flammable and volatile substances. As I have mentioned many times in this Chamber, farmers carry in the back of their utilities substances that could create dangerous situations if they came into contact with water.

I am pleased to see, in the general section of the report, a comment concerning the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade Board's Fire Week display. I am pleased at the inclusion of that subject because the board does put on an excellent display and it works exceedingly hard to bring home to the public the

need to have a knowledge of fire-safety, including how to combat a small household fire.

Another matter I wish to raise concerns industrial development. Because of the problems in disposing of waste materials from new factories, legislation will have to be introduced to cover the collection and disposal of those materials. A particular problem exists with the match factory in my electorate. A considerable quantity of phosphorus is taken from that factory and dumped at a council dump and time and time again the fire brigade is called out to attend to fires that break out. In addition, there is the matter of pollution. Another plant, which deals with plastic, has a very serious waste-disposal problem. This matter should receive close attention. It should be mandatory that all factories install industrial-waste bins. Then we have the problem of where to dispose of the waste.

We must look carefully at zoning for development, particularly in the environs of Brisbane. At the moment small factories are popping up in residential areas, and this should not happen. Therefore we have the increasing problems of noise as well as bad housekeeping in the factories, which disturb the residents.

The department is offering very favourable terms to any manufacturer who wishes to establish a factory on an industrial estate but quite candidly I wonder whether sufficient is being done in this area. I am not denigrating anything that the department is presently doing.

A private industrial area has been established at Strathpine by a local developer. In addition, a Government industrial estate has been established at Narangba. Considerably more industry is being established in the private Strathpine area than at Narangba, despite all the concessions offered there. A number of years ago—I think it was in 1966—approaches were made to the State Government to set up and develop an industrial estate at Strathpine. If that had been done, there would now be a thriving industrial community at Strathpine, which has the necessary work-force. At the moment, these people have to commute to the city. Any industry set up in the area would have an assured work-force. Therefore, I ask the Minister to look very closely at the possibility of stepping up the programme of development at the Narangba industrial estate.

Let me revert to the subject of fire, which has caused me a good deal of concern in my electorate. Since the proclamation of the Fire Safety Bill, officers have been in training to become fire safety officers. Unfortunately for the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade Board, its fire prevention officer is now training to become a fire safety officer and the board has lost his services. The officer who was being trained to take his place has been lost to the board because he too intends to become a fire safety officer.

Up to the present, the board has not received any answer to its correspondence about the appointment of a fire prevention officer for the Pine Rivers district. I should like to know whether fire safety in the Pine Rivers area and a number of other areas—Redcliffe and Caboolture, for example—is going to be the responsibility of fire safety officers working from Brisbane, or whether the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade Board can expect to have its own fire prevention officer, as it has had in the past, to make inspections of the tremendous number of buildings that are still being erected in the area. Of course, Government members would have us believe, Mr. Bird, that we are experiencing a recession.

I referred earlier to council dumps to take the waste from Government industrial estates. As I said, a problem arises from the manufacture of plastics in the Pine Rivers area because at present there is nowhere to dump the plastic waste. A very serious fire occurred in a plastics factory in my area recently, and I suggest that finding a solution to the problem must be given high priority by the Government. If that is not done, one of these days many people at Strathpine will have to be evacuated from their homes solely because of air pollution from burning plastics. A fire is bound to occur with plastic waste being mixed with the phosphorus dumped from the match factory. An attempt should be made immediately to ensure that the waste is disposed of in such a way that the safety of the community is not endangered.

Mr. ALISON (Maryborough) (2.44 p.m.): I am pleased to take part in the debate on the Estimates introduced by the Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs. I am a member of the Minister's committee, and it is a great pleasure to work with him and the officers of his department. I thank the Minister for the many courtesies he has extended to me and the assistance he has given me in my duties as member for Maryborough. I place on record my thanks to Sir David Muir, the head of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, and his staff, and to the Under Secretary of the Department of Industrial Affairs, Mr. Harold Muhl. They have always been extremely helpful and ready to assist.

In endeavouring to have industries established at Maryborough, I have had quite a bit to do with the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development over the past few years. I have always found officers of that department to be very professional in their approach. Probably one of the reasons for Sir David Muir's success in obtaining such a high standard of executive officers is that he does not hesitate to look outside the Public Service when he requires staff.

It has not been a good year for industries in Maryborough. Actually it has been a rather disastrous year, solely because of the shocking, completely irresponsible economic

policies of the Federal Government. Later I will elaborate on the difficulty of getting industries to come to Maryborough in the prevailing economic climate.

One of the good things that happened during the year was that sand-mining was confirmed as an industry for Maryborough and district. The Department of Commercial and Industrial Development played no small part in that achievement. I was very happy to be associated with the project right from the start.

In the first instance, I was approached by Mr. Bill Everson, the executive director of Dillinghams, who was seeking assistance on the way to go about getting technical advice and the avenues for negotiating a satisfactory freight rate for the transport of the ore from Maryborough to Brisbane. I introduced Mr. Everson to the department, and things started to hum from there on. In due course Dillinghams advised me that it had reached a reasonable negotiated freight rate, and that as far as the company was concerned it was "all systems go" for sand-mining in Maryborough.

The partnership Dillinghams and Murphyhore has already set up its workshop in Maryborough, and it is doing fabrication and other work. I understand that sand-mining on Fraser Island will commence in April next year. This will mean an extra 200 jobs for Maryborough and district. About 170 persons will be employed on Fraser Island in the actual mining, and another 30 or 40 will be engaged in the workshops and the dry-mill processing plant to be constructed at Maryborough. There were certain problems right from the start. Some of the more radical conservationists were trying to throw a spanner in the works, but finally sanity prevailed.

Fraser Island is very important to industry in Maryborough. We get about half of the hardwood supplies for our two big timber mills from Fraser Island. I have already mentioned sand-mining. Fraser Island is becoming more and more important to tourism in that area. There is only one blot on the horizon. If we ever got a State A.L.P. Government, we would be in strife up there. Much ado has been made about what is and what is not in the A.L.P. policy regarding the future of Fraser Island. I know that a resolution or a motion circulated at the Labor-in-Politics Convention in Cairns read that, in the event of an A.L.P. Government coming to power, Fraser Island would be declared a national park.

Mr. Bromley: You are completely wrong, of course. First of all, anything circulated is not a resolution.

Mr. ALISON: I know for a fact that it was there. I firmly believe that had there not been an election on the horizon the motion would have been approved or ratified by the Labor-in-Politics Convention. The more radical conservationists have turned their support to the A.L.P. They have lost out every

other way, largely because they are completely irrational in their arguments and will not listen to the other side of the story. They have jumped on the A.L.P. band-wagon. In its efforts to get something to drag it out of the mire, the A.L.P. has adopted this policy. It decided that this would be a good way to get somebody's support. Of course, it will work in reverse in the Maryborough area because the Maryborough people are well aware of just what Fraser Island means to industries up there.

From the debate that has gone on in the local Press in Maryborough it can be seen by the average Joe Blow that there is still room for extension of the national park on Fraser Island. Already about one-quarter of the island has been declared a national park. I understand more is to be declared. There is room for sand-mining provided the State Government exercises very strict control on the revegetation and rehabilitation of the area after it is mined.

There is also room for forestry. In fact, timber has been taken from Fraser Island for something like 90 years and I understand that there is just as much there now as there was 90 years ago. The Forestry Department, by wise management, restricts the timber that can be taken off each year to the amount that is actually grown there during the year. I understand that at the present time about 7,000,000 superficial feet is being taken off each year and on this basis and at the present rate of growth timber will never run out on Fraser Island. It is treated as a crop.

If the A.L.P. came to power in Queensland we would be in serious difficulties in Maryborough. It would be as well for us to fold up our tents and move off because the timber industry would virtually collapse overnight if this nonsense about declaring Fraser Island a national park were enforced. We in Maryborough get a bit fed up with these academic rat-bags.

Mr. Frawley: You would not call the honourable member for South Brisbane an academic.

Mr. ALISON: I do not know what category he would be in.

Recently, we had Dr. Mosley, who, I think, is President of the Australian Conservation Society, breeze into Maryborough and announce to all and sundry after a rather cursory glance—no doubt he studied something or other, but I do not know whether at Maryborough or in Melbourne—that Fraser Island should be a national park. I do not think the man realised that we took timber from it and had been doing so for 90 years. Be that as it may, there was hell to pay—to put it mildly. A public meeting was called by the city council and about 400 to 500 people attended and made their views on the matter very definitely known. Some said they were a bit rude. Maybe they were but what would Dr. Mosley expect?

Did he expect a garland of flowers or something when he came back to Maryborough after making such a stupid statement? I am with the people all the way and the next time he comes in and makes such a ridiculous statement the people can tar and feather him as far as I am concerned.

I know for a fact that this year three industries were lined up for Maryborough. I believe that two of them would have gone to the industrial estate and the third, although it would not have gone to the industrial estate, would have come to Maryborough. However, they got cold feet because of the Federal Government's policies.

Mr. N. F. Jones: What are the names of the firms?

Mr. ALISON: The honourable member would like to know the names. There is still a chance that we will get these firms. Mr. John Jurss, the manager of the Maryborough and Hervey Bay Development Board, well knows the names of these firms. I am certainly not going to divulge them here; I hope that after the socialist Government has been thrown out early in the New Year—maybe within six months—we will get down to some sanity in the economic field and industries will start looking for development again. So we may yet interest these firms in coming to Maryborough.

That is the sort of thing we have copped in the neck in Maryborough this year. I have no doubt that these industries would have come there, but they got cold feet. It is well known that there is very little development on the industrial side in Australia at the present time, in Maryborough or anywhere else.

Mr. Whitlam cannot understand why industries have no confidence in the future. In his view we have a rosy economic future. I do not know why he does not come down from his ivory tower, force his way through the academics around him and talk to the man in the street or in the pub. He should have a look for himself and see what is going on in the community.

Mr. Frawley: Do you think Mr. Whitlam will be delighted to come to Maryborough?

Mr. ALISON: I do not know whether or not Mr. Whitlam is coming to Maryborough. If finance is stopping him, I would be happy to chip in to get him there.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bird): Order! There is far too much conversation in the Chamber. Will the honourable members at the rear of the Chamber carry on their conversation outside.

Mr. ALISON: I sincerely hope that Mr. Whitlam does come to Maryborough during the course of the election campaign. As I mentioned before, if it is a matter of finance—and I do not think it could be, the way they are throwing money around—I would

be quite happy to put in my little bit to get him there, provided he brings Mr. Charlie Jones, the Federal Minister for Transport, with him. We have a few questions we would like to ask Mr. Jones.

While talking about Mr. Jones and industry, I should like to mention a few other facts. The shipyard fiasco, which has gone on now since about August 1973, has dealt job opportunities in Maryborough a severe blow. With the closure of the shipyards, 300 employees lost their jobs. The Minister who has presented these Estimates and Sir David Muir offered to provide the Federal Government with every assistance to enable it to honour Mr. Charles Jones's unequivocal promise that the Federal Government would go it alone. However, the Minister's department has at no time received a formal request from the Federal Government for assistance.

The facts, briefly, are these: in August 1973, Walkers Limited submitted the lowest tender for the construction of an oceanographic vessel for the Australian Navy. I emphasise that point. At that time Walkers Ltd. was in the process of completing a vessel in its shipyards. For the benefit of Opposition members, I explain that shipbuilding is a highly complicated operation. A shipyard, on receiving an order, say, today, cannot commence building the vessel tomorrow. Everyone in Maryborough knew that even before August 1973 Walkers Limited was looking for orders in the hope that one would be obtained and the company could engage its drafting personnel on plans and other preliminary work prior to the laying of the keel. As I have said, Walkers submitted the lowest tender for the naval vessel. But what did Mr. Jones and the Federal Government do? They accepted a higher tender submitted by the Williamstown Dockyard. God only knows why! We certainly do not know the reason.

Mr. Frawley: What city is it in?

Mr. ALISON: Melbourne—one of those large cities down south in which there are probably over 1,000,000 voters.

It was obvious to me that the then Federal member for Wide Bay (Mr. Hansen) was not doing too well in making representations on behalf of his area, so in September I got Senator Bonner on the job. Mr. Jones, however, refused to speak to Senator Bonner for about three months. When he did eventually have a conversation with Senator Bonner it was about three or four days after his announcement of the letting of a contract to Walkers for the construction of two landing craft and one navigational-aid vessel. To say the least, it is strange that Mr. Jones would not speak with Senator Bonner, despite the fact that he and Senator Bonner would have literally passed each other in the corridors in Canberra.

The order placed by the Federal Government in November came too late. The die and been cast. Walkers Limited was battling

for orders, and subsequently, in January, the shipyard suffered severe damage in the flood. Next month, February, Walkers Limited announced that it would no longer engage in shipbuilding. At that time, of course, the ship under construction was nearing completion, and the situation was critical.

On 27 April—three weeks prior to the May election—the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Charles Jones, stood on the Town Hall green in Maryborough—Chifley Place, as it is called—and announced to all and sundry that the Federal Government would go it alone with the shipyards in Maryborough, regardless of the actions of the State Government and Walkers Limited. I was there, waiting to get on the stump after him. His statement had no strings whatever attached to it. I and hundreds of other people, heard it.

It is interesting to relate, therefore, that about an hour after making his statement he approached the editor of the Maryborough "Chronicle" and asked him not to publish it. I wish to quote from the editorial in the Maryborough "Chronicle" dated Monday, 16 September. It reads as follows—

"Mr. Jones's promise to 'go it alone' was unequivocal, made with no conditions; with no strings attached. He did not say his Government would 'go it alone' if something else transpired.

"The Chronicle feels that the truth of the matter is that Mr. Jones ran off at the mouth in a moment of electioneering enthusiasm. On that point this newspaper can now relate that the Minister did not have that 'go it alone' promise in the original speech notes he handed to the Press, and afterwards suggested that the Chronicle might not print the promise because it would give Premier Bjelke-Petersen an excuse for not sharing in a three-way proposition. We rightly rejected Mr. Jones's request."

I would expect such action from the editor of the "Chronicle", a highly professional and ethical man. He refused to withhold the statement made by Mr. Jones.

The election was held, and Mr. Hansen lost his seat—the closure of the shipyards would be one reason for that—to Mr. Clarrie Millar, the National Party candidate who is now doing an excellent job. After the election, the silence from Canberra on the shipyards was positively deafening. I tried to stir things up through Mr. Millar and in various other ways, but I could not get anywhere. A month or two later, Mr. Jones tried to get off the hook by saying that, so far as he was concerned, the Federal Government was no longer tied to his promise because the State Government would not co-operate.

I am not given to harsh statements, but, in my opinion, Mr. Jones is an unmitigated liar unfit to be a member of Parliament, and by no stretch of the imagination is he fit to

be a Minister of the Crown. He is a straight-out liar. As I said, I sincerely hope that he comes to Maryborough during the election campaign.

Mr. Jones then blamed the company—he had to have a go at somebody. He said that because the company would not lease the shipyards, the Federal Government no longer considered the promise valid. If honourable members care to read the Maryborough "Chronicle" they will see that on the next day Dr. Hughes, a highly ethical, professional man, well respected wherever he is known (and he is known throughout Australia) pulled the skids from under Mr. Jones again, and once more proved him to be a liar. Dr. Hughes is too much of a gentleman to call him a liar; but I am calling him one now. The shipyard workers—the 300 fitters, turners, dockers and painters—had the rug pulled from under them; their jobs have gone down the drain.

A few days after Mr. Jones was in Maryborough, I had a conference with representatives of the unions who told me certain things. It was quite obvious that the men were very sincere. They believed what Mr. Jones had said on the Town Hall green, and in private. They asked me to do certain things and to take up certain matters with the Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs, which I did. As the shipyard and 300 jobs have gone down the drain, there would be very little difficulty in arranging a tarring and feathering committee should Mr. Jones ever show his face again in Maryborough.

A Government Member: The honourable member for Brisbane thinks that's claptrap.

Mr. ALISON: I do not think he has ever been to Maryborough. That is typical of the Queen-Street, Trades-Hall thinking of Labor members. I do not think they care a damn about anything north of Caboolture.

Mr. Charles Jones is certainly not welcome in Maryborough. I repeat my challenge to him to go there during the election campaign. If he accepts it, I should be very pleased if he would give me a few hours' notice to make sure that I, too, am there.

Mr. Frawley: You will organise a welcoming committee for him.

Mr. ALISON: I will do my best to organise a welcoming committee. We will put on something for him. I am not too sure what it will be.

I congratulate the Minister on what he has done for Queensland. After serving on his committee and accompanying him on several investigatory trips, I know what he has done for Queensland through both of his departments.

Mr. YEWDAL (Rockhampton North) (3.4 p.m.): It seems to me that I should express my sympathy to the Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs because the two Government speakers who have

spoken on his Estimates spent most of their time talking about the Federal Government and the problems they associate with it. I should say that bad representation by the honourable member for Maryborough has allowed the situation in Maryborough to deteriorate. All the glorious promises that he and his running-mate made about what they would do for Maryborough have come to nothing. While Bundaberg is going ahead in leaps and bounds, Maryborough is going backwards.

The honourable member referred to Fraser Island—he spoke about the tourist industry and so on—and he also mentioned the Australian Labor Party's policy. The honourable member for South Brisbane hit the nail on the head when he said that our policy on Fraser Island is that there should be a complete land survey of the island. The arguments on conservation advanced by the honourable member for Maryborough will not stand up when the Government's record is examined.

The earlier speaker from the Government side, the honourable member for Ithaca, used his time in the debate for political grandstanding in his own interest. He is part of the "ginger group" in this Chamber, which no longer has any ginger in it. Its effect now is negligible.

I was particularly interested in the Minister's remarks about the revitalisation of the Industrial Advisory Council. Personally, I feel that that is a progressive move. However, to my mind, it is rather belated. This afternoon I intend to confine my remarks to the subject of industrial relations. I believe that the Minister, who is responsible for industrial affairs in Queensland, should look closely at what I regard as the blind spots in industrial relations. In my opinion, his department should embark upon a programme of positive and constructive approaches to overcome the many and continuing troubles within industry today.

With the growing development of the mining industry and increased construction throughout Queensland, industrial problems can easily and quickly manifest themselves and grow out of all proportion. One might ask whether overcoming such problems is part of the role of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development. I believe that, in the interests of the State, the Minister should accept that responsibility.

I envisage a scheme under which employers and employer organisations would enter into consultations to develop an understanding so that those holding managerial positions would be conversant with the policies of their companies. That understanding should then flow to job level. On the other hand, the trade-union movement has, to a greater degree, developed a better understanding of policies, and it has applied them with much more co-ordination.

I do not suggest that the trade-union movement has perfected this aspect, but it is certainly much better organised than the employers.

The main reason I offer this suggestion is that far too many disputes occur at job level because the employers' representatives are ignorant of the policies of their principals. Often after a stoppage of work and subsequent compulsory or voluntary conference, management very quickly and readily accepts the demands of the employees, or agrees with their argument, and a return to work is effected. If there were a grass-roots understanding of policy, very often disputes would not occur.

In the industrial arena, disputes arise basically in the following areas—

- (1) wages, hours, leave, etc.;
- (2) physical working conditions;
- (3) managerial policy and trade unionism; and
- (4) a grouping of other issues, one of which is politics.

I intend to quote figures which, though not completely up to date, give a fair indication of what occurs.

In 1965, 65 per cent of all disputes arose from the second and third groupings I instanced; that is, physical working conditions and managerial policy and trade unionism. In 1967, it was 67 per cent. In 1971, which was a year in which there were a number of disputes on wages, leave and hours, it was 52 per cent. In 1965, the working days lost on issues relating to the same areas of dispute amounted to 31 per cent; in 1966, the loss was 41 per cent; and in 1971 it was 20 per cent.

Related to the very distinct problems that I have outlined is the overriding failure of people to communicate, and by that I mean to communicate at the time a dispute arises. Foremen and supervisors at job level make hasty, unconsidered decisions and sack employees or refuse to accede to requests or arguments brought forward. A complete cessation of work often occurs not only in the area of dispute but also very often in a wide area of associated work-places.

I refer now to the remarks of the Minister in outlining the activities of his department in the field of seminars for safety and management, etc. In my opinion these activities are very often left on the agenda paper and are not followed up in any positive or practical way. In effect, they are exercises in theory but very often not in practice.

Over a period of some 25 years in the industrial movement I became involved in varied activities on behalf of my fellow workers. I was very heavily involved in job-level activity. I know just what can happen at a very volatile point of time in a working place.

I return to my point on communication. Very often, because of lack of communication, job supervisors are not aware of the attitude and policies of their superiors. In some instances, employers and unions may, on a State and national level, arrive at an area of mutual consent on a certain matter. One of the parties does not pass that decision down the line and an issue arises which results in a cessation of work. The problem then is not resolving the job issue that caused the dispute but getting the men back onto the job. Very often the employer and union are fighting on two or three different fronts and the original issue is somewhat lost. A lot more could be done in this regard. As I pointed out earlier, I do not say that the unions are faultless or that they have done enough homework in this matter. I hope that the revitalisation of the Industrial Advisory Council does serve some useful purpose in this regard.

Another point I raise briefly is decentralisation. People living in areas outside Brisbane are very often at a loss to understand why they cannot get service from various departments, and, although it may not be distinctly related to the Estimates under discussion, the example I am about to give is pertinent. The Government continues to tell the people in the country areas of its decentralisation policy. I cite the procedures of the Main Roads Department to prove the absolute falsity of the Government's claim. Motor vehicle number plates are issued where registration is paid but registration stickers, which the law requires to be affixed to vehicles, are issued in Brisbane, and not for instance, in the Rockhampton area, a fairly large area catering for Central Queensland.

My information from the department is that at the moment the issue of registration stickers is 2½ months behind. Many people in country areas are receiving summonses for late payment and other sorts of involvement with the Main Roads Department. Quite often summonses and stickers cross in the mail. I have spent a considerable amount of time communicating with the Main Roads Department and I have been getting quite a deal of satisfaction from the officers; however, the situation is completely unacceptable. That is only one argument that I could advance to destroy the Government's claim on decentralisation.

I have previously said in this Chamber that the block-release training scheme is acceptable and is progressing quite successfully. However, there is a problem and disadvantage confronting country families with apprentices who have to travel to Brisbane. I can speak with personal experience on this matter. My married daughter, who lives in the Brisbane area, billeted a young apprentice for the seven weeks he was in Brisbane. She did this to assist him, as he was a friend of the family.

I talked to the lad personally while he was in Brisbane and also when he returned to Rockhampton, and he had many personal

problems. It was his first time away from home, and he had no particular friends in Brisbane. But for the fact that he moved into a private home here, I think he would have returned home before the seven weeks were up. He was lonely and homesick and had all sorts of problems.

I understand that the department's move to obtain accommodation in the Central Queensland area is progressing, and I hope it will not be shelved and remain only a promise. As a base, Rockhampton surely could cater for large numbers of apprentices from the Central Queensland area, and most of the lads involved would be able to return home at week-ends when they did not have to meet the training requirements of the department. I appeal to the Minister to implement the proposal as quickly as he can. It would be not only in the interests of the families and the apprentices but also, and equally importantly, in the interests of business firms in the area that could perhaps, in cases of extreme need, make use of the services of some of the apprentices, possibly at night or during week-ends when they remained in the area.

I wish to raise only one other point. I have had a little to do with the officer in the Department of Industrial Affairs in Rockhampton, and I have always found him to be quite courteous and co-operative. However, the issuing of rail passes to elderly people—pensioners and others—travelling within Queensland on holiday does not seem to be related to the duties of industrial inspectors. That is where they are now issued, and I suggest seriously to the Minister that he collaborate with the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services and have them issued through the tourist Bureau.

Elderly people do not connect the Department of Industrial Affairs with the issuing of rail passes and my colleague and I continually are asked, "Where do we get these passes?" Often they make their application rather belatedly and are told by the officers of the department that they should make application at least a fortnight before the date of travel. As I said, in the main people who make these applications are elderly, and it often takes some time to explain the procedure to them. I believe that it would be in their interests as well as in the interests of the department if the issuing of passes was done through the Tourist Bureau.

In addition, I think that at times the officers could use a little more discretion. Sometimes people who apply for passes are told quite bluntly that they will not get them for a fortnight. My colleague and I often have to make representations on behalf of elderly people to have passes issued earlier. I had to deal with one such case as recently as last week.

The main problems that I have raised are the blind spots in the sphere of industrial relations, and I trust that the Minister will consider my submissions on those points.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs) (3.19 p.m.), in reply: For seven years I have had the privilege of being in charge of the portfolio of Industrial Development, more recently Department of Industrial Affairs. I should say that the comments critical of departmental administration have been far fewer in this debate than they have been in earlier Estimates debates. I thank honourable members for their appreciation of the efforts of departmental officers and the services they are giving.

The honourable member for South Brisbane made quite a few points, including a reference to the projected A.L.P. industrial relations policy. He said that inherent in the A.L.P. policy emphasis would be placed on the commission's power to conciliate. He knows that the commission already has broad powers of conciliation. I think he knows also that conciliation can be effective only if there is good will on both sides. So there is a limit to the extension of the powers of conciliation.

The honourable member proclaimed that it was the policy of the A.L.P. to introduce long service leave. He is a bit late in promoting that. Queensland has investigated this matter far more deeply than any other State, and we are coming to a conclusion in our negotiations.

I was surprised to hear the honourable member say he wanted to see a technical college established on the Gold Coast. Surprisingly enough, there is a technical college on the Gold Coast already! It is in High Street, Southport, and it was opened three years ago. It caters for carpentry and joinery, cabinet-making and ladies hair-dressing. There is a big demand for hair-dressers on the Gold Coast. Apprentices pursuing other callings either attend college in Brisbane or receive training by correspondence.

The honourable member made reference to the national apprenticeship assistance scheme. If he looks through my speech he will see that I did not criticise the Commonwealth Government on that scheme. I could have criticised it for the fact that, although the subsidy to employers for first-year apprentices has been increased, it is still doing nothing to assist employers of later-year apprentices who are undergoing block-release training. All States, including South Australia, have made strong representations on this matter.

The honourable member for Ithaca dealt with the issues which have caused so much instability. He supported my appeal to the Federal Government to change its policies which are having such a devastating effect on industry and, in consequence, are causing such a down-turn in the community.

The honourable member for Pine Rivers dwelt on fire services. He complained that the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade was losing the services of its fire-prevention officer. I hope

he does not want to deny that officer promotion. He should be aware that the State Fire Services Council has already given approval for the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade Board to employ a fire prevention officer on the condition that that officer will deal with urgent work at Redcliffe during the leave periods of the officer of the Redcliffe board.

As to the Fire Safety Act, I think the honourable member is aware of the steps that are being taken to draw up regulations, and to provide for the training of the necessary officers to implement those regulations. As the matter is well in hand his criticism was not well founded.

The honourable member for Maryborough pointed to the importance that the mineral sands industry which is being developed in that area will have for Maryborough because of its significance as an employer of labour. He also bemoaned the loss of the shipyard and was particularly critical of the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones). I am at a distinct loss to understand why there has been such a shift in policy in the Federal sphere on shipbuilding. As I said earlier, I heard a most positive policy statement made by Mr. Jones at the naming of the "Robert Miller", and subsequent policy announcements have been in quite marked contrast to it. It would appear that, in view of the reduction in the period of the subsidy, the Federal Government feels that the shipbuilding industry in Australia is redundant.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North made reference to the Industrial Advisory Committee. He made the very good point that he believed there should be much greater involvement of both employers and employees in the matter of industrial relations. I think this Government can be proud of its record in this field, particularly over the last year or so. I believe that we have encouraged a new concept of consultation between employer and employee. If I had the time I could cite several cases where this desirable attitude has brought about a tremendous improvement in industrial relations.

His reference to block-release training and the problems which a young lad encounters when leaving home for the first time and going to a big city is appreciated. My department is fully aware of the problems and our officers are always on the alert to discover any accommodation or other problems encountered by young men who come to the city and they are taken care of. I look forward to the time when we will no longer have to bring apprentices to Brisbane for their block release training. I look to the time when the department's policy of having block-release training conducted in decentralised areas and provincial cities, with the provision of accommodation, will overcome this problem.

Members of the Opposition seem to resent our criticism of the results of the Federal Government's policies. It is a very simple

matter to identify the problems and trace them back to the policy decisions that were taken when the Whitlam Government took office. The only way in which that Government will overcome those problems it has created will be to completely change the policies it introduced at that time.

Already, the Federal Government has seen the error of its ways and is making changes in its policies. It revalued and then it devalued. It decreased tariffs and now, because of the chaos created, it is considering import licensing as a means of overcoming the tremendous hardship caused in the textile industry, the furniture industry and the footwear industry, throwing out of work tens of thousands of highly skilled workers, many of them with a lifetime of experience in the particular industries.

VOTES PASSED UNDER STANDING ORDER No. 307 AND SESSIONAL ORDER

At 3.30 p.m., under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 24 October, the questions for the following Votes were put by the Chairman and agreed to:—

Development and Industrial Affairs—	\$
Department of Commercial and Industrial Development	2,312,277
Balance of Vote, Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds and Loan Fund Account ..	31,341,173
Executive and Legislative,	
Balance of Vote	1,591,526
Premier	7,048,432
The Treasurer	156,540,352
Conservation, Marine and	
Aboriginal Affairs	21,326,616
Lands and Forestry	16,552,846
Local Government and Electricity	4,626,517
Primary Industries	17,744,898
Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services	23,429,989
Transport	2,934,164
Works and Housing	73,040,825
The Auditor-General	1,335,307
Railways	227,462,000
Trust and Special Funds	
Estimates, Balance of Estimates	645,970,563
Loan Fund Account Estimates, Balance of Estimates	
Supplementary Estimates (Consolidated Revenue), 1973-74	91,476,534.74
Supplementary Estimates (Trust and Special Funds), 1973-74	34,334,263.54
Supplementary Estimates (Loan Fund Account), 1973-74	9,216,859.08
Vote on Account, 1975-76	428,000,000

SIXTH ALLOTTED DAY—RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions reported and, on motion of Sir Gordon Chalk, received.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS

The Resolutions being taken as read—

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer): I move—

“That the Resolutions be now agreed to.”

Honourable members indicating a desire to discuss certain Resolutions—

Resolution 1 agreed to.

Resolution 2—Mines and Main Roads—

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (3.42 p.m.): In speaking on the resolution for the Department of Mines and Main Roads, I wish to raise the matter of the road to the proposed new Brisbane port. In 1970, when a new road plan was laid down for Brisbane, the rate-payers of the city lost five miles of State-assisted road in the Brisbane city area. Looking at the map contained in the Main Roads report this year, we see that the road from Shafston Avenue through to the new port displays no mark to show whether it is a State highway, a main road, an arterial road or a subarterial road.

It amazes me that a road that services the area of Wynnum, Manly and Lota and a large section of Redland Bay—an area that is planned to carry all of the traffic for the new port in Brisbane—should not even be classed as a subarterial road—not arterial, not main road, and not even subarterial. To me, that is disturbing and frightening.

Those honourable members who have driven on that road in the morning peak hours or late at night would know that it is not just a suburban road; it is a major road that carries a large share of the traffic from areas outside the city as well as from the bayside suburbs.

It seems to me that one of the proposals appearing in the Main Roads report should have been a new road to service the port. The Main Roads Department speaks of the money it is to spend in the next 12 months, but the road to Wynnum does not receive a mention. If it is said that this is an ordinary suburban road, let me make these points. Every bullock, steer or cow that comes to the Brisbane saleyards by road has to be transported over portion of that road, and they account for a great proportion of the cattle sold there. All the fertiliser sent out by road from Consolidated Fertiliser's works on Gibson Island for distribution to rural communities throughout the State is hauled along this road. In addition, all the petrol distributed from Ampol to petrol stations in the city and outside is transported along this road. Yet the Government has not classed this highway, which is so vital to

the rural community, as even a subarterial road. Obviously, it is not an ordinary suburban road. It is a major traffic route and one that warrants and should attract State assistance towards its construction and maintenance.

Wynnum Road in parts is a very dangerous and narrow road. Anybody who has travelled from Shaftston Avenue to East Brisbane would know the problems that are continually experienced at the Heidelberg Street lights. Again, there are problems at Galloways Hill and the Balmoral cemetery. In addition to today's problems, all of the additional port traffic will have to travel along that road. This is part of the plan for the port. The major share of the traffic will travel along Wynnum Road past the shopping centre at Morningside, where parking facilities are short, and as a result drivers turn to the right in the middle of the road when they are seeking parking spots and thus hold up traffic. Large road trains of cattle, large petrol tankers and large fertiliser trucks are travelling through this congested shopping centre day and night.

Transport vehicles with high loads cannot travel under the railway bridge near the Colmslie Hotel. There have been at least 26 accidents at this spot in the past few years. As part of the Government's road safety planning, it has had this Railway Department bridge, which is blocking a major road to the port, painted in black and white stripes so that it looks like a zebra, instead of raising it so that vehicles with high loads can pass under it safely. As well, little has been done to speed up plans for raising the bridge so that the road can be widened to four lanes. The Brisbane City Council has constructed four lanes to each side of the bridge, but lack of Main Roads Department planning and Railway Department planning have created a traffic bottle-neck there.

This road passes a number of schools. What problems are the school-children going to suffer if it is decided that the port is to be established at Wynnum and the council is required to maintain Wynnum road as the port outlet, and keep it up to its present standard? The Cannon Hill State School fronts the road. Children cannot study in some of the front rooms. The enrolments at this school are dropping, so it has been possible to leave some of the front rooms vacant and give the children some peace and quiet in the rear rooms.

The same conditions exist at Tingalpa. School-children have been killed there and no safety move was made until this year. I repeat this is not an urban or suburban road, and its maintenance must not be left to the ratepayers of the Brisbane City Council. If that is the decision, the road will be a charge on the citizens of Brisbane, although it will be used by the major industries of Queensland and will be of benefit to large areas of the State.

The Government has planned the harbour industries zoning of that area and the Government has made the suggestion that this area be set aside for the port. It is to be the harbour industries area, the area where all the noxious and hazardous industries will be built. We are adding daily to the hazards of this road.

All of the fish transported by road to the city markets must come down this highway. All of the fertiliser and fuel supplies from Ampol will be carted along that road daily. And the Tingalpa, Cannon Hill, Wynnum West and Wynnum North High schools front that road. The residents of the area know nothing about the plans for the future. What does the future hold for those whose homes front this road if the new \$90,000,000 port is to be built there?

The port plan shows that cargo for the port will be drawn from as far west as Charleville, from as far north as Maryborough and from as far south as Coffs Harbour. With roll on, roll off shipping and containerisation, Wynnum Road will be worse than Kingsford Smith Drive.

There has been little planning of the freeway which supposedly will run from the Gold Coast road, up Creek Road and over the Gateway Bridge to the north side. Every time I ask the Minister, he says the bridge will be built in about 1985.

Mr. Camm: It could be longer if your mates in Canberra have their way.

Mr. BURNS: If my mates in Canberra had not been elected, it would never have been done; they are the only people providing money for this State. Would the Minister care to tell me what his mates in Canberra prior to 1972 gave Queensland towards the freeway system and the Gateway Bridge? Nothing—not a cracker!

At present the Government has planned to build a \$90,000,000 port to cater for all the major export industries from as far away as Maryborough, Charleville and Coffs Harbour. Everything will come down this road, yet no-one knows what the plans are.

The Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs is in the House. He has planned industrial estates in that area, but he certainly has not planned decent roads to them.

We have problems with the roads to the industrial estates. The roads go past Iona College and down North Road, Wynnum. Some of those roads go under water in wet weather. I do not think that the Minister even knows the area in which it is planned to put the port or the area through which additional traffic will flow. Some of the area's roads go under water twice a year. On some occasions in the rainy season, people from Wynnum are fortunate if they can get through, and they have to travel via a number of side streets and tracks. The land being developed by the Department of

Commercial and Industrial Development is the greatest mosquito-breeding, swampy area in the district.

Mr. Campbell interjected.

Mr. BURNS: Most of it has not been filled. A few roads have been built on it, and swamp holes have been left between them. Water collects in the holes and mosquitoes breed there. No attempt has been made to provide a transport service to the area. The department depends upon the Brisbane City Council to do that. The Government builds a little industrial estate and then says to the ratepayers of Brisbane, "You pay for it." The design of the estate is such that the people of Brisbane are going to face additional costs, as they have done before in other areas.

I suggest that the next time the roads plan for the city of Brisbane is reviewed, the number of main roads should not be reduced—it was reduced by five in 1970—but increased. I submit that the Wynnum road from Shaftston Avenue right through to Wynnum is not a suburban road. It most certainly ought to be graded above subarterial or arterial, but at the moment it is not even graded on the lists in the report that the Minister produced. Something should be done immediately about that major road and future planning for it.

People are concerned about the large volume of goods that will be conveyed to the port and the effect that the additional traffic will have on those using the road and exposing themselves to the traffic hazards on it. They are concerned also about the children who attend the three major primary schools and the one State high school on that road.

In addition, I am worried about action being taken by the Main Roads Department on the resumption of land in the area. I have written to the Minister about this matter. From time to time, people have told me that surveyors of the Main Roads Department have been seen on the roads in the Tingalpa area and other areas, and the Minister has agreed that they have been checking these areas lately. With all the stories that people have heard about free-ways and forward-planning by the Main Roads Department, as soon as they see surveyors from the Main Roads Department, they say, "There is immediate danger to my property."

I would like to know what is going on. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask for some sort of public relations exercise in the area. I am not attacking the Minister on this point. He has replied to my letters and given me the answers I desire. But why should there not be some sort of planned exercise, taking the public into our confidence. It should not be necessary to write into the department. Why should not

the department say, "There will be surveyors from the Main Roads Department working in the area. You should not be worried about what might happen to your property. At this stage we are only carrying out a number of exercises to see what might happen in the future." It does not seem to me that that would cause very much hardship to the Main Roads Department. Certainly it would remove some of the apprehensions of people living along the road.

The Main Roads Department should also do some planning for pollution controls on Wynnum Road. I have read the results of some of the surveys and tests carried out by the university on the Bruce Highway and other roads. There is a high incidence of pollution from the large volume of traffic on those roads. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what the decision to build the port in this area will mean to the people living in houses along Wynnum Road? The road is already badly congested and pollution is increasing. I suggest that the people in the area should be consulted and their interests taken into consideration before any major decision is made. The department certainly should make some decision on imposing pollution controls for future Wynnum Road traffic.

Finally, I wish to make a couple of points about mining wardens courts. It seems to me that in this day and age we could well do without them, and certainly the question of using them ought to be reviewed. As I understand the position, magistrates have jurisdiction to hear cases involving amounts of up to about \$1,200. Yet those same magistrates can sit in mining wardens courts and make decisions on multi-million-dollar leases. On the one hand, a magistrate sitting as a mining warden can make decisions on leases valued at perhaps \$1,000,000; on the other hand, as a magistrate his jurisdiction is restricted to \$1,200.

I suggest that mining wardens have very little knowledge of environmental matters. One of the pressing problems facing concerned citizens is that the protection of a particular area is finally left to conservation groups, many of which are only voluntary organisations with very little outside assistance, and they are virtually broke. They have to appear before a mining warden who does not know very much about environmental matters and who sometimes knows very little about the law. In a Maryborough case the mining warden was asked by the sand-mining companies—I think as a threat—to award costs against the conservationists who were appealing, and he said, "I don't know whether I can, but I would if I could." Fancy that sort of statement from a man who is making decisions that will have a vast effect on the future of the State! Surely decisions of such magnitude should not be left in the hands of mining wardens. I am not condemning

mining wardens as men, I am condemning the concept of having magistrates make such decisions in their role as mining wardens.

I know the Minister will say that the mining warden does not make the final decision, and that the Minister himself makes it. That being so, we do not really need the mining warden as such. Rather we should have some sort of ministerial, departmental or public inquiry. The necessary expertise should be available. There ought to be Government representatives giving evidence on the principles of conservation, land-use and rational planning. We should not have the mining side being put forward by the mining companies that are out to make a dollar—that is their business, and no-one can blame them for that—and, on the other side, a group of untrained volunteers, who are short of funds, putting the people's case for the protection of the environment. That seems to me to be unreasonable and unfair.

The Minister has said a number of times that he is a conservationist. If he is fair dinkum—and I do not doubt his own personal commitment—now is the time to consider changing the system of mining wardens courts. Let us have some form of expert body that can assist both sides to put their case—a body that can rationally look at the piece of land in question, the mine in question and the mineral in question, and determine what value the mineral will have as a export earner and what will be the value of the land after it is mined and what would be the value of the land if it was left unmined. That is not unreasonable. That seems to be an extension of what officers of the Co-ordinator-General's Department and others have said in the proposed study of the Moreton Bay islands.

Those are the two matters I wished to raise in the debate on this resolution. Firstly, we need to take a close look at mining wardens courts. There must be a far more modern and efficient way of making the necessary study. I do not believe that a magistrate who has a restriction of \$1,200 placed on him in the Magistrates Court should be allowed to make a decision on a \$1,000,000 claim when he sits in another room in the same building.

Secondly, the road from Shafston Avenue to Wynnum is a major traffic hazard today. Imagine what it is going to be like if all the goods to the port are going to be transported along that road. I know the Main Roads Department has assisted to build a culvert here and widened the road there. But that is not enough. That road should be declared a main road, and the Government should provide the money to maintain it. It certainly will become a major road because, as I have said, it will be carrying all the fertiliser, petrol, cattle, fish to the local industries as well as passenger and general cargo to the port.

Dr. EDWARDS (Ipswich) (3.58 p.m.): I wish to bring to the notice of the House a couple of matters which I believe should be mentioned at this stage. First of all I refer to the state of the mining industry throughout Queensland. A tribute should be paid to the Minister and his department for the thriving state of that industry. The industry is booming throughout the State. We are very proud that the mining industry in my area has taken on new incentives. In the time I have been in this Parliament the mining industry has played a tremendous role in the development of many towns and cities in Central Queensland. It has been largely responsible for population growth in that area, and the development of associated industries. The Government's policy of giving encouragement to the mining industry has led to the development and progress of which we are so proud. Of course, in Ipswich we are still a little concerned about the coal-mining industry. I pay tribute to the Minister for his particular interest in that industry. We are very proud of the promises he has made to us in our city about the future of the coal-mining industry in the Ipswich area.

As is well known, Ipswich has been a coal-mining area since about 1851 and has produced many millions of tons of coal the pattern of use of which has changed over the years with the changing pattern of industry within the State. It is very interesting to note that in 1949 most of the coal produced in the Ipswich area was used in the production of steam for railway locomotives. As the years have passed, the major portion of our coal has been used for the purpose of electricity generation and at present about 90 per cent of it is being used for this purpose, most of that going to Swanbank Power Station.

It is true that at times we have felt considerable concern for the future of our coal-mining industry. The demand upon it at the present time approximates 50,000 tonnes per week and it is very pleasing to know that in the last few weeks production at Ipswich has increased to such an extent that the miners in the area are able to produce this amount without depending on imported coal to build up the stockpile. This has been achieved despite the tremendous problems faced by the industry in the past two years.

In 1972, honourable members will remember, a tragic disaster occurred at Box Flat, in which 17 fine Ipswich miners lost their lives and another one has since died from injuries he received at that time. The disaster disrupted the whole industry in that area.

In January this year we experienced the devastating floods which not only had a tremendous effect on the people of the city but also seriously affected the coal-mining industry in that four of the mines in the area were seriously damaged and some closed for all time.

I pay tribute to the Minister for the interest he has shown in these mines and the industry generally especially following the devastation that occurred. He has visited the Westfalen mine and has given advice. His department has been most helpful, as has the coal board, in trying to have this mine rehabilitated. It was a great pleasure to see, a week or so ago, the first coal brought up from underground since January. I hope that in the future we will see tremendous advances in this industry. The Minister has taken a great interest in this redevelopment project and I hope that, in the future, he will be in a position to give even more assistance than he has been able to give up to this stage.

The mining industry in the Ipswich area, however, is still at the cross roads. As we well know, the Gladstone Power Station comes on stream next year and this will reduce the Swanbank station to a peak-load station if present plans are proceeded with. We believe that Swanbank should be continued on full load. I know that the Minister, very wisely, has instituted a survey of the mining industry in the West Moreton field. I pay tribute to him for that. It is a tremendous task and I look forward to the benefits that it will bring to the city of Ipswich. I believe that the survey will show that the industry is a thriving one and one in which we should continue to undertake substantial progress. I believe it will also show that the Ipswich and West Moreton coalfields, despite some of the criticism one hears of them, have a tremendous future. It is well known that the field has about 360,000,000 tons of coal in reserves. These are proven reserves and I am led to believe that we can probably extract 50 to 60 per cent of them without having any effect upon the strata above the coal leases. So there is a tremendous future for this area. I am sure that the survey the Minister has undertaken will prove without a shadow of a doubt that the future of the Ipswich and West Moreton coalfields is secure and that the men employed there will not need to fear for their jobs.

It is very interesting to note that, despite the down-turn in employment in many other spheres, the mining industry at present is employing increasing numbers of men. On the Ipswich field at present some 1,100 miners are employed and if Westfalen comes back into full coal production in the next few months probably an additional 50 to 100 miners will be employed.

I know that other mines are in the process of developing new areas. These will flourish if the long-term, stable contracts in which the Minister is particularly interested come to pass as the result of the survey about which I spoke. I think we shall then see ever-increasing numbers being employed in the industry in the Ipswich area.

We thank the Minister for his continual assurances that he will not allow the coal-mining industry in Ipswich to decline. We

look forward to progress and to retaining in Ipswich, our local miners, for whom we have the greatest respect.

I turn now to another matter. The Minister has been sympathetic towards approaches made to him about the distribution of motor vehicle registration labels and plates. A branch of the Main Roads Department operates in the Ipswich Court House building, but I do not believe that it is able to serve fully the purpose for which it was intended. Recently the Government decided to erect a Government office building, one in which the Ipswich branch of the Main Roads Department could conveniently be located. I hope that this building will be commenced in the near future. A larger office for the department would allow it to undertake the local distribution of registration plates and labels. Ipswich is the centre of thriving industrial activity, with a high level of motor vehicle ownership. I feel that decentralisation of the type I envisage will be of great value not only to the people of Ipswich but also to the Main Roads Department.

Finally I refer to the proposed southern bypass. I greatly appreciate the planning and work that have been undertaken by the Main Roads Department on this project. I pay a tribute to the Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr. Hansen, and his staff for the way in which they have willingly discussed this project with those who are vitally interested in it. It is a large-scale project and one that will cost many millions of dollars. I have been assured that planning is well under way and that some properties have already been resumed. The Minister and the Main Roads Department have readily acceded to requests to meet with the engineers of the Ipswich City Council with a view to ironing out any problems that might arise in the early planning stages.

Such a bypass between Warwick and Brisbane will draw traffic away from the centre of the city of Ipswich as well as from the suburbs. I am led to believe that it will bypass the city, follow Station Road and, later, will traverse Raceview, Dinmore and nearby areas. We have been assured by the Minister that work will commence in the New Year.

It has also been suggested that a second traffic corridor could be constructed through to Rocklea. This would have the effect of greatly reducing the volume of traffic on the main highway to the city of Brisbane. I have greatly appreciated the advice and assistance given to me as well as to the Ipswich City Council by the engineers of the Main Roads Department.

It has been a pleasure to speak to this resolution. Again I thank the Minister for the interest that he has shown in the Ipswich area, and I look forward to exciting developments there in the future.

Mr. BALDWIN (Redlands) (4.9 p.m.): I notice from the Estimates that expenditure from the Main Roads Fund has increased by 24 per cent over last year's figure. This is, of course, a significant rise and one that would more than cover in some directions the inflationary increases that we have to contend with. However, the increase is not sufficient in the light of all that needs to be done to improve general road safety and so on in my own electorate, which is but one of 82.

In following the line of argument advanced by the honourable member for Lytton, I emphasise that road maintenance in certain areas that are congested with traffic because road transport is the only means of conveyance has lagged in the past four or five years. I refer particularly to the section of Old Cleveland Road between Belmont and Capalaba. After arriving at Capalaba outbound traffic spreads out over three roads and the problem is not so great, but before Capalaba two traffic lanes do the work of six. At the main road junction at Capalaba, there is increasing chaos, danger and clutter-up.

In response to a question I asked the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, a survey of this area was conducted. Soon after that extensive works were undertaken on the parking facilities attached to the Carlton and United Breweries Capalaba Tavern. The work was paid for long before. Indeed, the licensee from South West Hotels Pty. Ltd. complained about this matter months ago. Although the job was paid for months ago, it has just been recommenced. My main concern is that whatever is done there should become part of (without duplication, destruction or loss) what is intended to be done to alleviate the over-all problem. The need for a four-lane, high-level, flood-free bridge across Tingalpa Creek is a major cause of delay in upgrading this road. I am sure that the Minister, as Minister for both Mines and Main Roads, is aware that mineral sand trucks from Cleveland and Redland Bay pass through Capalaba over the existing bridge and then proceed up Old Cleveland Road and New Cleveland Road. Some of these trucks when loaded weigh 45 to 50 tons. During the last wet season they ruined Finucane Road and Middleton Street, Cleveland. People had known for years that that would happen. That section of Finucane Road is belted around and the only new work done on it is that paid for by home buyers on estates adjoining it in East Capalaba; they now have better sections of the road in front of their houses. On the bumpy sections of the roads the noise of empty trucks is like thunder.

As the honourable member for Lytton said, people deserve more consideration. They raise families, work and provide profits. If the workers do not enjoy good health, there can be no profit from the mineral sands on the islands. Workers are just as much a part of the whole process as the automotive

equipment. Unfortunately there has been a tendency to treat workers in the light that there are plenty available, so why worry about them. Figures tend to show that plenty more will not be forthcoming. We must look after the well-being and peace of mind of our working men and women and their families.

I note also with some misgivings that the amount provided in the Estimates for the maintenance of main roads has been increased by only 3 per cent. Obviously, unless additional money is forthcoming from other sources, maintenance programmes will be reduced. The Main Roads Department some time ago assumed the responsibility for the maintenance of main roads passing through shires, so obviously road users and people living in the vicinity of main roads have little prospect of any improvement.

I hope that as a result of the survey—and I feel confident that the Minister will keep his word and advise me or, if I am not returned, my successor what the result of the survey—

Mr. Lee: You're not too confident of being returned.

Mr. BALDWIN: I am not one of those who kid themselves, like the loud-mouthed grazier from Goondiwindi. I know the chances in this game and I accept them as such.

What I point out is that, regardless of party considerations, certain work should be done. It appears—I am not making a definite statement, but it does appear—that the neglect during the period of more than five years that I have been a member could be attributed to political considerations. I ask the Minister to remove that appearance and to look much more closely at the needs of this area.

The east coast road on North Stradbroke Island should be looked at again. It was removed from the list of declared roads; I am happy to see that it is back on the map. However, in the Main Roads report, which I have just studied with interest but not pleasure, no mention is made of it. A similar problem exists there. I was pleased to receive advice from the Minister that \$48,000 was to be spent in preparation—I suppose on gravel purchase and dumping—for the foundations for the bitumen link that is so necessary. During the last five years traffic along that road has more than trebled. As is well known, heavily laden mineral trucks use the road. Public buses travel over it. Use of the road by private transport has increased four or five fold in five years. School children have to travel over it in buses to Dunwich and the mainland. The time is fast approaching when tragedy will result if nothing is done.

I draw attention to the interesting contrast with the road T.A.Z.I. built from Dunwich eastward to the Pacific Ocean, across the

dunes. There was no waiting for five years with gravel roads, nor was there with Con Rutile in its latest project south of Dunwich.

The company conducted surveys showing that beyond all doubt it paid to construct a bitumen road at once and not muck around with gravel tracks over loose sandy soils. There has been a continuing maintenance cost on the island because of the failure to spend that little bit extra, which would have meant a tenfold saving over a period of years.

Some of the things being done lead one to believe that inbuilt work perpetuation is being practised. From years of experience and observation of what happens when a job is not done properly, I know that it is wrong. I do not hold myself out as an engineer, but I know what the soil is like and I know what happens when it is disturbed and not carefully re-laid and other precautions are not taken.

To those people who live along the highway, this associated works programme with main roads construction is a continuing source of worry and damage. The idea has always been to spend money on the road alone so that more road can be constructed. That is understandable, too, but when the cost of repairing future damage cuts back on the money available for future main road construction in a period of five years, we end up behind the eight-ball.

I have already mentioned Finucane Road. I shall now refer to some road junctions. Years ago, when the Mt. Gravatt-Capalaba Road was constructed, it was more than adequate to handle the traffic. Today, in peak hours, it is a shambles. This applies particularly at its junction with Old Cleveland Road, where numerous bad accidents have occurred. The approaches to the intersection have been slightly widened lately but far more than that is needed. A whole complex must be built there for quick and safe entry and for the distribution of traffic at that junction. It has been estimated that it costs our society \$48,000 a year to keep a paraplegic in hospital. It does not call for much imagination to realise that the costs flowing from a few serious road accidents would far outweigh the sum needed to make that intersection safe and efficient.

I now refer to the junction of Springwood Road with the Pacific Highway. In every period of sustained wet weather, bitumen on Springwood Road is broken up and washed down onto the Pacific Highway and repeatedly that junction becomes a serious bottle-neck. At peak holiday times motorists use Springwood Road and Rochedale Road, and back through Mt. Cotton and other places, as a bypass route to the Gold Coast. This happens particularly at long week-ends. It is completely unrealistic to leave that junction in the mess that it is.

I suggest that when heavily used roads like the Pacific Highway are constructed or reconstructed, regard should be had to what will happen to the lead-on or lead-off

roads if a certain amount of work is not done as part of the whole main roads infrastructure, or inevitably subsequent damage will be done to those main roads.

The Minister and his officers would know of the long, drawn-out and disappointingly unsuccessful campaign conducted by the people living between Franckom Drive and the bridge just before Kuraby Road, Eight Mile Plains, over flood-drainage problems following the reconstruction of the Pacific Highway four or five years ago. Those people cannot have gardens; in fact they cannot have front fences unless they let the water through. Between midnight and quarter past 12 on the morning of 26 January last, the rush of water there was frightening. I knew what it was like so I deliberately went there. I knew that some of the families would be cut off by the rising waters backing up from the Logan River. The police laughed at me and told me to go home and forget about it. But I was right. They had to go back to rescue those people. I have known that country on and off for 40 years. I know what that road was like that night. It was just a sheet of rushing water that swept away gardens and fences. I admit that that was an extreme case; but that sort of thing happens every time there is an inch of rain in half an hour.

All that is needed is the expenditure of an extra \$2,000 or \$3,000 to provide a cut-off channel on the other side of the Pacific Highway. That would stop water rushing across and damaging the road. Such a volume of water at such a rate must damage the road. At the moment I am concerned about the terrible plight of the people who live at the bottom of the dip. Water went through their houses. It was not back-up water. It was flood run-off water, which belts along at 10 or 12 knots. It would take a person's feet from under him. It even pushed cars over to one side of the road.

Of course, I am speaking not only of particular cases but also of the general principles which they highlight, and I ask that these safeguards be considered as part of the infrastructure of works associated with the construction of all main roads. I believe that if that were done, the department would more than get its money back over a period of five years, and it would then have additional money to spend on further road development.

I am sure that the Minister will take in good part what I have said—he always has done so far—and have these matters further investigated. I am sorry to have to take up the time of the House today, but four or five years is a long time to wait. The people concerned have complained and I have complained, and I understand from some of the residents that a petition was submitted. The time has now arrived when I have to ask the Minister directly from the floor of the House to re-examine the position in the instances that I have mentioned.

Mr. LEE (Yeronga) (4.27 p.m.): I hope that, unlike the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, I will not send any of my colleagues to sleep. The honourable member for Nudgee and the honourable member for Mt. Isa were both wide awake when he began his speech; they are now asleep.

Mr. Newton: The Government's late nights on legislation are the cause of that.

Mr. LEE: The honourable member for Belmont cannot use that as an excuse. They were bored.

Honourable members opposite called for this resolution to be debated. Naturally, they did that for political purposes, hoping they could score points for the coming election campaign.

Mr. Newton: That is why you did it. We wanted to discuss some of the other resolutions.

Mr. LEE: Honourable members on this side of the House are very proud of what has been achieved by the Main Roads Department since National-Liberal Governments have been in office. I was a contractor when A.L.P. Governments were in office, so I know the way in which roads were constructed then. However, before dealing with that subject, I should like to tell the House what has been accomplished in my electorate in the 10 years that I have been its representative.

Over \$10,000,000 has been spent on main roads work in the Yeronga electorate, principally on the Rocklea overpass on Ipswich Road. I made frequent representations over many years for the construction of that overpass, and I am proud to say that it is now one of the best sections of Ipswich Road. Even in the January flood it was above flood level and was used as a parking area for vehicles from surrounding suburbs.

Over \$3,000,000 is being spent on the Nyanda railway crossing. Unfortunately, the contractor is somewhat behind schedule at present. I know that he has had problems because of wet weather—the January floods covered much of the work—and labour shortages. Over the last six months, of course, the Government in Canberra has very quickly cured the labour shortage. The contractor informs me that he now has no labour problems and hundreds of men approach him each day looking for work.

Because of problems that have arisen at the cement works, cement imported from Japan is now being snapped up at \$4.50 a bag.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. LEE: The fellows on the day-labour force work so slowly that they would not even need cement.

I am pleased that the Commissioner of Main Roads has allocated over \$10,000,000 for work in my electorate in the past 10

years. Both the Commissioner and I would like to see the contractor finish the work on the Nyanda railway crossing on schedule next year. I make a plea to the contractor, M. R. Hornibrook Pty. Ltd., to do everything in its power to get on with the job so that it can be completed on schedule.

It is worth mentioning that I had a chap by the name of Clem Jones poke his nose into my electorate. He thought he would be able to pick up an easy seat, but he found out that I did a bit of work. He pulled every shady trick in the book to try to remove me. When the tramlines on the main road were being covered by the Main Roads Department, he claimed that this was council work that he was doing. Certainly it was work that he should have been doing, but the council did not do it. The Main Roads Department undertook the work because of the danger to traffic. I know that on many occasions the Commissioner of Main Roads made a great effort to try to get the council to do that work. When he could wait no longer and had his department undertake the work, my opponent tried to take the credit for it. By means of a Press statement, I was able to reveal the true facts to the electors of Yeronga.

I thank the Main Roads Department for the many sets of traffic lights that have been installed in my electorate along Ipswich Road and Beaudesert Road. Both those roads carry a great volume of traffic. Ipswich Road probably would carry the heaviest volume of traffic in the State. Traffic lights have been installed on Ipswich Road at Venner Road, Chardon's Corner (where Cracknell Road and Villa Street join Ipswich Road), School Road, the Beaudesert-Ipswich Roads junction, Moorvale, and Moorvale school. When the council does its part and constructs Muriel Avenue from the Rocklea overpass across to Beaudesert Road, another set of lights will be installed at Evans Road. At the moment that area is causing me great concern, but I have not made strong representations on this matter because it is not fair to ask the Main Roads Department again to do something on behalf of the Brisbane City Council.

I am in a position to talk about main roads because for many years I was a contractor, and I built a considerable mileage of roads throughout the State.

Mr. R. E. Moore interjected.

Mr. LEE: The specifications are very different today. Of course, in the days of the A.L.P. Government roads were built only 12 feet wide, with the bitumen over 4 inches of gravel, regardless of the foundations. That Government's policy was to build narrow roads of poor quality so that it could boast about all the miles of bitumen road it had constructed. The honourable member for Redlands said that vehicles were tearing up the roads. That is happening because most of the roads in and around

Brisbane were not properly constructed in the first place. They have no decent foundations. In fact, just before the last council election the Brisbane City Council was sealing all the shoulders of the roads between the edges of the bitumen and the kerb. Basically, they were throwing bitumen over clay, and the people of Brisbane will rue the day this was done because it will all crack up in a few years. I consider it to have been a complete waste of money. The bitumen surface will not last because of the movement in the ground.

The honourable member for Redlands criticised the Government for spending money only on roads and not thinking about landscaping. Surely he must have travelled on the South East Freeway, which I think is a credit to the Main Roads Department, and on which literally thousands of dollars were spent on landscaping. But this type of beautification does not occur overnight. It sometimes takes years to come into its own. No-one can expect a tree to grow overnight. Enormous sums of money have been spent on landscaping this road, and anyone with any vision at all can see that this will become a beautiful area. People living along the freeway will in the future be looking out on beautiful lawns and green trees. The area will be much more attractive than it used to be. The honourable member's statement that the Main Roads Department spends money only on the roads is far from the truth, and I am glad to be able to refute it.

To revert to what I was saying about the A.L.P. and the way roads were constructed prior to this Government's coming to office—the A.L.P. Government would build a 12-foot wide strip, and very seldom would it have more than 4 to 6 inches of gravel as foundation. On certain types of soil, particularly black soil, such a foundation is utterly useless. On occasions 2 or 3 inches of loam would be laid and then 6 inches of gravel, but the gravel was not of the quality that is demanded today. It was much cheaper and easier to obtain. Today the quality of gravel used in Queensland roads has to meet very high standards and on many occasions I have seen it laid to a depth of about a foot. In fact, I have seen it put to a depth of 2 feet on certain types of soil. Yet the A.L.P. has the audacity to criticise this Government for the specifications being used, and to claim that we are spending too much money on too short a mileage.

A.L.P. members used to claim that they had built a bitumen road from Brisbane to Cairns. It was in fact really no more than a goat track. It was built to poor specifications, and it was too narrow to allow two cars to pass. Since this Government has been in office, we have strengthened and straightened virtually every highway in the State, and we have also built bridges. It is easy to say that we have not constructed many miles of road, and quite ignore the fact that we have had to repair all the bad and shoddy work

that should never have been done. And this was not the fault of the engineers; it was the result of political interference at that time. In my years as a contractor I spoke to successive Main Roads Commissioners and engineers nearly all of whom told me it was just a waste of money but, because of political interference, they were forced to lay poor-quality material to a minimum depth.

Mr. Marginson interjected.

Mr. LEE: I did no work for the Ipswich City Council. I certainly carried out some work for the Moreton Shire Council, and my engineer supervised it to ensure that it was done according to specifications. If, as the honourable member claims, the road has cracked up, it is further proof of my contention that the specifications laid down under Labor Governments from 1947 to 1957 were inadequate.

I am sure that most honourable members will remember the days when we used to drive along country roads and, on coming to dilapidated bridges, be forced to take detours. Since 1957, however, this Government has constructed literally miles of bridges. In some instances it has laid as much as 20 to 30 miles of road to serve only one bridge. We have had to pick up the tab for work that should have been done while the Labor Party was in office. For years beef roads, for instance, remained unsealed, but since our Government's election to power they have been steadily upgraded and are now a credit to the Government. They are beautiful roads to drive over.

Mr. Frawley: You have said that we had to fix up the roads. That is only one of the myriad things we have had to do since we came to power. We have had to fix up all the rotten things left over from the days of Labor.

Mr. LEE: I accept the honourable member's interjection as it is to the point. Further, it makes common sense—unlike some of the inane interjections made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He would know as much about roads as he would about house construction.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt interjected.

Mr. LEE: After we win 10 or 12 seats from the Labor Party at the next election, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will be walking a very lonely road.

I turn now to Commonwealth grants for urban roads. In 1972-73, they totalled \$27,400,000.

Mr. Marginson: You're only reading a brief.

Mr. LEE: No, I'm not; I am only quoting facts ascertained from the Main Roads Estimates, which you can't read. I realise that you have to get your doctor son to read them to you.

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

Mr. LEE: His son is a decent fellow, and I certainly would not criticise him. At least he has seen the light and left the A.L.P.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the resolution under discussion.

Mr. LEE: I shall do so, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, in 1972-73 Queensland received \$27,400,000 by way of Commonwealth grants for urban roads. This year, 1974-75, the figure dropped by \$13,000,000 to \$14,400,000. At the same time, with inflation, the cost of building roads has increased by 15 to 20 per cent. If 15 per cent or 20 per cent is deducted from the allocation, we have so many million dollars less.

We are also led to believe that the position will get considerably worse over the years. It is to be regretted that the outlook for free-ways in the Brisbane area is so grim. It was imperative that we should implement the Wilbur Smith programme; and the former Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra was prepared to grant funds to carry out the work. It realised that the Main Roads Department and Cabinet had made a wise decision to construct freeways to take the traffic past the inner city. Unfortunately, under the A.L.P. centralist Government we are being cut back year by year to the stage where we can carry out only a moderate amount of maintenance and freeway work. It is a shame that this should happen.

We should be getting at least \$30,000,000 a year, but it is only \$14,000,000 a year. We are about \$16,000,000 worse off this year. Next year A.L.P. members will criticise the department for not spending sufficient money on road construction. We should not be deprived of this money. It is money we pay in taxes and we are entitled to get it back by way of grants. It behoves A.L.P. members to look into the mirror now and again before criticising our lack of spending.

It is a crying shame that our programme should be cut back under the centralist-socialist Government in Canberra. Queensland is not the only State to be affected. Every State in Australia is similarly affected by the centralist Government in Canberra, which wants control of all the money so that it can say, "Build this road where we want it." The people in Canberra are quite happy to let us do the planning, but they want to determine from Canberra, about a thousand miles away, where the roads will be. What would they know about our requirements? The Main Roads Department has undertaken lengthy studies of road requirements and surely it must be in a better position than the people in Canberra to know what is required in Queensland.

Mr. Frawley: The socialists want to think for everybody.

Mr. LEE: That is right. The centralist-socialist Government in Canberra has given virtually no money to the shires. Any money that has been given has been channelled into A.L.P. Federal electorates such as Ipswich. Not a cent was given to the Gold Coast City Council or the Boonah Shire, which adjoins Ipswich. Mr. Hayden certainly made sure that ample money was available for road works in the shire in his electorate.

Dr. Edwards: I thought the Grants Commission was not supposed to be political.

Mr. LEE: It should be non-political, and it always was when the Liberal-Country Parties were in Government in Canberra. However, regardless of that, if there is money involved the A.L.P. Government in Canberra wants to have the complete say on how and where it is spent.

I suggest to the councils that, instead of approaching the Main Roads Department and the Department for Local Government and asking for more money, they should say, "Because we haven't received our rightful share from the Australian Grants Commission to allow us to carry on with road works, we will have to put off all our men." They should just let their employees go. The Federal Government would then be placed in the position of having to give each council its fair share of the money. However, the Main Roads Department and the councils adopt a humane approach. Because they are close to the people and concerned about their welfare, they try their utmost to provide employment for them.

A lot of criticism has been directed at the Main Roads Department about its resump-tions.

Mr. Davis: A shocker!

Mr. LEE: Never mind about that. The honourable member wants to have a council road put through his electorate. Then he will see what happens. Clem Jones doesn't even put a new road on the town plan. That's how sneaky and rotten he was about the whole deal. After granting a permit for the building of a brick house, what did he do? One week after it was finished a resumption notice was presented to the owner. Clem Jones tried to put a road through. Nowhere on any road plan or town plan for Brisbane was that road marked.

Mr. Davis: Untrue.

Mr. LEE: It is absolutely true.

Only about four weeks ago the Minister informed me that, because this was so irregular, construction of the road will not be permitted.

The council not only attempts to do these things behind a person's back but also offers practically no money for the resumption. A foreman who used to work for me when I was contracting, Mr. Roy Sanderson, and who lived on the corner of Days Street and Kingsley Parade, was affected by

this. The road I mentioned was not even on the map. Because there was an "S" bend, the council realigned the road to within 4 ft. of his bedroom window. Not one cent of compensation was paid; yet Opposition members have the hide and audacity to criticise the Main Roads Department, in spite of the humane way in which the department approaches its resumptions.

Mr. Miller: The council does the same thing in Toowong.

Mr. LEE: I warn the honourable member for Ithaca to watch the position. The council has as much heart as a fish.

It makes me boil when I hear the A.L.P. Opposition in this House criticise the Government for its attitude towards the resumption of property. At least we give consideration to the landowners. For one thing, an owner receives five years' notice. A resumption notice is not presented overnight. To me, the council's attitude is unjust and unkind.

Mr. Davis: Ha, ha.

Mr. LEE: It is all very well for the honourable member for Brisbane to say "Ha, ha." I do not know how the "Hansard" reporters will record that; but as long as they indicate a gravelly sound or something like that, they will be near the mark.

Mr. Hanson: He is the same breed as "Chalky".

Mr. LEE: No. There is no way in the world he is the same breed as "Chalky".

The Main Roads Department is very humane in dealing with resumptions. Mr. Guy will always sit around a table and discuss any problem with a deputation.

Mr. Marginson interjected.

Mr. LEE: That is more than the honourable member would do. He would not even give away a decent smile. That is how miserable I am told things are in Wolston. I have been told that the honourable member has not given anybody a cup of tea since he has had his new office.

After discussing a problem, 99 people out of 100 are satisfied with the payment offered for their property. This is more than can be said for the Brisbane City Council. It is impossible to get a council officer to a table or even have him indicate where a road is going. I have heard that there is a great leak in the pipeline up to the Trades Hall and back to A.L.P. Opposition members. They have been told to try to disguise the way in which the council is resuming land for roadworks.

Mr. Miller: The Main Roads Department is doing a marvellous job at the North Coast.

Mr. Bird: And the Far North Coast.

Mr. LEE: I have two interjections, one that a marvellous job is being done at the North Coast and the other that a wonderful

job is being done along the Far North Coast. I could not refute those statements. I have not been up there of late. As both members are men of integrity, I must accept their word. They certainly would not try to mislead the House. Possibly they should take the opportunity in this debate to speak about the Far North. I have not had the opportunity to travel up there of late. I have been busy looking after my electorate. Unlike Opposition members, I cannot rush all round the countryside. They rush hither and thither in the electorates of other members. And they use the main roads to get to their electorates.

Mr. Frawley: They don't even use their own cars.

Mr. LEE: Like the two members who interjected, I am a person of integrity, so I cannot answer that; I just do not know.

It has been a pleasure for me to join in this debate. It is a shame that the A.L.P. is trying to score politically off such a magnificent department which has done a tremendous job over the years.

One matter that has always been close to my heart is the free-enterprise system as opposed to the day-labour system. As soon as I said that, the ears of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition turned red. He is known as "socialist Fred". He is steeped in day labour. Day labour has a place. Never have I said that it has not. But it is wrong to give to day labour rather than free enterprise the greater proportion of work. This is my opinion and I could be wrong.

Mr. Newton: You are wrong.

Mr. LEE: I am not wrong. More miles of road can be constructed for less money under a free-enterprise system than under a day-labour system. However, the Government should never have all the work done by free enterprise. It could very quickly be over a barrel if it did that, and I do not believe that any Government should put itself in that position. In my opinion, it is reasonable to have 70 or 80 per cent of the work done under a contract system and 10 to 20 per cent under a day-labour system. Day labour is more suitable for small jobs such as widening of roads and carrying out repairs.

Mr. Gunn: There must be a blending of the two.

Mr. LEE: Yes.

Mr. Tucker interjected.

Mr. LEE: How are the roads up in Townsville?

Mr. Tucker: Bloody awful!

Mr. LEE: I hope "Hansard" has recorded that.

I agree with the honourable member for Somerset that there must be a blending. I have never advocated that only a free-enterprise system be used. That does not work

any more than a completely day-labour system works. When I entered Parliament, about 11 per cent of main roads work was done by contract and the balance by day-labour. The situation has now been almost completely reversed, with approximately 72 per cent being done by contract and the balance by day labour. I hope I do not see the day when the percentage done by contract is reduced. Now that the beef roads in the Far West have been completed, there is a tendency to do more work by day labour.

Mr. Miller: The lowest price should be the determining factor.

Mr. LEE: I do not agree that the lowest tender should always be accepted. The Commissioner of Main Roads should give a reasoned judgment to the Minister. Sometimes the man who has submitted the lowest price has made a mistake. He should be given an opportunity to reconsider his position, rather than be pushed into the job. If he is pushed into it, he may go broke and be unable to complete it. Selective tendering should be used, and contractors should be classified. If a job is of a certain size, it could be given to a certain contractor in the knowledge that he would carry out the work without getting into difficulty.

Mr. Newton: You have given all the tough jobs to the day-labour men and all the perk jobs to the contractors.

Mr. LEE: I am glad to accept that interjection. It shows how stupid the honourable member is. Surely he would not try to tell me that building a road in the west beyond Boulia or Windorah is not a tough job. I suppose Ipswich is as far west of Brisbane as he has been.

Mr. Gunn: West End.

Mr. LEE: I am told that the honourable member for Belmont has not been farther west than West End. It is utterly stupid for him to say that jobs out in the West, where climatic conditions are extreme, are not tough jobs.

As a matter of fact, the Minister and the commissioner will know that when the Main Roads Department began to tighten the conditions of tendering in 1957, many contractors said, "We will tender under the old conditions." When the conditions were applied according to the specifications, dozens of them went broke. K. and K.—I think that was the name—suddenly found they had to do the job up to specifications for the first time. When I was tendering the favourite trick was to have two samples of gravel. First of all the tenderer would have one lot of gravel that he knew would not meet specifications. The Commissioner of Main Roads, who is in the lobby, is smiling at this. He knows that it took them a long while to wake up to what was going on. The department would say to the tenderer, "Your price

is right, but your gravel is no good." The tenderer would say, "I've got another gravel pit about 40 miles further away."

(Time expired.)

Mr. BOUSEN (Toowoomba North) (5.6 p.m.): It is pitiful to think that we have had to sit here for the last 40 minutes listening to such a tirade of abuse and arrant nonsense from the honourable member for Yeronga. He had a lot to say about what has been spent in his electorate over the last 10 years. I think he said it was \$10,000,000. That very clearly indicates to me that there has been some sort of political intrigue going on. To think that one member can have \$10,000,000 spent in his pint-size electorate when other far-flung electorates cannot get any money spent on main roads and arterial roads! If that is not political chicanery, I know nothing about politics.

I want to say something constructive. This is a very important debate, and it is a great pity that 40 minutes have been wasted by the honourable member for Yeronga. The inactivity of the Queensland State Government has again sustained Queensland's sorry reputation as the world's greatest quarry. The Treasurer, forced by the incompetence of his colleagues to take desperate action, has had to beg to the foreign mining companies for increased mineral royalties. He has also been assisted by the Australian Government, which he and his Premier have constantly reviled and obstructed. The Treasurer was given a record grant of \$24,750,000 by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and the devaluation of the dollar will result in a gain of more than \$100,000,000 for the mining industry, from which Queensland will benefit. Nevertheless, we have heard nothing but a stream of vituperation directed at the elected Australian Government.

The roads grant situation is a case in point. The Budget clearly states that, of the \$82,661,511 to be spent on roads in this State, \$64,700,000 is provided by the Australian Government. There has been a 16 per cent increase in the Australian Government's spending on Queensland roads. This means that the State Government is going to supply only 22 per cent of the total road-works expenditure. As that 22 per cent is derived largely from motor vehicle registrations, which are constantly increasing, the State Government has no reason to cry poor mouth in this area, but that is just what it is doing.

Queensland is going to receive \$570,000,000 from the Commonwealth for roads over the next five years, with a further \$11,000,000 available to all States for worth-while projects. The States are going to receive \$315,000,000 more than under the Government grants formula of the previous Federal Government, yet the Minister for Mines and Main Roads keeps insisting that Queensland has been short-changed. If Queensland has

been short-changed, it has been by the Queensland Government and not the Australian Government which Government members are all so ready to condemn.

The report of the Mines and Main Roads Department contains several paragraphs of lengthy lament about what it calls "Commonwealth control at a quite detailed level". It continues, to assert that the Commonwealth has given "no valid reasons for the serious increase in controls envisaged." If the State Government is genuinely puzzled about why the Australian Government is obliged to play a larger part in the detailed spending of its road grants, it has only to look at the report of the National Highways Study Team, which states that the Bruce, Warrego, Landsborough, Barkly and Flinders Highways are all significantly deficient. They are major arterial roads and it is the duty of the State Government to maintain them in reasonable repair. These roads are part of an Australia-wide transport system and if the State Government will not attend to this vital matter then the Commonwealth Government must do so.

One weak link in the chain of highways destroys the effectiveness of the whole, yet it seems that the Queensland State Government is determined to be that weak link. Perhaps it has already adopted the policy of secession by neglect similar to the policy of destruction by neglect it practises in relation to historic buildings in this State, or perhaps it is planning to have these roads classified as relics of a previous age.

Most of our State roads are suitable only for horse-drawn traffic. After all, the concept of a dual carriage highway is scarcely a radical innovation, yet in 1974, of the 24,738 miles of road in this State, only 163 miles are dual carriage ways—six miles more than last year.

Dual carriage highways can save lives. Of the 6,410 road accidents involving motor vehicles alone during the quarter ended December 1973 5,290 were between two or more vehicles. Obviously a system which reduces the opportunities for collision must reduce accidents.

I am forced to doubt whether the Queensland State Government is actually concerned with reducing accidents. I do not like to think that it could ignore such a problem but we must judge it on its actions.

There are three main ways of achieving a cease-fire in the current war on our roads, namely, increased driver efficiency, increased traffic supervision and improved road conditions. The first could be achieved by more stringent testing together with the provision of more licence-testing facilities. The State Government has taken no worth-while action in this regard. The second could be achieved by providing more policemen. There should also be an improvement in the conditions of those policemen who have not already resigned in disgust. Instead, the

present State Government has been responsible for a total decline of morale within the Police Force. The third could be most simply achieved by spending more wisely the ever-increasing grants which the Australian Government has made available.

The Minister must be aware that the findings of the National Highways Study Team showed that 81 per cent of Queensland roads are deficient. By 1979, at the present rate, this will increase to 94 per cent and by 1989 every road in this State will be deficient, that is 100 per cent. What steps is the Government taking to prevent this? It seems that it has grudgingly decided that it must spend some money this year on road maintenance. It is shelling out \$5,650,000—a mere \$200,000 more than last year. And, of course, much of that \$200,000 will be absorbed by repair of roads damaged in the disastrous floods of January 1974.

It is spending only \$200,000 more in spite of the fact that the figures I have just quoted clearly show that this minor amount will not even begin to remedy the situation which prompted that highly adverse report from the National Highways Study Team. It is evident that the Government has no plans to expand the State's road maintenance programme. Last year it employed 4,180 people on road construction and maintenance; this year the figure has risen by only 244.

At a time when the State Government should be making every effort to alleviate the unemployment created by its own intransigence and refusal to accept either advice or assistance from the Australian Government, it is totally ignoring this opportunity to reduce unemployment and at the same time upgrade our substandard roads. It could commence a massive roadbuilding and repair programme, thereby creating employment for those unskilled workers who are most affected by a rise in the level of unemployment. The Government has refused to do this.

Similarly, it could set up an emergency road information service instead of imposing further on the R.A.C.Q., an organisation that cannot be praised too highly for the service that it provides. In January this year the State Government contemptuously tossed a \$10,000 grant to that body. If the Government really acknowledged the extent of its indebtedness to the R.A.C.Q., it would have given it in excess of \$100,000.

As usual the State Government relies on someone else's initiative and then tries to grab the credit for it. It appears that the Government has decided to allocate a miserly \$406,000 to the Queensland Road Safety Council. Meanwhile the slaughter continues unabated. The Government shows no concern. Cabinet Ministers will not expose their precious hides to danger on Queensland roads; they follow the poor example set by "Jet-set" Joh, who flies around the State in his aeroplane at a cost to the State of \$1,000 a week.

In 1972-73, a total of 603 people died on Queensland roads, 11,276 were injured, and 30,486 reported accidents occurred. In other words, in that period one person in 60 was involved in an accident that resulted in death, injury, or property damage in excess of \$100.

In the first half of this year, 289 people have died and 5,128 have been injured. And we have not yet reached the worst period, namely, the December quarter. Last year the number of accidents in the December quarter increased by more than 1,000 over the figure for the corresponding period in 1972. This means that in the forthcoming December quarter alone we can expect some 9,000 accidents to occur.

What is even more frightening are the statistics in relation to motor-cycles. Since 1969 the number of motor-cyclists killed has increased by a staggering 400 per cent, in spite of the fact that motor-cycle registrations have risen by only 133 per cent.

I have been speaking in terms of figures. Honourable members should take time to think what these figures mean in terms of people. Are Government members aware of the fact that most fatalities occur in the 17 to 20 age-group? These figures represent teenage children—the ones who would be considered to be too young to be sacrificed in war.

Statistics reveal that the majority of road accidents occur on straight roads. In 1972-73 a total of 12,728 accidents occurred on straight roads. The next highest number, 10,245, occurred at uncontrolled intersections. The ratio of road deaths to population is increasing. The greatest number of road accidents occur on Saturdays, next on Fridays, and next on Sundays. The greatest number of road accidents occur between 4 and 6 p.m., and 42 per cent of all road fatalities occur on week-ends. As I have said, the greatest number of road accidents occur in the 17 to 20 age-group. The result of these statistics is that the person most at risk is an 18-year-old, driving along a straight road at 5 p.m. on a Saturday. Until recently they were not old enough to be given a vote, but they were old enough to be slaughtered on Queensland's substandard roads.

Today, the engine of the modern motor-car is built for speed, but its chassis is not. Light-framed, high-speed cars are travelling on roads not fit for the speeds of 100 to 120 miles an hour which many cars can attain. Fast motor vehicles are murderous weapons in the hands of drunken lunatics. But the best this Government could do to control them was introduce its infamous, "Doctors-dob-a-driver scheme."

Of the 553 drivers who were given breathalyser tests last year after accidents, 489 were positive, and the majority of these had blood-alcohol levels of .15 or above. Honourable members can imagine the possible

consequences arising from one of these drivers driving on any one of our 81 per cent of unsuitable roads.

It is tragically clear that Queensland roads are not serving their primary purpose, which is to provide an efficient system of transport for all drivers within the State. At the same time they are not adequate for the speedy transport of produce. The Queensland Government should accept its responsibilities and allot more money to areas that benefit the rural dweller. The Australian Government has set the pace. Of the total Commonwealth grant for roads, 39 per cent is directed to urban purposes, and the rest, that is, 61 per cent, goes to upgrading rural roads. The Commonwealth has agreed to provide \$700,000,000 to the States over the period 1974-75 to 1976-77 for rural arterial roads, development roads, rural local roads and beef roads. Of this amount, Queensland will receive \$147,700,000. Meanwhile, the Queensland Government has allotted the "princely" sum of \$413,640 for beef cattle roads. That is less than we have to pay for the television time that Ministers waste in whingeing about the Australian Government's generous allocation. The beef roads programme is virtually at a standstill. The Main Roads Department's report lists only one road as being fully completed this year. That is the Gregory development road, which is now bitumen surfaced.

To summarise—I point out that the State's road-transport system is in complete confusion. It has reached such a stage of inefficiency that it drains away not only money, but lives. Clearly the development of main roads in Queensland requires a co-ordinated approach rather than the haphazard, stop-gap attitude evidenced in the Treasurer's Budget and associated Estimates.

The Minister's current thinking seems to be, "When in doubt, build a freeway." He does not decide to remove the one-lane bridges that are such a hazard in northern Queensland. He does not build up roads to save us from another three months of roads cut by flooding. His idea is, "Let us build another freeway." Freeways have already cost the State \$14,214,116, with a further \$96,040 being spent on maintenance, the latter sum representing an increase of \$31,000. The Minister thinks that freeways win votes. This cynical, political chicanery is no way to run a State. I am relieved to think that, by this time next year, the present Government will be out of office and we will be able to run the State on a much better basis.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BOUSEN: Despite all your interjections—I do not care what you say—you will not be in Government this time next year. You can take that from me. We will be here for certain.

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

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. BOUSEN: If you can keep these rat-bags quiet over there—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that I am presiding over the Chamber.

Mr. BOUSEN: I appeal to the Minister to upgrade our Queensland roads and thus reduce the high incidence of fatalities and accidents that we are experiencing today.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (5.24 p.m.): The only life in the speech of the honourable member for Toowoomba North was when he departed from his prepared screed and launched into what he considered to be a peroration to the effect that things would be better next year when Labor was in office.

Mr. Ahern: It was his valedictory.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: As the honourable member for Landsborough points out, it was his own valedictory. We will miss his smiling face, but his politics we can do without. I am quite sure that his replacement will hold up an end.

In 23 months of Labor Government, we have suffered the worst unemployment since 1946, the highest interest rates since the Rum Rebellion, the sharpest inflation ever, uncertainty and instability—and they want to govern Queensland! They have to be joking!

In the prepared screed that the honourable member presented, the burden of his remarks was directed to the road grants and the road formula and, later, to freeway development. It is, I suppose, understandable that he made no reference to the original overtures that were contained in the formula put forward by the Commonwealth because, breaking away from precedent, they laid down a policy that would have allowed the Commonwealth to dictate the priorities not only for main roads but also for all secondary roads flowing into local authority areas. That precipitated an enormous reaction from every local authority throughout Australia.

Although members of the Opposition constantly say that we in Queensland are the knockers, it is interesting that we were not to the forefront in the enormous counter-reaction to this measure from the States. Indeed, the reaction was of such an order that the—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lickiss): Order! There is too much audible conversation on my left.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: The Federal Minister for Transport had to change his attitude—sadly for him, because he wanted to be the big brother in main-road development. Sadly, he had to climb down. The Senate

again flexed its muscles and said that the formula as written by the Minister would not be accepted and, happily for local authorities in this State, they do not have the same rigid order of priority imposed upon them that they undoubtedly would otherwise have had to accept. I repeat that it was a remarkable change of philosophy, and we are enormously grateful to the Senate for changing the direction of the formula.

The honourable member for Toowoomba North also referred to freeways. He did not go quite as far as to say that freeway development should be stopped—

Mr. Davis: You wait till I get up.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Let us hear it. What is the honourable member muttering about?

Mr. Davis: You'll hear it.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I thought we might have received some gem of wisdom, but we wait in vain. I gave him a wonderful opportunity.

If the honourable member for Toowoomba North did not go as far as to say that freeway development should be stopped, that is certainly advocated by at least some of his colleagues. A number of organisations in the city advocate the complete cessation of freeway development.

When the present Federal Government came to office, the Minister for Urban and Regional Development very early in his ministry asked for a report on freeway development.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am trying to hear the honourable member for Chatsworth. Cross-firing in the Chamber will not be permitted.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if you did not hear this speech there would be a great void in your life. It will be one of the gems of the day.

When Mr. Uren commissioned this report on freeways, he asked his officers to compare for him, on the basis of costs and disturbance, the construction of freeways and the development of arterial roads. Mr. Uren was more than a little embarrassed when that report found its way to his desk, because it showed that it is cheaper to build freeways than to widen and develop existing arterial roads. The report further said that there is less disturbance to the populace with the building of freeways than with the expansion of arterial roads.

For reasons that are well understood, Mr. Uren has always chosen to ignore that report and to pretend that it does not exist; but the fact is that he himself commissioned it in the very early days of his ministry. It flies completely in the face of all that he and his cohorts have been saying about freeway development in this country.

Having said that, I readily concede that there can be a proliferation of freeways. I readily concede that there are places in the United States where freeway development has gone too far. Indeed, in some cities, freeways are being demolished, and that must certainly be the complete evidence against them. I concede readily that freeway development is not the total answer, and that it must be watched very carefully.

In Brisbane, no freeway development is feeding traffic into the city, which is always the great argument against freeways; rather, the city is being bypassed. The freeway that runs close to Parliament House is a classic example of the point that I am making.

When it is finished, people coming from the suburbs that you represent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, into the better suburbs that I represent on the south side, will be able to travel along the freeway without entering the city area. It means that they will be able to get to the electorate of Chatsworth so much sooner, where the air is a little fresher and the grass is a little greener. I think that that is a good sentiment.

Similar comments will apply to the freeway that will go through the northern suburbs. If a freeway development is watched carefully, people will not be fed into the city but will have a way of bypassing it. Far from aggravating the problems of the metropolis, those freeways, when completed, will ease them.

It absolutely amazes me that, for purely political reasons, people will argue against the development of freeways. If they say, "We are concerned about the people and the disturbance and enormous disruption imposed on them", we are at one. I agree totally that people who have to move from their homes have an almost traumatic experience inflicted upon them. We must be concerned about their compensation and re-establishment, and the social problems that arise for them. But there is not one problem; there are two. Compassion and sympathy can be extended to these people, but at the same time the wisdom of constructing freeways to bypass the city, and so minimise its traffic problems, must be realised.

Mr. Davis: Have you any freeways in your electorate?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I have one that services my electorate and is in close proximity to it. If anybody from the north side uses that freeway to make a visit to the south side and says, "It should not have been built", he will be laughed out of court. All the commuters who use that freeway say, "Isn't that freeway tremendous? Doesn't it save time? Doesn't it facilitate the flow of traffic? Won't it be even better when it is completed?" We hear that a dozen times

a day. It is a great pity that freeway development cannot be put into proper perspective, and recognised in this way. I have conceded that we could go too far with freeway development and I concede what American experience has shown. But I argue that we are nowhere near that stage in Brisbane. Every project has been well planned in advance and it serves the people of this city well.

Now that I have demolished Tom Uren and the honourable member for Toowoomba North, and the honourable member for Brisbane has retired hurt, I refer to another matter that I think is one of the most exciting things I have heard in this Parliament.

Mr. Davis: My speech on Weedmans?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: What is he mumb-ling about now?

Mr. Davis: My Weedmans speech.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: His what speech?

Mr. Davis: My Weedmans speech.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I am trying desperately to help the honourable member for Brisbane but he will not help himself. What can we do about him?

Mr. R. E. Moore: We will do something about him on 7 December.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Yes, on 7 December—the glorious Pearl Harbour Day. We look forward to it with keen anticipation.

Mr. Davis: They should put the honourable member for Chatsworth in an ambulance and take him away.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: He actually knows the name of my electorate. He is improving all the time.

It is proposed that twin steel complexes be established—one on the coal-fields in Queensland, and one on the iron-ore fields at Pilbara in Western Australia:

Mr. Davis: That is A.L.P. policy

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Now the honourable member for Brisbane says that is A.L.P. policy. The person who first propounded it was Sir Charles Court, when he was a Minister in the Brand Government in Western Australia, and it was embraced by the forward-looking statesman who leads the the State of Queensland, namely, our distinguished Premier. To say it is A.L.P. policy is nonsense, and I am going to demonstrate that the Labor Prime Minister of this country is doing everything he can to kill the scheme.

Mr. Marginson: Sir Charles Court says "no" to it.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Isn't it wonderful, Mr. Deputy Speaker! The honourable member for Brisbane, having retired hurt, has now got another up. I feel like a boxer who has sparring partners coming at him one

after another. If the honourable member for Wolston wants to be mauled a little, I do not mind a bit. He is now saying that Sir Charles Court does not want the scheme.

Mr. Marginson: That is right.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Sir Charles Court has told the nation of the Prime Minister's attitude to these twin complexes. He has said clearly that the terms Mr. Whitlam lays down are quite impossible, and we will not be able to proceed.

Mr. Marginson: You are not up to date.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I am very much up to date. Fancy an outmoded member of an outmoded party having the temerity to tell me, a man in the full bloom of youth, that I am not up to date! It amazes me. Anyway, it is the honourable member's dying flutter, Mr. Lickiss, so I must be kind to him.

As I said earlier, a twin steel complex is envisaged, and the suggestion is that carriers of a capacity of 200,000 tonnes would move round what I will refer to as the top of Australia, on the outward voyage bringing iron ore to Queensland and on the return trip taking Queensland coal to the iron ore in Western Australia. A steel complex would be developed in each State. It is the type of project that I find exciting—almost breathtaking—and it must proceed at any price. The possibility of using our own natural resources on the Australian mainland is so exciting that the opportunity must not be allowed to pass.

What are the obvious advantages of the proposal? The first advantage, of course, is that it provides for a domestic utilisation of these rich natural resources. It also provides for an enormous economic stimulus. I ask honourable members to imagine the thousands of millions of dollars that would pour into this country, and the ancillary industries that would come in the wake of such steel complexes. The two sleeping giants—Queensland and Western Australia—would not only set the pace for the rest of Australia; they would set the pace for the rest of the world.

Mr. Marginson: You are pretty right about their sleeping.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: The honourable member has been doing his share of sleeping for the last 2½ years.

These industries are both labour intensive. Therefore, the employment opportunities that they would create would be of a high order. I am attracted also to the possibility of an export industry. As far into the future as one can see, there will be a continuing high demand for steel. With the development of these two complexes, Australia could become a major steel exporter.

An aspect that should warm the hearts of honourable members opposite—they probably have not even thought about it—is that

the establishment of steel complexes would break the monopoly now held by B.H.P. My party, being anti-monopoly, is excited most of all by this prospect. For too long B.H.P. has set the pace and been able to tell people when they can have steel and on what terms. The possibility of breaking the monopoly and providing competition should be particularly exciting to members of the A.L.P. It certainly is exciting to members of the political party to which I belong.

What are the possibilities of creating these two complexes? I should say that the only possible way of creating them is to invite multi-corporations to participate on a corporate basis in funding the schemes. Quite clearly it is beyond the capacity of Governments alone to fund them, and to bring them to a successful conclusion. But the Prime Minister has said that the three Governments—the Queensland Government, the Western Australian Government and the Federal Government—alone (not even participating, but alone) should fund them. His estimate of cost is \$2,500 million, which is easy to say but hard to envisage and raise.

Sir Charles Court, who has been quoted wrongly by the honourable member for Wolston, has said that the estimate of cost is quite low, and that the figure would be far in excess of that. Realist that he is, Sir Charles Court concedes that it would be beyond the capacity of the three Governments alone to complete the complexes.

If the Prime Minister had spoken about some participation by Government, then I would have very little objection, but there is a world of difference between participation and saying that the three Governments must do it alone. The result of the Prime Minister's comment has been that Sir Charles Court is now pessimistic about the scheme's being brought to fruition.

I can only say that I find it a totally exciting concept. It is one of the most imaginative schemes ever advanced in this country. Its abandonment would be a matter for great sadness and regret. I should hope that, notwithstanding the Prime Minister's feeling that only the Governments should do it, the two free-enterprise Governments in Queensland and Western Australia will pursue the planning of it and make sure that people are invited to participate in it, and that by their own efforts, with or without Commonwealth participation, they will do everything to have these complexes created.

The Minister has advised me that reserves of coal have been ear-marked. Quite determinedly the Government is going to make sure that that coal stays in the ground in the hope that this scheme will come to fruition. Of course it again shows that this Government is forward-thinking, and is prepared to play its part in the scheme.

I wanted to go on record as supporting this wonderfully exciting concept. I do hope that the Minister continues dialogue with

his Western Australian counterpart. I hope that in his ministry, at least the first steps will be taken towards the creation of these twin complexes.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Cook) (5.44 p.m.): It was quite refreshing to hear the remarks of the honourable member for Chatsworth after the speech by the honourable member for Yeronga, who showered condemnation and criticism on engineers for the job they did on road construction prior to 1957. It was very wrong of him to do that. He tried to score off the A.L.P. at the expense of engineers. The Minister would know that engineers are dedicated professional men, who would not on any account work for anyone who asked them to do an inferior job. The work they did remains as a testimonial to them. They are proud to see how the roads they built have stood up to what has been demanded of them. The honourable member for Yeronga fails to realise that there has been a vast change in the speed, weight and types of transport that are using the roads today compared with 1957 and further compared with the days before World War II. I put the record straight for his benefit. In an attempt to overcome his own inadequacy in looking for some excuse to attack the A.L.P., he criticised a dedicated branch of the Main Roads Department.

We all know the ravages of the floods earlier this year. They were bad enough in Brisbane, but in the Far North they almost eliminated whole towns, including the streets in them and the roads leading to them. I refer particularly to the town of Karumba. I think every one here will recognise Karumba's importance to the prawning industry. The town has now been rebuilt, so I will not canvass who was responsible for what happened. The road into Karumba has been rerouted and a very good job is being done.

But other minor roads in the area were washed out and have not been replaced. I refer particularly to the road running from the aerodrome into Karumba. It is only short but its use is subject to the tide and to run-off in the wet season, and it does not take much water to close it. People who rely on air transport for their goods are already faced with soaring costs, but when goods consigned to Karumba reach the airstrip and this road is out they have then to be transported by boat from the mouth of the Norman River up to Karumba.

That is bad enough but when the road is out, schoolchildren who live in the area have to travel by boat to the Karumba State School because no other means of transport is possible. Quite a number of families are affected and many further blocks of land have been sold to people desirous of living there so the numbers effected will increase. I mention this to the Minister because I am sure he will realise that it is impossible for the Carpentaria Shire Council to do this work unaided. It simply has not the finance.

It has a large, sprawling shire and it cannot afford to do permanent work of this type. I ask the Minister to arrange for his department to assist the council. If necessary he could approach the Australian Government for financial help in making this lifeline to the airstrip at the mouth of the Norman River an all-weather road. It is ridiculous to have an all-weather airstrip situated within 1½ miles of a township without an all-weather road connecting the airstrip to the town. If the road is reconstructed, the Carpentaria Shire Council could maintain it through the wet season—and it will need some maintenance because it is difficult country for transport. For instance, I think it would be necessary to place a limit on the weight of vehicles allowed to travel over it. I think several trips in a small vehicle would be preferable to having one large semi-trailer carrying heavy loads and cutting the road up so that it becomes impassable for everyone. It is such a short link that I am sure it would not embarrass the Government financially but it would be a wonderful asset to the people living in Karumba and to the children who travel to school. Two of the houses isolated by this road becoming impassable belong to the Department of Harbours and Marine. They are occupied by boat patrol officers and they and their families are inconvenienced by this interruption in communication with Karumba township.

I should now like to draw the Minister's attention to other sections of road in my electorate and to ask for some permanent works at creek and river crossings. I refer to the sections of road between Mt. Carbine, Lakeland Downs and Cooktown and between Lakeland Downs, Coen and Weipa. The Coen to Mt. Carbine Road runs down the middle of the peninsula and it would take off cattle from either side if it were made traffickable for most of the year. Unfortunately, it goes out and is impassable for many months each year mainly because of the absence of permanent works at creek crossings and because of the inroads of sand at river crossings where there are no bridges. Those tourists who are sufficiently courageous to use this road to visit Cooktown face the prospect of having to traverse dangerous detours through creek beds and gullies in which caravans can quite easily become bogged or damaged.

Besides being a tourist and beef-cattle road, it provides local people with an outlet to Mareeba and Cairns. However, for several months of the year, owing to the lack of suitable crossings over flood-prone rivers and sandy creek beds, the road cannot be used safely.

The third road is the one from Dimbulah to Chillagoe. It is a 58-mile section of the Dimbulah-Normanton development road. On reaching Dunbar Station the road turns south and traverses loose sand country along the coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria. No matter how much money is spent on it,

it will always present a problem to motorists. The road from Dunbar Station to Kowanyama provides a lifeline for many people.

On several occasions the Minister has told me that it is his department's policy to improve roads outwards from townships. I go along with this, but I would like to see the radiation from Dimbulah implemented more speedily than at present. Some work has been carried out on the crossings, but more needs to be done to upgrade this road, which now carries a large volume of traffic to the Chillagoe Caves. They have now been illuminated and made perfectly safe by the Forestry Department for tourists, and sightseers visit them in great numbers. In fact recently 400 tourists undertook a one-day rail excursion to the caves. They are a draw card and attract visitors not only from other parts of Australia but also from overseas.

The road has a tendency to become dusty and at times it is strewn with boulders. Many motorists who drive along it, particularly those who like to get off the beaten track, become heartbroken at the damage that is caused to their motor vehicles and caravans. The surface of the road from Dimbulah to Chillagoe needs to be upgraded.

I pay the Minister and his officers a tribute for the good work that has been done in many parts of my electorate. The honourable member for Yeronga referred to the road beyond Dimbulah. I am sure he had in mind the Georgetown beef road, during the construction of which many contractors went broke for various reasons, such as unfavourable weather conditions.

On other occasions Cabinet Ministers have indicated that certain contractors suffering financial hardship—perhaps from floods—have received financial assistance. I well remember an occasion on which floods swept across the beef road between Mt. Surprise and Georgetown and washed away eight or nine culverts. They ended up at least a quarter of a mile from the road. Neither the engineers nor the contractors were to blame. It was simply that the road had not settled. These were unforeseen troubles and additional finance had to be allocated to overcome them.

I have nothing but admiration for people who push roads through virgin country, remove huge basalt boulders, bridge creeks and overcome transport problems to bring in materials for the job and supplies for the people who live in camps. In this instance endless problems were encountered through lack of proper rail facilities to the railhead and the absence of good roads from the railhead to the camp.

I have not forgotten the future of Irvinebank, although the Minister may think I have. This township has lived on borrowed time for a number of years. The residents are waiting and wondering whether it will survive. The Minister thought that the tailings could be tested and re-treated, and

he offered them to various companies. To my knowledge, nothing more has been done. I will not pinprick by asking the Minister what has happened to the Loudon Dam; I know that its condition remains the same.

The Loloma mining company is doing quite a good job in the area. I urge the Minister to retain the Irvinebank battery at all costs. Plenty of mineral deposits are available in the area. Mine sites that were formerly inaccessible can now be worked thanks to new machinery for building roads and getting ore out.

I am certain that with improved machinery and methods Irvinebank can continue to produce and provide employment for people in this small town, which has weathered tin price fluctuations over many years and overcome its water problems. The town is now well on the way to showing other mining companies how to make do in the area. The State battery at Irvinebank should be given a new lease of life so that it may continue for all time.

[Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (7.15 p.m.): Before I begin to talk about Queensland roads, I wish to say a few words about the Commonwealth Roads Grants Bill of 1974, which is a perfect example of the centralist attitude of the Commonwealth Government. That Bill gives the Commonwealth power to approve all decisions on road projects undertaken by the States and local authorities. Any decision by a local authority or State Government to spend money on a road or road plan will have to be submitted and approved by a Commonwealth public servant or, perhaps, by one of the Ministers. What a ridiculous situation!

Local authorities should be able to make a decision at a local level. The Federal Government is attempting to concentrate power in Canberra by these insidious methods, which include suspect legislation. The net result will be one great big bureaucratic bungle, with Canberra attempting to override decisions not only of local authorities but also of State Governments.

State Governments and local authorities are elected by the people. They should be competent enough to make their own decisions. How can a centralist Government in a country the size of Australia possibly assess the road needs from one end of the nation to the other? State Governments and local authorities will certainly have less finance for road construction and maintenance because of this.

Mr. Whitlam broke a promise he made when he was in Opposition not to reduce the proportion of fuel tax then allocated to roads. In 1971-72 \$450,000,000 was collected in fuel tax and \$255,000,000, or 56 per cent, was returned to the States in road grants. Under the Whitlam Government's present proposals, only 53 per cent of the estimated \$2,132 million will be returned

to the States, which are as a result being forced into an impossible position with road-works.

The Commonwealth Roads Grants Bill is a blatant attempt by the Federal Government to ignore the constitutional responsibility of the States and to place all decisions on road matters into the hands of Canberra.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, you and I represent the Redcliffe Peninsula. The part of Redcliffe that is in Murrumba is the western side and the southern side. It is interesting that, after Redcliffe was discovered and explored late in the 18th century, the first settlements by convicts took place in 1824. They were short-lived, and a more permanent development started in 1862.

In the early days, transport was mainly by sea. The first formally surveyed track was marked out by a gentleman named Tom Petrie in the mid-19th century. It crossed the North Pine River and led to the Redcliffe coast along what is now known as Anzac Avenue, which is our main road. It was marked out to take picnic parties from the area of the North Pine that is now called Petrie to the beaches of Redcliffe.

The first formal road was commenced in Redcliffe in 1881. It ran the length of the Peninsula, north-south, along what is now known as Oxley Avenue.

Mr. Leese: What has this got to do with the resolution?

Mr. FRAWLEY: This has an important bearing on the main roads. I am leading up to that.

Mr. Houston: You are wasting time.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not wasting time at all. I am leading up to it. If honourable members opposite do not listen carefully, they will miss a valuable contribution to this debate.

A cause of the slow development of transport in Redcliffe was that it then came under the Caboolture divisional area, which administered a fairly large area. Later on there were attempts to provide for the rise in motor vehicle ownership. The first licence was issued in Redcliffe in 1914. It is interesting to reflect that all vehicles, whether motorised or horse-drawn, were restricted to a speed of 4 miles an hour at intersections. At a place of pedestrian concentration, such as the entrance to a public building, a speed limit of 8 miles an hour was imposed on horse-drawn vehicles and 15 miles an hour on motor vehicles.

Mr. Gunn: What about velocipedes?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not think any speed limit whatsoever was imposed on velocipedes. For the edification of the honourable member for Brisbane, velocipedes are bicycles.

With the rapid development of motor travel there was also an idea of a railway to Redcliffe. However, in 1935 the Hornibrook

Highway was commenced. I know that this is dear to the heart of the former Leader of the Opposition. He was always talking about the Hornibrook Highway and what the A.L.P. would have done if it had won the last election. That, of course, was completely untrue. Because of the franchise conditions it could not possibly have taken it over.

Mr. Houston: We would have built a new one.

Mr. FRAWLEY: There is no way in the world the A.L.P. could have built a new highway.

A co-ordinated service has carried passengers across the Hornibrook Highway for many years. It is a very good service. I do not carry any brief for the bus company at all. At times I have said some harsh words about it and the way it does not do what it should do on the highway—provide telephones at certain intervals. They need not be telephones that could be used to make a trunk line call to Sydney. They should be telephones connected to the toll office so that anybody whose car breaks down would only have to walk a short distance to be able to report it.

Mr. Leese interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: My suggestion was that the company purchase a tow-truck of its own. It could buy one for about \$500. It should be kept at the end of the highway and could be used to tow away vehicles that break down.

Mr. Leese interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Plenty of vehicles that apparently broke down on the highway did not in fact break down. This was done by stooges. Some of our political opponents in Redcliffe arranged for these vehicles to appear to be broken down on the highway, but they were not broken down at all. I know of one case involving a 1958 FC Holden station wagon. The driver walked away and left the car locked up for two hours and there was not a thing wrong with it.

Mr. Houston: Who was it?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not know who he was. I could have found out his name because I had his number.

Mr. Leese interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Mr. Speaker knows I have not got a tow-truck.

Mr. Jensen: What's your telephone account like? I am told it is \$1,000.

Mr. FRAWLEY: My telephone account would be one of the lowest of all honourable members. I would put money on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: At present, two major roads go north from Birsbane in the direction of Redcliffe. The one that is most used by Redcliffe traffic is Sandgate Road, which runs through the electorate of the honourable member for Sandgate. He is well aware of the situation. The road travels through Brighton and across the Hornibrook Highway to Redcliffe. The alternative route is the Bruce Highway, which passes through the electorate of Pine Rivers. It connects with Anzac Avenue. The distance from Brisbane to Redcliffe is roughly 20 miles by the first road and 25 miles by the second.

At present, a four-lane highway is being constructed along Sandgate Road just north of Cabbage Tree Creek. The Main Roads Department has already started the road, which will bypass Sandgate and Brighton. From the latest reports I have received, two lanes should be finished in 1975. This construction has been delayed not through the fault of the Main Roads Department but through unforeseen circumstances. No-one could expect a big project such as this to be finished right on time. This route will also connect with the southern end of the bridge. It would not matter if a new bridge were constructed tomorrow, the traffic problem would still exist. Anybody who tries to pin the blame on the Hornibrook Highway is stupid and is using that argument for political purposes. A new four-lane bridge built tomorrow could not handle the traffic.

Mr. Leese interjected.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not tolerate persistent interjections.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I like to place myself under your protection when I am being harassed.

A new route for the Bruce Highway is being constructed. Somewhere north of Bald Hills it crosses the Pine River. Most of the road has been constructed as far as Bald Hills and another two lanes will be added at a later date. The Bruce Highway south of Cabbage Tree Creek has been widened to four lanes. All of these improvements will reduce the distance by about 2 miles. Within a few years' time, both the Bruce Highway and Sandgate Road will be well aligned arterial highways. In the more distant future I can foresee that the Bruce Highway will be an extension of the Northern Freeway. It is logical that any new connecting road from Redcliffe should use one of these two routes.

As honourable members are aware, the existing Hornibrook Highway bridge is a viaduct, with a 20-ft pavement on a timber superstructure.

Mr. Leese: It is awful.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It may be awful, but it has served its purpose. When it was constructed in 1935, it was a boon to the Redcliffe Peninsula. It opened up the peninsula.

The late Sir Manuel Hornibrook deserved congratulations on his foresight in building that bridge.

Of course, it is a private toll facility, and the franchise expires on 21 October 1975. The toll has been 1s.—or 10c—and it has never changed since the bridge was opened. There has been no need to change it. I would like to have debentures in the Hornibrook Highway Company.

Mr. Jensen: You have shares.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I certainly do not. I have a list of the shareholders and debenture holders, and my name is not amongst them.

Mr. Marginson: Why did you get the list?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I got it to find out whether some of the people who were crying hardest about it were shareholders in the company.

Mr. Jensen: And did they give you any?

Mr. FRAWLEY: No. I wish they had.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will address the Chair.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I would certainly like to have shares in the Hornibrook Highway Company. It is paying a dividend of about 94 per cent this year, and that is not a bad effort. I do not blame anyone who owns shares in the company for resisting any attempt to remove the toll. They put in their money in the days when it was an uncertain venture.

Mr. Marginson: What about the Premier's investments in broken-down mines?

Mr. FRAWLEY: The Premier put his money into mines before he came into Parliament.

Mr. Miller: He has done more for Queensland than honourable members opposite.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Of course he has.

I know that the Crown has had the right since 1955 to take over the bridge. I do not intend to castigate the Labor Government that was in office in 1955 for not taking it over. Of course, Country-Liberal Governments have had the opportunity at five-year intervals since then to take it over.

Mr. Marginson: And they didn't.

Mr. FRAWLEY: No; I admit that. It should have been done before, but it is no good trying to place the blame now.

At present Redcliffe is a city with a population of about 39,000. The Redcliffe transportation study published in 1968 forecast that by 1987 the population of Redcliffe would be about 56,500. I predict that it will be even higher than that. Those who carried out the transportation study forecast that in 1987 there would be 46,000 vehicles a day at week-ends and 22,000 a

day on week days crossing the Hornibrook Highway. To carry that volume of traffic, four traffic lanes will be required on the new bridge.

Mr. Hartwig: It may be less than that if the price of petrol continues to increase.

Mr. FRAWLEY: That is right. The whole traffic problem of the Hornibrook Highway could well be overcome if the price of petrol continues to rise. It is only natural that people will stop driving their cars to work. At present, about 14,000 cars a day cross the Hornibrook Highway. Most of them have only one or two passengers, and they could easily take four passengers. I have approached the Minister for Transport on the matter, but his hands are tied. He cannot give permission for private vehicles to carry fare-paying passengers in order to try to alleviate congestion on the Hornibrook Highway. Although I still think it is a good idea, the State Transport Commission apparently cannot find any way round the provisions of the Act.

The narrow pavement and the poor vertical alignment of the Hornibrook Highway make it uneconomical to do any maintenance work on the substructure, and it will be necessary to construct a completely new bridge. It has been said that the most economical form of construction is the one that is proposed—a new bridge on the seaward side of the present bridge. However, some alternative routes have been suggested, and I venture to suggest that by the 1980's or the year 2000 it will be necessary to use one of these alternative routes. One is from Clontarf Point, south-west to the new bridge on the Bruce Highway, which would only require a bridge across Hayes Inlet. It could be constructed in the future. It would be a main road, and it would make less necessary the construction of four lanes on the present two-lane bridge being constructed across the Pine River.

Mr. Gunn: Don't you think Redcliffe will have a population of 60,000 by the year 2000?

Mr. FRAWLEY: It is supposed to be 56,500 by 1987, so it could well be 60,000 by the year 2000. In fact, it will probably be nearer 75,000.

Mr. Marginson: It will have to get better representation.

Mr. FRAWLEY: The city of Redcliffe has had good representation since 1960, when the present Speaker of this Assembly was first elected. I do not want to embarrass him by eulogising him. He was the first mayor of Redcliffe when it was declared a city, and he was the first member for Redcliffe. He will hold the seat as long as he wants to hold it. Attempts to take the seat from him have been made every three years, but they have all failed.

It was thought that, if the route I have just mentioned across Hayes Inlet were adopted, there would be no need for the Deagon deviation. I am certain that there will be need for them both. Of course, there are two or three alternative routes. It is economically the best proposition to build a new bridge on the site of the present Hornibrook Highway.

The Government is often accused of not carrying out its decentralisation policy. That is absolute rot. The Main Roads Department is a good example of decentralisation. Road construction and maintenance throughout Queensland are controlled through a decentralised network of offices. There is the northern division with headquarters in Townsville; the central division with headquarters in Rockhampton; the south-western division with headquarters in Toowoomba; and the south-eastern division with headquarters in Brisbane.

The development of Sandgate Road north of Nundah shopping centre has been completed. It has proved to be a much needed asset to the people of Redcliffe and Sandgate. The Hornibrook Highway has done a fine job. It has been a boon to Redcliffe.

The honourable member for Toowoomba North got up and propounded the socialist theory. He was well and truly brain-washed during his trip to Russia, where he was wine and dined by the commissars, and had all expenses paid.

The motion that was brought on in Cairns to have a referendum on the abolition of the State Government and to turn Queensland into a Federal territory was one of the most shocking things I have ever heard about. I do not know how it even got off the floor. I have a photostat copy of it, and I will spread it around my electorate.

The honourable member for Toowoomba North mouthed socialist fairytales about placing trust in "Big Brother" Gough and his band of Canberra fairies. Again he attempted to denigrate the Premier for using his aircraft. On an earlier occasion I pointed out what a boon that aircraft was during the floods. It enabled the Premier to travel very quickly from place to place.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Gough used a Boeing 707. Under this Government the honourable member for Bulimba was the first Leader of the Opposition, as he then was, to get a car and a driver. When the A.L.P. was in power our leader got nothing—not even a drink of water. I used to work down here, and I knew what went on.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. I cannot see that there is any need for the honourable member to deliberately tell untruths. The first Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament to have a motor vehicle provided was Mr. John Duggan.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I stand corrected. I thank the honourable member for putting me straight. He must have been the second Leader of the Opposition to get a car.

There are very many important roads in the Redcliffe electorate. There is a road known as the Redcliffe Connection Road, which runs from Rothwell out to the Bruce Highway. What a shocking name that is! I have already written two letters about changing the name of that road. I don't care what it is called, but let the name be changed. It could be called Leese Road, Houston Road, Hinze Road or anything else—I don't care. It could even be called Tucker Road. What it is called does not worry me, but for God's sake let us have the name changed from Redcliffe Connection Road. It could be called Davis Road because I spit on it every time I drive over it.

Another very important road runs from the electorate of Redcliffe through Murrumbidgee out to Rothwell. I refer to Anzac Avenue. I know that the Main Roads Department has plans to improve the intersection of Anzac Avenue, Elizabeth Avenue, Boardman Road and Grimley Street. I live in Elizabeth Avenue, so I am aware of the traffic that goes through there. It is a dangerous intersection that the Main Roads Department is going to upgrade when it gets the money to do it.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not have a radio in my tow-truck, Mr. Speaker, as you know. The reason I sold it was that the rubber cheques given to me by the members of the A.L.P. nearly put me out of business.

It is interesting to note that in the Redcliffe section of my electorate quite a deal of money has been spent by the Main Roads Department, and Main Roads money is a boon to any local town or shire council. All the maintenance on secondary roads is carried out by the local councils and they also do quite a bit of the Main Roads work.

On the Redcliffe Connection Road about \$2,820 was spent on maintenance last year and I should imagine that most of that would have been on work done by the Redcliffe City Council. This work enables these councils to keep their maintenance and construction staff at full strength at all times. Main roads and secondary roads work is very important to all shires and cities.

\$14,751 was spent on maintenance of the Redcliffe-Clontarf road and this has also been a boon to the Redcliffe council. An interesting point is that on State highways for permanent work and maintenance the Main Roads Department charges the local authorities absolutely nothing. The same thing applies to urban arterial roads, while for developmental roads the local shires pay 5 per cent for permanent works and nothing for maintenance. For main roads they pay 10 per cent for permanent works and nothing for maintenance; for subarterial roads, 10 per cent for

permanent works and 20 per cent for maintenance; and secondary roads, 25 per cent for permanent works and 30 per cent for maintenance.

My political opponents in the Caboolture Shire have been attempting to undermine me by telling the people of Upper Caboolture a pack of deliberate lies about the Roxburgh Road, which is in Upper Caboolture. People have been saying that the maintenance of that road is the complete responsibility of the Main Roads Department. This is completely untrue. Roxburgh Road is a secondary road on which the shire council has to pay 25 per cent of the permanent works and 30 per cent of the maintenance. In other words, the Main Roads Department is paying 70 per cent of the maintenance of Roxburgh Road and the shire council 30 per cent, yet stories are circulating that the reason nothing is done to the road is because the Main Roads Department will not spend any money on it. I repeat—this is completely untrue. These are the types of things one has to put up with on entering political life. All sorts of lies are told about the State Government and, of course, always by members of the A.L.P.

Part of the Pine Rivers Shire is in the electorate of Murrumbidgee and it contains many main roads. During the recent flood, great damage was done to these roads. Actually most of the damage was just outside the Pine Rivers Shire, but on the Brisbane-Woodford road, of which 22.7 miles is in the electorate of Murrumbidgee, \$90,000 was spent for permanent works and \$160,000 for maintenance. On the Brisbane-Woodford road, just over Mt. Mee towards D'Aguilar, a big landslide occurred and it cost quite a deal of money to repair the road. The road leading through Woodford also cost close to \$250,000 to repair. A great deal of money has been spent on those roads by the Main Roads Department in repairing flood damage. It took quite a while to upgrade them, but it was done. The Samford-Nebo road is another which I know will be very costly to repair and bring back to a satisfactory state. This is another road on which there is always a danger of landslides. People must put up with the inconvenience for the time being and use the old forestry road from Nebo to Samford.

In the shire of Caboolture, which I think would have most of the main roads in my electorate, roughly 17 miles of the Brisbane to Gympie section of the Bruce Highway is in the Caboolture Shire and on it \$164,000 has been spent on permanent works, \$43,000 on ordinary maintenance and \$8,000 on special maintenance. There is a very dangerous intersection on this road about which I have written to the Minister on several occasions. I know he has the matter in hand. I understand there will be an alteration of the Bribie Road from the Bruce Highway in an attempt to reduce the number of accidents that occur there. On a Saturday or

Sunday afternoon any motorist who tries to drive from Caboolture to Beachmere has no hope of crossing the Bruce Highway.

Another major road in my area is the D'Aguilar Highway, which connects Caboolture and Kilcoy. The Marysmokes Creek bridge, on this highway, is right on the border of the electorates of Murrumba and Somerset. It would be interesting to honourable members to learn how the creek got its name. Unfortunately, I do not have time tonight to tell them. The honourable member for Somerset would, of course, know the story.

Mr. Davis: I would like to know.

Mr. FRAWLEY: The honourable member for Brisbane probably hasn't even heard of Marysmokes Creek. He has not travelled further north than Breakfast Creek. As soon as he gets out of sight of a Brisbane City Council bus, he breaks out in a cold sweat.

Mr. Davis: I would really like to know.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not intend digressing to tell the honourable member. It is quite a long story.

The D'Aguilar Highway from Caboolture to Kilcoy suffered severe damage during the floods, and all of it can be traced back to the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, who refused to open the release valves at Somerset Dam.

Mr. R. E. Moore: You mean he prevented their opening?

Mr. FRAWLEY: He simply would not do it.

Mr. Gunn: He was only grandstanding.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Of course he was. He was told by his engineers that the opening of the valves would not have any effect on the level of the Brisbane River. In spite of that, he refused to open them, and brought about flooding in the Kilcoy area, thereby causing great inconvenience and even financial loss to local dairy farmers. They could not deliver their milk to the Caboolture butter factory, and thousands of gallons were poured down the drain. A lot of good work was done by members of the Moreton Bay Boat Club and other people who ferried milk across the swollen streams, but in spite of their efforts the farmers lost heavily. The Brisbane City Council should be made to cover the cost of repair work carried out by the Main Roads Department on the D'Aguilar Highway.

In the Pine Rivers Shire repair work is being carried out on the road around Dayboro, and this has greatly pleased the local people. They would be more pleased, however, if the money set aside for the purpose of resuming land in the Dayboro area had not been used to purchase Lennons Hotel.

Mr. Alison: It was a scandal.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It was a travesty of justice. Some Dayboro people have had their heritage eroded by the Lord Mayor and his gang of cut-throats.

A great deal of destruction occurred on the Campbell's Pocket Road. The Caboolture Shire Council was hard pressed at the time, and it was fortunate to have the Main Roads Department come to its rescue. A total of \$18,000 was spent on ordinary maintenance work on the road, with the result that it is now a fairly good thoroughfare.

Over the past 12 months or so pedestrian-activated signals have been installed in various locations. There was an urgent need to install such a safety device outside the Kippa-Ring State School, which is on a road that carries a heavy volume of traffic.

Mr. R. E. Moore: How did Kippa-Ring get its name?

Mr. FRAWLEY: The area used to be an Aboriginal bora ring. Unfortunately it has since been destroyed. I have suggested to the Minister for Lands that any area such as that should be preserved. I have quite often been referred to as a racist.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting lost in the Kippa-Ring area. He will come back to the resolution.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Over the past 12 months 781 miles of declared main roads have been constructed in Queensland, 35 new bridges have been erected and major repair work has been carried out on a further 49 bridges. This bears out the comments made by the honourable member for Yeronga to the effect that under an A.L.P. Government no bridges whatever were constructed and motorists were forced to detour through creek crossings in a manner that could be likened to a game of snakes and ladders.

The Government has also installed traffic signals at 31 major intersections and installed six sets of flashing lights and one half-boom gate at railway level crossings. This work clearly shows that the Government pays due consideration to the main roads of the State. From memory, there are 24,800 miles of declared main roads throughout Queensland. But for the present Federal Government, all main roads in Queensland would have been sealed. When the A.L.P. was in control in Queensland, we seldom got a decent road. All roads finished at Stafford and we travelled on goat tracks from there on.

I understand from the Department of Main Roads that when the road at Mango Hill, Kallangur, is finished, approximately 3,000 vehicles a day will use it. Most of them will come from my electorate and the Kippa-Ring area. I have seen where the new deviation is being constructed. If 3,000 vehicles a day use it, it will make a big difference to the people of Redcliffe and Deception Bay.

I sincerely hope that the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, or anyone else who is able to do something about it, will change the name of Redcliffe Connection Road so that people may know exactly where they are going.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (7.46 p.m.): All who heard the honourable member for Murrumbidgee this evening will remember his speech for a long time, firstly because it was akin to a travelogue. It is a long time since I heard an honourable member waste 40 minutes taking us step by step, metre by metre, throughout his electorate. He talked about obvious things and matters that the Government refused to do anything about although he brought them to its attention on many occasions. If ever there was a good reason why the honourable member should be deposed and replaced by a Labor member, he gave it tonight by using 40 minutes to tell us about his electorate and all that is wrong with it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. If the honourable member looks at the clock he will see that I took only 30 minutes. His statement about 40 minutes is completely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: Unfortunately the member is not only blind, but also, apparently, dumb. He spoke for longer than 30 minutes.

The honourable member's speech will be remembered as his last in this House. I have no doubt that it was his swan-song in this Assembly.

A Government Member: Are you feeling a little sensitive?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, not at all. If it were legal to do so, I would take a few thousand dollars from him.

I wish to raise a matter that concerns me, and which should concern all honourable members. It relates to the size of heavy transport vehicles using our roads. They play havoc with many roads, particularly those that are constructed for much lighter vehicles. I hope that a limit will be placed on the size of vehicles registered to travel on roads, particularly suburban roads. Because the roads are used by these massive vehicles, local authorities have to bear the added cost of providing much stronger roads than would normally be required to carry suburban traffic. To my knowledge most of the very large transport vehicles do not carry Queensland registration. The States and the various authorities should get together to fix the maximum weight and power of transport vehicles. A road cattle-train using a beef road in a country area in which there is no rail transport is an entirely different proposition from heavy transports using suburban roads. Heavy transports on beef cattle roads are a sensible means of moving stock and other heavy loads, and they do not interfere with public or private transport. In the cities, particularly Brisbane, some of the large and heavy vehicles carrying tremendous loads are a menace not only to the roads but also others who use them. Hardly a day goes by without one's reading of an accident in some part of the State involving

a heavy vehicle. I am speaking now of heavy vehicles, not extra-heavy vehicles. Recently on an average of about once a week, transports have tipped over or lost their loads. Only the other day a vehicle attempting to climb a hill had insufficient power for its load and rolled back, causing damage.

This is not the way in which to operate a motor vehicle registration system. Surely the registration of a vehicle should mean much more than the Government's obtaining money for Consolidated Revenue. Registration should cover also the safety of the vehicle. In this debate, I do not want to enter the field of mechanical checks and the like. However, I believe that the nation's relevant authorities should meet and agree on a formula for the type of roads to be used by different sizes of vehicles, and the circumstances under which they may be used.

Every time a new vehicle is advertised or a manufacturer produces a new model, stress is laid on the great loads it can carry and the enormous power it has.

Mr. Chinchin: Don't you know that there are standards in regard to this?

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, but vehicles are getting larger every year. That is the point I make.

Mr. Chinchin: The standards are set.

Mr. HOUSTON: I know they are. The point is that the standards are getting more liberal year after year, and larger and larger vehicles are allowed. Ten or 15 years ago it was thought the size of vehicles then would be the standard. At that time it was not envisaged that a larger, more powerful and wider vehicle would be built for use on the road. However, as time has passed, that has happened.

Mr. Chinchin: The axle loading is not increasing.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member should walk around with his eyes open and examine some of the vehicles now being used. Axle loadings have increased. But it does not stop at axle loading. Safety on the road is affected by greater vehicle length, width and power. Whether or not their braking systems are sufficient for their power, I do not know.

Another point is whether the power of the motor is sufficient for the load of the vehicle. A report appeared in the Press the other day of an accident caused by a vehicle that ran backwards down a hill. It was reported that the vehicle was travelling up a hill, and the tyres started to slip; in other words, the motor could not take the load and the tyres lost traction on the road surface. The vehicle rolled back. That has not been denied, so I assume it was a fairly accurate report. Surely it is the responsibility of the authorities to see that under-powered vehicles are not given registration.

The authorities should call a halt to further increases in vehicle size. Only yesterday on my way to Parliament House I was driving behind a large vehicle. Because of the width of the vehicle, I had no chance of seeing what was ahead, and I had to slow down to a virtual crawl behind it. Vehicles of that type should not be allowed to travel on ordinary suburban streets. If they have to travel from one point to another through the suburbs, they should be restricted to certain roads and highways.

When vehicles travel from one city to another for purposes of trade, the Main Roads Department should be responsible for the roads that they use. Although I am referring particularly to Brisbane, the same remarks apply to other local-authority areas. When a local authority constructs a road for use by vehicles of ordinary size, it is quite suitable. However, somewhere in the same area the Government may decide to establish an industrial estate. Private enterprise may build factories there. Heavy vehicles will then be travelling along ordinary suburban roads to get to the factories. This will result in the breaking-up of those roads, and the responsibility for their repair is thrown back on the local authority. This is quite wrong. The Main Roads Department should accept this responsibility, or a special allocation should be made to the local authority to cover such roads. Perhaps their administration and control could remain with the local authority.

Local authorities get their money from two major sources. They receive rates, and they obtain grants from the Federal Government and subsidies from the State Government. Loans must be excluded in this case, because they have to be repaid, with interest, out of income. Whenever responsibility is transferred from local government to the State Government or the Federal Government, all that happens is a change in the responsibility for payment from one area of taxation to another.

I support the remarks of the honourable member for Lytton on the road from East Brisbane to Wynnum and Manly. It carries a tremendous volume of heavy transport. It is the main feeder road from many south side suburbs to the city and Fortitude Valley. It also carries a tremendous amount of traffic from the south side to industries on the north side.

Mr. O'Donnell interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: As the honourable member for Belyando said, many drivers of heavy trucks who desire to travel along Creek Road to the south-western suburbs use that road in order to avoid other traffic bottle-necks. Wynnum Road and Lytton Road are now carrying many loaded heavy commercial vehicles. I understand that that road connects with the freeway to the Story Bridge. The Main Roads Department should accept responsibility for those roads.

I also support the plea of the honourable member for Lytton for the widening of Wynnum Road under the railway bridge near the Junction Road-Wynnum Road intersection. I made this plea several times when it was in my electorate. It is certainly a traffic hazard, and many accidents have occurred there. A good deal of petrol, and many hours of commercial and private time, are wasted because there is a four-lane highway on each side of the railway bridge, and only a double lane highway beneath it. Correcting this situation is a more urgent job than much of the work undertaken by the Main Roads Department recently. I hope the fact that it is a Labor-held electorate is not the reason why it is not proceeded with. I have advocated for many years that something be done in that area.

I repeat that I am completely opposed to the extension of a freeway through Norman Park, with a bridge over the Brisbane River to New Farm, and then through to somewhere near Fortitude Valley. I am opposed to it for several reasons. Firstly, I do not believe that a radial freeway of this type is required—at least not at this stage of the city's development. Secondly, I do not believe that a densely-populated high-class residential area should be interfered with in order to provide a freeway.

The location now being investigated is not that originally suggested by Wilbur Smith. It was at Mowbray Park, and it was designed to bring traffic into Fortitude Valley and nearby areas. I do not think it should be used, either. A person can put forward all the theories he likes, but if a bridge were put across the river from Norman Park to New Farm, the traffic on it would interfere with the tranquility and comfort of many hundreds of people living nearby. That is quite apart from the construction of a freeway.

Although it would also interfere with the comfort of people living on the New Farm side of the river, my main concern at the moment is for those who live at Norman Park. I believe that the Main Roads Department should stop spending its money on testing at Norman Park and forget about a project of that type, certainly for the next decade or so. In my opinion, it will then be clear that there is no need for a freeway in that area. There will be other and better means of overcoming some of our communication problems.

I wish to mention also the number of houses that have been bought by the Main Roads Department. Unfortunately, some of the houses and the yards are not being maintained as they ought to be. Some houses are left empty for long periods. They require maintenance, and the yards become overgrown. When houses are offered for rental, great care must be taken to see that the tenants are suitable. I do not want to go into the matter again, but one house bought by the Main Roads Department was later rented and used for business purposes.

That is a warning to the department, and it must ensure that such a thing does not happen again. Consideration should be given to leasing houses for a long period or selling them. That would provide security of tenure, and ensure that the properties were maintained.

It is one thing to suggest that something should not be done; it is another to suggest an alternative. To my mind, in this instance the alternative is very clear. In my opinion, the State Government has a responsibility to build urgently a bridge or a tunnel—and I am not arguing the merits of either—on the lower reaches of the Brisbane River. It has been needed for years. Quite a number of years ago, when Sir Francis Nicklin was Premier of Queensland, he saw fit to call tenders for a bridge or a tunnel—I think it was a bridge—on the lower reaches of the river. However, the whole matter died a natural death after an election was held.

The Brisbane City Council, with its own finances, came to the rescue of the State Government by providing the "Sir James Holt" cross-river ferry. It has shown that a more permanent and quicker means of crossing the river is needed. If a bridge or a tunnel were constructed, I believe that it would play a tremendously important part in the development of the city.

One of the obvious reasons why it has not been proceeded with is the domination of the National Party in the Cabinet. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads, being a National Party member, would not understand the need for development of this city. The policy of the National Party is not designed to promote the development of the capital city of this State.

Mr. Chinchén: The report shows that 32 per cent of the traffic going through Brisbane does not wish to do so.

Mr. HOUSTON: I quite agree. Every expert comes up with the same answer. The Wilbur Smith Report laid it down quite clearly that there had to be a bridge or a tunnel. The main thing is that it would bypass the inner city—and the Valley, which is an area of great congestion. Anyone who travels along Wickham and Ann Streets gets a knowledge of what congestion there can be in the Valley for many hours of the day.

I cannot speak too strongly about the need for this project. It has other ramifications. In the future increased road transport services will operate between Queensland and the southern States. Vehicles coming via the inland highway could easily deviate towards the Murarie-Tingalpa area. Similarly, vehicles coming up the coastal highway could easily get to that area. A freeway could be built through it without any interference to homesites. I am sure that the honourable members for Mt. Gravatt and Mansfield would agree that at the present time there is vacant land in that locality

that could be used to provide a connecting freeway road. If we wait for another 10 years, development in that area will catch up with us, and we will be in the same position there as we are now with the inner city areas.

Mr. Chinchén: I agree.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am pleased to hear that. This is not a matter of party politics but a matter of the development of our city. With a connection across the river in that area we would tie in the future port development on the south side with the present port development on the north side. It would also tie in south-side manufacturing and engineering establishments with the northern side of the city. This Government decided to allow Ampol and Amoco to establish their respective refineries on opposite sides of the river. Service stations on one side of the river are supplied with petrol from refineries on the other side of the river. Surely it is in the interests of the city, particularly with transport costs, to provide a connection between the north side and south side in the area I have mentioned.

When the private sector of industry finds it necessary for one reason or another to dispense with the services of employees, Government and semi-Government authorities should spend money on these developmental projects, not when there is a big labour shortage in the private sector. Today an abundance of labour is becoming available from the private sector. Unfortunately, people are losing their jobs in that sector. If the Government wants to play an important part in helping to overcome unemployment, it should be obtaining and spending money on a project such as that bridge or tunnel crossing. At the initial stages of such a project not a great deal of employment would be created, but, as the project developed from the drawing-board to the stage of manufacturing components and performing work on the site, work would be created for many hundreds of males and females in various classifications.

So within 12 months of starting the project we would be providing employment opportunities for many Queensland people. I believe that that alone should spur the Government into thinking very seriously of proceeding with such a project. It would have the added advantage, of course, of bringing into many Brisbane homes salaries and wages that have been denied them through circumstances completely beyond their control.

Those are the main matters to which I wished to refer in this debate. I hope that the Minister and his department will see fit to give the Gateway Bridge project, as it is commonly called, top priority. Get on with the job so that this city can develop unchoked by traffic; it would then bypass the city.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (8.11 p.m.): I have been in this Chamber for but a few short years but I was astounded to hear the speech of the honourable member for Bulimba. He showed that he could not get out of his own electorate—a man who at one time wanted to lead the Government of Queensland. In fact, I should have thought that he could not get out of a horse paddock. He went to great lengths in talking about his own electorate, forgetting that this great State occupies more than one-fifth of the total area of the Commonwealth. And in what he said he did a great injustice to a man who has dedicated his lifetime to this State. He said that the Minister for Mines and Main Roads would not understand. I believe that when the history of Queensland is written outlining great roadworks and mining projects, the name of Ronnie Camm will be written in gold in part of the book. It amazes me that a man who has moved from the front benches of this Chamber to the very back should stand up and have a “crack” at the Minister and accuse him of failing to understand something happening beneath the Brisbane River.

I never fail to highlight the inefficiency of 20 years of Labor Government in this State. What a mess our roads were in back in those days! Let us take our minds back to what Queensland was like under a Labor Government. First of all, it took a day and a half for a person to travel by car from Rockhampton to Brisbane and in doing so he ran the risk of damaging his vehicle on the rough “missing link” sections in our national highway. Today a person can drive from the N.S.W. border to Cairns and beyond without opening a gate and on sealed highway all the way. He can travel under similar conditions from Brisbane to Charleville and other areas of the State, and from Cairns and Townsville to the West. Even in remote areas of this State today one can find very fine sections of road constructed by this Government, firstly under the administration of the late Ernie Evans and later under our present Minister. His mind goes further than the Brisbane River and the area of Bulimba. His mind encompasses the whole of the State. In fact, this Government looks at Queensland as a whole, not just at one particular section of it.

Roadworks can be carried out only in terms of the finance made available, firstly, by the Federal Government, secondly, by the State Government and, thirdly, by the local authorities. It is as simple as that. A higher standard of road construction is required these days than 10 or 15 years ago. For example, roads now need to be much wider than they were previously. In the days of Labor Government, highways were only 10 ft wide. In contrast, these days they are 22 to 24 ft wide and they stretch for miles to the remote areas of the State. The people of Queensland are fully aware of the fine job the Queensland Government is doing.

Since the Whitlam socialist Federal Government's election to office in Canberra, Queensland more than any other State has been neglected in the allocation of finance to roadworks. The Queensland Government experiences added difficulties because of the vast area of the State, which covers 22½ per cent of the area of the Commonwealth. By comparison, Victoria represents only 3 per cent of the total area of the nation. A Victorian motorist who likes his beer and has a glass before setting out on a journey from one side of the State would reach his destination on the other side without even feeling thirsty. A Queensland motorist who has a couple of pots in Brisbane before setting out would not get as far as Gympie before he felt the need to refresh himself once more.

The Queensland Government is faced with maintaining not only highways and arterial roads but also main roads and local authority roads.

For six or eight years I was shire chairman in Monto, and I am aware of the financial assistance that we receive for roadworks.

Mr. R. E. Moore: You were a great one, too. They were sorry to see you go.

Mr. HARTWIG: They were, and they gave me a great send-off. In those days the council was able to draw up its budget in the light of knowledge of the funds that would be made available to it under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Scheme. It was a wonderful scheme and one that provided financial assistance to all local authorities. However, under the present system the Commonwealth is starving the States. For example, it is hogging the petrol tax instead of pouring money back into the States and local authorities for roadworks.

The Labor Party claims to be the champion of local government. What utter rubbish! It will not even allocate Commonwealth aid to road funds in sufficient time to enable local authorities to draw up their annual budgets. The outcome of the unavailability of Commonwealth finance is the necessity for local authorities to charge such high rates that many landholders are forced off their properties.

The honourable member for Bulimba spoke about tunnels under the river. The Labor Party is opposed to the construction of city expressways, yet tonight one of its members urges the construction of a tunnel under the river. Where does he think the money for such a giant project would come from? It would cost millions of dollars. How much would the Commonwealth Government offer to Queensland for such a purpose?

The Queensland Government has bent over backwards to ensure that people whose properties will be affected by the construction of freeways are given proper consideration. When Mr. Lowe was the Commissioner for

Main Roads I travelled around Brisbane with him for two or three days. At that time he was trying to resettle people without too much disturbance. We must have expressways. It is utter rubbish to say that we do not need them. How can we cope with the traffic in Brisbane, with its narrow streets, without them? Our streets are not much wider than those in Hong Kong and Singapore. Expressways are the answer to the present-day traffic congestion. The Government is looking to the future, to the year 2000, in providing beautiful expressways. Now that the stables in the grounds of Parliament House have been demolished we have only to walk out onto the rear veranda to see the beautiful Riverside Expressway and the South-east Freeway that was opened by the Minister for Mines and Main Roads a few months ago. What a boon they are to Brisbane traffic. Before they were opened few cars went past the Bellevue building, but now thousands of them do.

Finally, I shall make a few comments about my own electorate.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: While the honourable member for Belmont was sleeping I was talking about many places in Queensland.

Since I became the member for Callide the Main Roads Department has approved many good jobs in my area. While Mr. Hansen, the Commissioner, is in the lobby I point out that the Upper Burnett-Callide Valley highway should be completed. It is a vital missing link.

Mr. Bromley: Is this before or after the election?

Mr. HARTWIG: I should like to think it would be done before the election, but Opposition members wanted an early election. You challenged us to an early election and you are going to cop it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARTWIG: There is a missing link on a road to Gladstone, and another on the Upper Burnett-Callide Valley highway.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: The mates of Opposition members in Canberra denied us the money. If the previous Liberal-Country Party Government had stayed in office, these jobs would have been finished. Under Labor's policy of constructing national highways and to hell with the rest of the roads—that is the way Labor thinks—it is concentrating on highways between Brisbane and Sydney and between Sydney and Melbourne. But there is more to it than that; good roads are needed to get produce to the cities.

The road from Yeppoon to Rockhampton is one of the worst I have travelled on for many years. Traffic counters on that road reveal that 2,000 vehicles a day travel on it. If I go to Yeppoon in a hurry I become

almost car-sick from turning round the many corners. This road must be upgraded because the Capricorn Coast serves the hinterland of Central Queensland and the Rockhampton area. With the wonderful boat harbour at Rosslyn Bay, many Central Queenslanders now spend their week-ends on the coast.

A Government Member: Do they come from Longreach?

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes, all the way from the Far West. More of them would do so if something could be done about our beef prices. Unfortunately they are so low that I doubt whether many—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is going around more corners now. I ask him to address himself to the resolution before the House.

Mr. HARTWIG: You must agree, Mr. Speaker, that the condition of this road affects the amount of traffic that will use it. We want people on the coast, and the price of petrol and the low beef price have something to do with it.

If I were in charge of Main Roads I would have a good look at some of the engineers.

Mr. Davis: Well, that's an insult straight off.

Mr. HARTWIG: I say what I think. When a highway is constructed over a level plain, what do we find in many instances when it comes to a creek or a watercourse? The level of the road drops. I could cite half-a-dozen instances of road construction where the bridge is lower than the roadway. The bridge just to the west of Marlborough is lower than the road, for instance. In heaven's name, why do our engineers continually makes these mistakes? At Yaamba the railway line has to be used as a traffic bridge half the time during wet weather. That is because the road bridge has been built too low. When the wet season comes, the first thing to go out is the low road-traffic bridge. It does not matter how good the road is; if the bridges are too low it will be impassable in wet weather. We must construct higher road-traffic bridges.

Mr. Melloy: It will cost five times as much.

Mr. HARTWIG: I don't care if it costs 10 times as much.

Mr. Melloy interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: Look who's talking. Members of the Opposition should be the last ones to criticise. Their colleagues in Canberra have given us nothing—not a cent.

In Queensland we have many remote areas where people are totally dependent upon road transport. Road transport is their lifeline—for sending their produce to market and for getting in supplies. Road permit fees should be abolished. Where there is no competition with the railway, something must

be done to assist people who are living in outlying areas. They are on the bread-line, and road transport fees must be removed.

Mr. Davis: Why don't you do something about it?

Mr. HARTWIG: We are.

I repeat that the construction of roads today has to be of a higher standard. The days are long past when four, five or six inches of gravel was sufficient foundation for a road. In many areas of the State it is imperative to have 15 to 18 inches of gravel because of the tremendous weight of the transports. They are long and heavy—and getting larger. The only point on which I am in agreement with the honourable member for Bulimba is the width and length of these trucks.

In some cities overseas—from memory, Bangkok is one—large trucks are not allowed to use the main streets during the daytime. They have to operate at night. I believe in the interests of traffic generally, we should consider introducing a measure such as that in the heart of Brisbane. There should be a limitation on the times at which large trucks can use our congested roads. They clutter them and pollute the atmosphere. Clem Jones's buses are bad enough—they clutter the city up—but these long, heavy trucks seem to come to life right on peak hour. In our narrow streets they hamper the traffic flow and constitute a serious traffic hazard. Sooner or later the department must consider placing a limitation on the hours during which large trucks can operate in the heart of the city. I believe it could be arranged without any undue difficulty. At night-time, when the traffic flow is lighter, they could operate much more quickly and much more efficiently. Traffic congestion would be eased considerably.

In thinking of roads and highways, we should get out of the metropolitan area and consider the far-flung areas of the State, particularly the central, northern and western areas, where cities are growing every day of the week. The people who have to put up with the hazards of country living are entitled to good sealed roads. I am amazed and frustrated when I hear Opposition members talking about Brisbane all the time. They never get out of Brisbane and that is why they are in opposition. They do not know anything about the rest of Queensland, unlike the Minister, who travels the length and breadth of the State at least once every week.

Mr. Melloy interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: If we ever get in in the metropolitan area things will be 100 per cent better than they are now.

Mr. Melloy: Are you having a go at the Liberals now?

Mr. HARTWIG: No. We are going to have a go at all the Labor-held seats. We will do the A.L.P. like a dinner at the next election because of its policies, outlook and negative attitude to development in this State.

The A.L.P. has no Main Roads policy. It only has one in Canberra. If it had not been for the Opposition in Canberra, every job submitted to a local authority throughout this State would have had to be approved by a white-collar worker in Canberra. That is what the Federal A.L.P. Government wanted to impose on Queensland and the rest of Australia.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting. The honourable member for Callide will be heard without interruption.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is the way it wanted to allocate funds to local authorities. It went on record as saying, "We will make direct grants to local authorities." That was its only policy. But what happened? It could not decide on the terms and conditions. What it asked the local authorities to accept was not acceptable to men who are dedicated to the welfare of their own areas.

Mr. Melloy: Rubbish!

Mr. HARTWIG: The Central Queensland Local Government Association intended to boycott the Commonwealth funds because of dictation from Canberra.

This is how the breakdown came about. The Commonwealth Government interrupted our national roads programme. I guarantee that the honourable member for Port Curtis would back me up if he were allowed to speak, but he is not. The Commonwealth Government's general negative attitude has interrupted the whole programming of roads within Queensland by a lack of finance and planning. Today the State Government made a grant of so many millions of dollars.

Mr. Marginson: \$16,000,000?

Mr. HARTWIG: No, it was not \$16,000,000. I would not take the honourable member's word for that. The State Government granted that money to try to assist local authorities, to tide them over this period of unemployment. The local authority is the best employer in many small areas. Sometimes 40, 50 or 60 men and their families depend on one local authority. They were on the brink of being stood down but the State Government came to light with some money. If it had not been for our economic policies, which are so sound, that could not have been done and those men would have been sacked because of Whitlam and his false promises.

Mr. Melloy: When did this Government come to life?

Mr. HARTWIG: About 18 years ago, and what a wonderful record it has. It is a record that will be put before the people on 7 December, and we will be returned with a greater majority than ever.

Mr. DAVIS (Brisbane) (8.35 p.m.): The honourable member for Callide, who just sat down on his big wide bronze——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I inform the honourable member for Brisbane that he will not be continuing his speech for very long if he continues in that vein.

Mr. DAVIS: Just a slip of the tongue, Mr. Speaker.

At the beginning of his speech, the honourable member for Callide dealt with the last 20 years of Labor's administration of this State. Perhaps I should discuss the 17 years of Tory administration of the Main Roads Department.

Liberal and Country Party members, one after the other, have risen in their places in this Chamber and told the House what a great job the Main Roads Department has done in the last 17 years. The honourable member for Callide showed National Party thinking when he attempted to berate and criticise the honourable member for Bulimba. One of the troubles with the National Party is that it has a hillbilly type of thinking, and that is clearly evident in the Government's handling of the Main Roads Department. The honourable member for Bulimba gave very sound reasons why freeways should not be built in Brisbane. If the Government had gone in the right direction and constructed the Gateway Bridge and ring-road system, the people of Brisbane would have benefited more than they have from freeways now being provided.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on numerous occasions in this Chamber about freeways. Not only is my own electorate involved in freeway construction; my own property is affected by it. The people of Windsor and Fortitude Valley are waiting anxiously to see what will happen to them. I object to the sneaky way in which the Government implemented freeway construction. If it had been fair dinkum before the election in May 1972, it would have gone to the people and said, "We are going to put the Northern Freeway through." It did not say a word about the Northern Freeway before the election, but four weeks after the election brochures were sent to everybody in the affected area indicating how far the freeway would go.

Mr. Chinchin: You should have gone to your local member. He should have known.

Mr. DAVIS: No Labor member knew. If the Government was so much in favour of freeways, why did it not make a political issue of them?

How many members of this Assembly, particularly members of the Liberal Party, have begun to have a change of heart about freeways? At the first meeting of the Freeway Association, which was held in my electorate, the honourable member for Merthyr said that he was in favour of assisting persons who were affected by the freeway to be transferred to other houses. Later he came into this Chamber and berated me and everybody else who was opposed to freeway construction. For the last two years, both through the newspapers and in discussion in this Chamber, he has expressed opposition to the residents of the area and indicated that he favours the construction of freeways. Suddenly, last Friday, the honourable member for Merthyr, because he knows that an election is pending and the community interest of New Farm will be destroyed by the construction of a freeway in the area, decided to get on side with his constituents. He can rest assured that, in the interests of democracy, I will tell the people of New Farm where he stood in regard to the construction of the freeway.

Reference has also been made to the way in which areas become depressed following the construction of freeways.

Mr. Frawley: Say it to the honourable member for Merthyr now, face to face.

Mr. DAVIS: I will put it to him straight. He knows where I stand on this, and I know where the honourable member for Merthyr stands on the question of freeway construction. He did not worry one iota about the freeway two years ago when he berated me and everybody else who was opposed to freeways. But all of a sudden, because the honourable member for Merthyr is facing an election, and realises that the freeway will be an issue in the New Farm area, he has changed his whole thinking on the subject. He is asking for increased prices for the houses.

Mr. Lane: Did you agree with me or didn't you?

Mr. DAVIS: He just copied my speech from about two years ago.

Mr. Lane: What a load of rubbish! You haven't got a brain in your head. You couldn't devise such a speech.

Mr. DAVIS: Why does he get so upset if he did not copy my speech? That has been the way he has operated. I will make sure that the people of New Farm know where he stands on the freeway issue.

Mr. Lane: They would lynch you if you came down there.

Mr. DAVIS: I am pretty popular down in New Farm, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Lane: Why don't you come into all our electorates?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that he must refrain from persistent interjections.

Mr. Lane interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAVIS: As a relative of mine said, "You can never buy culture." We can see that the honourable member for Merthyr is not cultured.

Residents of the Fortitude Valley and New Farm areas have been told that if they want to sell their properties they can start discussions regarding price with officers of the Main Roads Department. Of course, there are some grey areas where it is not known whether the properties will be bought by the Main Roads Department. It all depends on how long it will be before the bridge is constructed from Norman Park to New Farm, what type of structure it will be, and so on. This can put the owner of a property in a very invidious situation. Probably nobody would want to buy his property. When I wanted to put an addition on the back of my house, I tried to get a loan from the bank. Because the Main Roads Department indicated that it was going to take 4 perches out of my 16-perch block, I could get a loan on only 12 perches. I do not know when the Main Roads Department is going to resume the land or when the freeway will go through.

The area in which property is resumed becomes depressed. In the area where resumptions have been made paint is peeling off houses, and the population is transient. I do not want to be put in the same category as the honourable member for Callide, who rubbished Main Roads Department engineers, so I place on record the fact that I appreciate the great co-operation I receive from Mr. Bell and Mr. Barlow in the real estate section. They are both great gentlemen to deal with.

To show that I am not Brisbane bound, I will now refer to the Landsborough Highway. I do travel throughout the State, and as a former Transport Workers' Union official I know something about the trucking industry. Four or five years ago I referred to the condition of the Landsborough Highway. The honourable member for Callide referred to what a great job the Main Roads Department has done throughout Queensland. Every time there is a heavy dew that road is untrafficable.

The honourable member for Murrumbidgee also spoke about the great job that has been done by the Main Roads Department. Just 12 miles out motorists are held up on the Strathpine flats if there is a light shower. Mr. Speaker, you realise the shocking road surface that has to be negotiated across the Hornibrook Highway to the Redcliffe Peninsula. After all the years the honourable member for Landsborough has been in this Assembly he is only now getting the toll taken off the Bribie

Bridge. All these things will be aired in the forthcoming election campaign. We will also be disclosing some of the deficiencies of the Main Roads Department itself.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (8.45 p.m.): I thought it was quite fitting that this resolution should be discussed, as we were rather restricted for time in the debate on the Mines and Main Roads Estimates. Tonight I have sat and listened to quite a few contributions. Most of those from the other side of the Chamber related to the city of Brisbane and to road construction therein. Some members from the Government side spoke about problems in their own areas and I intend to deal with the points individually.

I should have thought that, from the Opposition side at least, we would have had some arguments supporting the Federal Government and its attitude to the mining industry of Australia. I should also have thought we would have heard some contributions in support of the Federal Government's attitude to the provision of funds for main road and street development in Queensland. But not one word was spoken in defence of the Federal Government and its policies, which leads me to believe that even Opposition members of this Parliament realise that there is no likelihood of any policy on the mining industry emanating from Canberra.

Recently we have been able to pick up newspaper after newspaper and read editorials and other articles pleading with the Federal Government to make its policy clear because in the coming weeks men of affluence, representing Governments with tremendous sums of money, will be coming to Australia to investigate the investment possibilities of this country. After two years in office the Federal Government will not be able to present them with a policy in respect of those investment possibilities.

During the last four weeks there has been a complete change of attitude in the Federal Government. We now find Mr. Whitlam getting quite excited at the possibility of attracting tremendous sums of money from Japan. Mr. Connor is advocating that a uranium enrichment plant be built somewhere in the Northern Territory. These are the same men who, when they came into power, chased foreign investors out of Australia. These are the men—one of them in particular—who described leading mining executives and managers as hillbillies and mugs. That is how men with top technical skills were described by one Canberra Minister. But these same men now feel quite excited and elated at the prospect of attracting capital from Japan or getting it from the Shah of Iran, who recently visited this country.

Ever since we have been the Government of Queensland, we have said that this State and Australia can develop our natural resources to the fullest extent only if we

can obtain overseas financial assistance. There is not sufficient risk capital in Australia to finance the proper development of our natural resources. A few years ago Queensland firms were drilling for oil throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. What is happening today? Those same Queensland firms are drilling in the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia. The number of drills operating in Queensland at the present time is so low that the position is farcical. All this has been brought about by the discouragement of the mining industry and the people who were prepared to invest their money in Queensland in an endeavour to find oil, natural gas or minerals. These people were chased away from Australia.

Mr. Connor has become quite excited about the possibility of a hydrogenation plant being established on the Darling Downs. He fails to recognise, of course, that the Queensland State Government has been working on this very project for the past few years.

Mr. Bousen: Rubbish! You have not.

Mr. CAMM: The honourable member shows how little he knows about mining in this State. It was two years ago that we advertised our intention to make coal available in the Galilee Basin to any company that desired to carry out a feasibility study into hydrogenation. We made two areas available, one of which was taken up by Dampier Mining Company, a subsidiary of Broken Hill, and the other by the Shell Company. Those two companies are prepared to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to ascertain whether coal is suitable for this purpose.

On the Darling Downs the Millmerran Coal Company has held an authority to prospect for some time and has been carrying out exploration work. We have given it permission to send a large sample to Japan for testing in the Mitsui company's coal hydrogenation pilot plant. Now that all this has been organised, the Federal Government hops onto the band wagon and says, "We will encourage the establishment of a hydrogenation plant in Queensland."

The indications from Canberra are that a certain quantity of the oil obtained through the hydrogenation process will be made available for export. One of the conditions that we impose on the establishment of these plants in Queensland is that no oil will be available for export until Australia is self-sufficient in this product. Only then will we allow the companies to seek export permits from the Federal Government. When it is all said and done, the only rights the Federal Government has in projects of this type are the control of the export of the product and the financing of the undertaking if the introduction of overseas capital is necessary. The Queensland Government, on the other hand, grants authorities to prospect and mining leases. As a matter of fact the Federal Government does not even have a Mining Act of its own. Yet it claims it should be

given the credit for the establishment of this plant on the Darling Downs—provided, of course, it is established, and that is still doubtful.

Similarly, it was eight years ago that phosphate traces were first found in the cores obtained by oil companies that were drilling in the Mt. Isa-Duchess-Lady Annie area. These cores were examined by Broken Hill South, which, as a result, requested authorities to prospect. These were granted. Every encouragement has been given to Broken Hill South to mine phosphate rock in the north-west of the State.

For many years Australia's phosphate needs have been met by the British Phosphate Commission. An agreement between the Australian Government and the commission has been reached in relation to the supply of phosphate to Australia. This hindered to some extent the establishment of a phosphate industry in Australia, because at that time the transport costs for phosphate were fairly high. However, since the steep increase in phosphate prices the mining of phosphate in the Duchess area has become a viable proposition.

The only way to ascertain what the Federal Government's policy might be is to read the Press. Mr. Connor was reported as saying that phosphate rock from Morocco, Africa, was bringing \$67 a ton, and that Australia would obtain more than that for its phosphate. Senator Wriedt then said that all the phosphate rock to be mined will be used in Australia. In effect, Mr. Connor said that Australian consumers will be paying more for Queensland phosphate than they pay for supplies from Morocco. It seems that they would be paying many times the price that they are paying now. I could tell Mr. Connor and Senator Wriedt that one of the conditions to granting a lease to mine the phosphate rock will be that Australia's needs are met before any of the rock can be exported.

Mr. Davis: We both agree.

Mr. CAMM: The honourable member for Brisbane agrees. But Mr. Connor said that we will get a higher price for phosphate than Morocco receives.

Labor cannot have it both ways. It has to enunciate a policy or people will have to take note of what they read in the Press. Whether the Press reports are correct or not, that is all we have to go on. Many years ago State Mines Ministers established what was called the Australian Minerals Council. The State Ministers met in council with the Federal Minister two or three times a year to discuss various problems associated with mining and the administration of the mining Acts in the various States. Ever since the Labor Party came to power in Canberra we have tried in vain to get Mr. Connor to the conference table. I and other State Ministers have pleaded with him to meet us so that he can tell us his

policy. We could then work in with him. We readily accept that the Commonwealth has power to control the export of our natural resources, to dictate what money will come in and to declare how much equity an overseas company can have in a project and so on, but we are working completely in the dark when we have no idea of the Federal Government's policies.

The State Ministers have to confer with the mining companies that desire to prospect in their States. Companies do not approach the Federal Government for authorities to prospect. The State Ministers have to outline the conditions that will be imposed on any leases granted. The Federal Government cannot fix them. How can we expect a company to come in and discuss conditions with us without knowing what overriding conditions may be imposed on it by the Federal Government? Would it not be better for the Federal Government to get us down there and tell us? If it does not want to negotiate or co-operate with the States, let it tell us in precise terms its policy on mining, and then we would know.

Not once, but on quite a few occasions in the last 12 or 18 months, top industrialists and mining people from other parts of the world have spoken to me. A consortium of steel industrialists from Germany and Italy wanted to establish a tremendous coking plant in Queensland. We negotiated with their representatives here and an office was established in Brisbane. I visited them at Dusseldorf in the Ruhr Valley to see what sort of project they envisaged. When they sent out their top officers to negotiate final details, I said to them, "Before committing yourself, it would be better, now that you have got to this stage, to go to Canberra to ascertain the Federal Government's policy on finance coming to Australia to fund the project." The following morning one of the representatives told me, "We will be closing our Brisbane office because we have been told in no uncertain terms that we are not welcome in Australia, and neither is our money." And so another project flew out the window.

Industrialists and financiers from Japan have come here to investigate the possibility of establishing the same type of plant as that which the Federal Minister is claiming credit for in the Northern Territory. That is the Federal Government's territory; it can do what it likes up there. The negotiations proceeded so far that the Premier took them down to Canberra in an endeavour to ascertain what conditions would be imposed by the Federal Government for the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in Queensland. They, too, went home dissatisfied and humiliated by the treatment that they received. That is the sort of dead-hand control that the mining industry has been experiencing during the last two years. It is no wonder that no major project has been initiated and established since the Federal Labor Government came to power.

The growth of the mining industry and the income we are deriving has resulted from the work done during the last 10 years, when we encouraged people to come to Queensland, with the blessing of the then Federal Government. The Federal and State Ministers met in Canberra, Melbourne, Adelaide and even in this House for discussions on how the Commonwealth would treat a project that had been proposed by an Australian or overseas company for the mining and export of some of our products.

It seems that at last someone in Canberra is beginning to realise that, by restricting mining development and exploration within Queensland, they are depriving a lot of people of the employment and income that follows the establishment of a mining enterprise. They are also beginning to realise that Australia is not the only source of supply of raw materials such as coking-coal and iron-ore. Today in Brazil iron-ore can be loaded into boats at a lower price than in Western Australia. Admittedly there is a freight advantage from Western Australia to Japan, which enables us to continue to capture the major share of the iron-ore market in that country. However, Japanese industrialists are going to other countries in the world for their coking-coal requirements.

I have every confidence that, if we maintain the progress that we have initiated in Queensland, we will continue to hold the Japanese market. Our coking-coal is of relatively high quality and the Japanese coke ovens are geared to the use of that type of coal.

I have some figures that indicate the advantages to the country when major undertakings are initiated and operating. In the year ended June 1974, which no-one can claim was the major year for expansion and development of the coal industry in Queensland, mining companies operating for the export of our coal expended some \$49,627,000 on plant and equipment and development of mines at the face. For power and water they paid the local authorities, the electricity boards or the Irrigation Commission \$11,163,000. For rail freights and harbour dues they paid \$43,152,000. Staggering figures, aren't they? Towards the upkeep of the towns that housed the workers for these mines—the building of homes and the provision of water and sewerage facilities—they provided \$4,449,000. I repeat that this is for one year only. Other capital expenditure in the various centres amounted to \$426,000. Last year \$109,317,000 was spent on capital expenditure alone. Admittedly some of the huge items of mechanical equipment used—for instance, some of the draglines and trucks—had to be imported. It is estimated that the cost of importing this machinery was less than \$24,000,000, so that \$85,317,000 was spent on capital improvements and expenditure last year in Queensland.

I shall now outline the production costs of our export coal industry. The amount paid to the Australian Government in excise duty alone was \$728,000. I will not go into all the details, but the amount paid to the Queensland Government in pay-roll tax, royalty, Workers' Compensation premiums, miners' pensions and rail freight, was \$47,641,000. The amount paid to harbour boards was \$2,742,000; to local authorities, \$486,000; and to the State Electricity Commission, over \$5,000,000. These are operating costs, not capital expenditure.

Then there are other production costs, such as wages, which amounted to over \$31,000,000. The costs of explosives, stores, materials, maintenance, insurance and other items totalled \$60,700,000. Production and administration costs totalled over \$6,000,000. The total is \$124,661,000. If that is added to the capital expenditure, the amount coming from the mining companies in just one year, and paid in Queensland after deducting what came from overseas, is \$191,763,000. That is the amount that flowed into the economy of our State.

Mr. Chinchin: More important perhaps is the number of people employed directly and indirectly in this major industry. It would be thousands and thousands.

Mr. CAMM: Yes. It would be difficult to outline all the benefits that flow from the expenditure of such an amount in one State.

The advantages from this enterprise are spread from Cairns to Brisbane. A few years ago in Cairns I saw a barge that had been constructed there being loaded for use in the construction of the jetty at Hay Point. Equipment was being manufactured in Brisbane for the same coalfield. Walkers Limited, and every other machinery company of any consequence, received orders and other benefits from the development of the coalfields in Central Queensland. This is the sort of development that we like to encourage, and that we hoped would continue while these mining companies were in operation in Queensland.

I, and many others, thought the Hail Creek project would have been in operation by now. However, it has been frustrated and hampered. The Australian equity in the company has altered over the past 12 months or so, yet it is predominantly an Australian company. Utah Development Company, which is desirous of mining further down in the Norwich Park area, has already built the township of Dysart to service the Saraji and Norwich Park operations.

We then discover that in a snide way, according to the quotation in the Press the other day, Mr. Connor has told Utah that they need to dig a little deeper. He implied that they will have to mine underground. This will force men to go underground in the Norwich Park area, where there is a deposit of 1200 million tons of coal within

500 feet of the surface. How could anyone with any knowledge of the mining industry try to force a company to go underground to mine coal below these seams? That would jeopardise the prospect of mining the top seams, because there is not sufficient coverage on the underground seams to carry the tremendous burden of the open-cut operation. Is it not better to encourage them to mine the top seams first and, as they get deeper, put the men underground of necessity? They should not be forced to go underground in the first place.

This is how the companies mining our export coal have been able to maintain continuity of expansion. It is far cheaper to mine coal by open-cut methods than by underground methods, and the companies have mined by open-cut methods. Thiess Peabody Mitsui now have a ratio of 60 per cent open cut to 40 per cent underground. They have gone deep enough in open-cut mining to necessitate their going underground, but they were not forced to do that if the first place. Thiess Bros. at Blackwater now have a ratio of about 50 per cent open-cut to 50 per cent underground, and they will go underground when the need arises. But let them finance the construction of railway lines, let them finance port facilities, let them build houses and meet all the other infrastructure costs that we impose on them, by mining the relatively cheap coal close to the surface. Millions of tons of coal will still be available after they have removed the quantities that the Government allows them to mine.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. CAMM: The honourable member for Brisbane, who has lived in the protected metropolitan area for years, said that we should not sell all our coal in various parts of the world. Does he know how much coal Queensland really produces and sells? In the entire history of the State—and coal mining has been going on in Queensland for 130 years—we have not yet mined as much coal as was produced and consumed in England in one year. For 10 years after the Second World War, more coal was mined and consumed each year in England than has yet been mined in Queensland. Consumption in England is now down to 130,000,000 or 140,000,000 tons a year. In Queensland we have not yet mined 160,000,000 tons. In Great Britain—England and parts of Scotland—almost 200,000,000 tons of coal a year were being mined and consumed at one stage.

The honourable member for Brisbane said, "We don't want to be sending our coal overseas." I have just told him that in one little field in the Norwich Park area it is estimated that, mining by open-cut methods to a depth of 500 feet, the reserves are over 1,000 million tons. In addition, there are deposits at Peak Downs, Saraji, Moranbah and Hail Creek. Queensland has tremendous reserves of coking-coal, and the honourable

member can rest assured that the conditions the Government has imposed on the mining companies will ensure that these natural resources are well protected for future Queenslanders. There will be ample coal for hundreds and hundreds of years to come.

I do not think that anyone on this side of the House blames the Commonwealth Government for all the ills associated with the inflationary trend—one might call it a recession—in Australia, because inflation is becoming a world-wide problem. However, there are some methods by which inflation can be countered, and other countries have adopted many of them—control over currency, control of rates of exchange, and so on. One method by which inflation can be stemmed is to increase productivity, and we should be attempting to encourage increased productivity in this country. That encouragement has not been forthcoming for the mining industries, and it certainly has not been forthcoming for the primary industries. That, of course, is a matter for another department. I am dealing precisely with the effect that the policies of the Federal Government have had on the mining industry in Queensland.

In spite of the Government's efforts, we cannot regain anything like the tempo that had been achieved over the past 10 years. Exploration, and the bringing into being of new projects in the mining industry, is almost at a dead end. The State Government has been offering every possible encouragement for the establishment of mining industries, and it is very heartening for me to hear, and read in the Press, that at last someone in Canberra is recognising the need to encourage the development of some of the projects utilising the vast natural resources of this State.

We could be accused by countries that are poor in natural resources of mounting a resources diplomacy, as it were, and holding them to ransom. Here we are, with 13,000,000 people, endeavouring to tell the rest of the world that we are very loath to allow them to come in here to help us develop our tremendous mineral deposits. As indicated earlier, we just do not have in this country the finance necessary to develop our natural resources. Tremendous sums of money are needed. Why cannot we allow people from overseas to come in under some measure of control? We have always maintained controls. Why cannot we allow them to come in and assist us with the development of our resources? From the figures I have quoted, it is obvious that the capital expenditure for the establishment of these industries has been a tremendous boon to the people of this State.

Mr. Jensen: We find plenty of money in time of war. It should be possible to find money to develop our resources.

Mr. CAMM: I have heard that said. That is the sort of statement that is made by those who really do not think about where money

comes from and how finances are arranged. I am sure that no-one would advocate a return to the emergency measures that had to be introduced during a time of war. No people would today undergo the privations that they have to undergo, and willingly undergo, when their country is in danger. Our country is not in danger of invasion. There is no threat of war to Australia. Why should we have to introduce measures that are only necessary when such dire circumstances demand them? There is plenty of money in the world. People are crying out to invest in this country. Countries are crying out for a share of our natural resources. In all seriousness, can we sustain the policy of telling these people, "No. We have these tremendous deposits of natural resources, but we are going to keep them for ourselves. We haven't got enough money to develop them ourselves, and they are going to stay in the ground until we say that they can be mined."?

The honourable member for Lytton concentrated principally on roadworks. He advocated the declaration of the road from Shafston Avenue to Wynnum so that it would come under the control of the Main Roads Department. He knows the classification of roads in the city area. The urban arterial and subarterial roads are designated with the concurrence of the Federal Government. I do not anticipate that there would be any difficulty in having that road upgraded to a subarterial road. But the mere fact of gazetting that road as the responsibility of the Main Roads Department would not mean that one more cent could be spent on it. We have a programme of road construction for the city of Brisbane on which we spent over \$20,000,000 last year. The whole allocation from the Federal Government for urban arterial roads must be spread over cities with a population of 40,000 or more. Last year on that category of road we spent \$27,000,000 in Brisbane, Toowoomba, Ipswich, Rockhampton and Townsville. But next year, and for two years after, we will have only \$14,000,000 to spend.

Mr. Harvey: Sixty-five per cent of your money came from the Commonwealth, according to the Auditor-General's report.

Mr. CAMM: Of course it did. The Commonwealth has restricted the allocation in this category and reduced it from \$27,000,000 to \$14,000,000 and now someone advocates that we should take over responsibility for more roads in the city of Brisbane! How can we take over responsibility for more roads when the very programme we have outlined and planned for the next three years has to be cut because there will be insufficient money to build what we planned during that period?

As to a lack of knowledge of road construction, which the honourable member for Bulimba referred to, might I say that, when we accepted the report of Wilbur Smith and

Associates and certain of the recommendations, we established a policy committee in Brisbane. On that policy committee we have responsible men who have the authority to decide where the money will be spent. I happen to be the chairman of the committee. Other members are the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, the Town Clerk, the Minister for Transport, the Commissioner for Transport, the Co-ordinator-General and the Commissioner of Main Roads. We meet quite frequently and plan and discuss the future road development of this city.

Should anyone think that that group has not sufficient knowledge to plan the road pattern in Brisbane, I mention that we also have a technical committee comprising the Assistant Commissioner of Main Roads and the top engineers from the Brisbane City Council. They act in an advisory capacity and report on various projects. We also have a transport committee which reports to us. So I can assure the honourable member that the planning of these roads is in very good hands.

The only force militating against the building of new roads or the taking over of new roads is lack of funds. I am not criticising anyone when I say that this applies to the road system throughout the State and I suppose it applies to every road-building authority in Australia. It is no good members of the Opposition advocating that we should take over roads when their own political cohorts in Canberra have reduced our allocation from \$27,000,000 to \$14,000,000.

The honourable member for Lytton advocated the widening of roads. Does he not realise, as was pointed out by the honourable member for Chatsworth, that the widening of roads causes more disturbance to people than the building of freeways and is more expensive? Every intersection has to be catered for. With a freeway the work goes straight through.

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

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: The honourable member for Brisbane says it is a lot of rot, but it is contained in the report that Mr. Uren asked for.

Mr. CAMM: Of course, I do not place much credence on what is said by the honourable member for Brisbane, who urged the building of a road to the port, as did the honourable member for Bulimba. As I indicated a while ago, the only reason this cannot be built immediately is again lack of funds. We cannot allocate money for it. The allocation of funds from the Federal Government under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act was always regarded as a reimbursement to the States of the petrol tax collected. This reimbursement, as a proportion of the total amount of tax collected, has been reduced year after year, but not so long ago we were still enjoying 70 per cent of the tax collected by the Federal Government. This year it will be far below

50 per cent. Let me point out also that the tax collected by the Federal Government is an indication of the amount of petrol being used and that, in turn, is an indication of the increased mileage of travel on our roads.

Mr. Harvey: That does not take into account the \$80,000,000 for the intercapital project.

Mr. CAMM: The national highway? That is taken out of this grant. The Federal Government has been making a song about taking over the national highways and about the fact that they are going to give us \$8,000,000 a year for beef roads. In the past, the allocation for beef roads was an additional allocation, but the beef road allocation is also going to be taken out of this amount. The national highway expenditure will come out of the same fund.

When we say that we have \$14,000,000 this year in comparison with \$27,000,000 earlier, we have to take into account the inflationary trend this year compared with the rate three years ago and relate it also to inflation in the ensuing three years. We will then realise that the \$14,000,000 is worth about one-third of what we were able to spend during the previous three years. It follows that, compared with what we were able to build in the city areas during the preceding three years, only about one-third of the mileage of roads will be built.

I was amazed at the lack of knowledge exhibited by the honourable member for Lytton, who tried to gain some political advantage from criticising the ability of mining wardens. He suggested that they do not have the ability to sit in judgment on applications for mining leases. I point out to him that all the mining wardens are stipendiary magistrates and, with one exception, all are qualified solicitors or barristers. They are trained in the law as well as in the evaluation of evidence submitted to them by mining companies. The mining warden's duty is to ensure that the law has been complied with and to hear evidence put forward by objectors to the granting of mining leases. He then has the duty to make a recommendation to the Minister.

When I receive a recommendation from a mining warden, I do not sit on my own on a little chair in the corner and make a decision. I have within my department a very competent staff, who advise me as to what should and should not be done. Quite recently it has become the practice to require mining companies to carry out environmental impact studies if their projects are of such a nature as to be likely to have some effect on the environment.

The member for Lytton suggests that we should set up an outside body to adjudicate on the applications for mining leases. Who would constitute such a body? We have at our disposal the advice of top public servants in all departments, and we seek that advice. It is given by officers in the Departments of Harbours and Marine, Primary

Industries, Lands and Forestry, just to name a few. Among our top public servants we have more brains and knowledge in this field than private enterprise has. The present set-up has stood the test of time, and, with the present practice of conferring with conservationists and ecologists, the rights of those people who protest against applications for mining leases are fully protected.

The honourable member for Ipswich expressed pleasure at the investigation to be carried out into coal supplies for the power station in the Swanbank area. It is gratifying to have a member speak so highly of the men whom he represents. He is at all times a great advocate for the workers in his area. From the time of the disastrous Box Flat explosion he has highlighted the need to protect mine workers. Time and time again he has pleaded on behalf of the coal miners to keep the Ipswich mines in operation. I assure him that it is the policy of my department as well as that of all other Government departments to keep the Ipswich coalfields in operation and to find markets for their coal. We have given considerable assistance to some of the mining companies in his area.

Mr. Davis: Don't forget me.

Mr. CAMM: I haven't forgotten the honourable member, but as his name is on the bottom of my list I do not think I will have time to reply to him.

I was surprised at the comments made by the honourable member for Toowoomba North. He seems to have his speeches written by someone with a radical outlook, and he has the utmost difficulty in reading them.

Mr. BOUSEN: I rise to a point of order. The Minister's comment is a deliberate lie, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. CAMM: I will accept the honourable member's assurance. Can I say that he writes his speeches himself with a very radical tint, and that he must be a poor writer as he experiences extreme difficulty in reading the speeches he claims to have written. This does not say much for his intelligence or his ability to compile a speech—or his eyesight! Every time he rises to speak in this Chamber he castigates Government members.

At 9.30 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, I shall now put the Resolution under discussion and all other Resolutions not already agreed to by the House.

Resolution 2—Mines and Main Roads—agreed to.

Resolutions 3 to 24, both inclusive, agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

OPENING OF COMMITTEE

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

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer): I move—

“(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-75, a further sum not exceeding \$582,576,003 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-75, a further sum not exceeding \$640,845,029 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-75, a further sum not exceeding \$129,715,033 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(d) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1973-74, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$91,476,534.74 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1973-74, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$34,334,263.54 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1973-74, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$9,216,859.08 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1975-76, a sum not exceeding \$190,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1975-76, a sum not exceeding \$220,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(i) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1975-76, a sum not exceeding \$18,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

FIRST READING

A Bill, founded on the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced and read a first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer) (9.38 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

This is the second and final Appropriation Bill for the current financial year. As honourable members are aware, the Appropriation Bill brought down at this time of the year provides not only for the expenditure included in the Budget Estimates for the current financial year but also for unforeseen expenditure incurred during the previous financial year and for the first two months of next financial year to carry the Government over until further supply in that year can be granted.

The amount provided for 1974-75 is \$2,233,136,065, made up of \$967,576,003 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$1,080,845,029 from the Trust and Special Funds and \$184,715,033 from the Loan Fund.

These amounts represent the appropriations for the full financial year, apart from the amounts appropriated under Special Acts totalling \$113,493,592 as set out in the Estimates. They incorporate the amounts appropriated last year in the second Appropriation Act, which granted supply for the months of July and August of the current financial year and the further amounts appropriated in the first Appropriation Act introduced in this Assembly on 30 August which granted further supply to the Government to enable us to carry on until the passing of this present Bill.

Unforeseen expenditure during 1973-74 which has had Executive authority and now requires approval of this Parliament totals \$135,027,658 made up of \$91,476,535 from Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$34,334,264 from the Trust and Special Funds and \$9,216,859 from the Loan Fund.

Full details of the amounts under the various appropriations are shown in parts six, seven and eight of the schedule attached to this Bill.

To provide Supply for the first two months of the financial year 1975-76 it is estimated that \$428,000,000 will be required made up of \$190,000,000 for Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$220,000,000 for Trust and Special Funds and \$18,000,000 for Loan Fund. This allows for a normal escalation in costs generally and provision for additional costs associated with award variations made or expected to be made this financial year.

I wish now to refer briefly to two topics of extreme concern in the minds of every thinking Queenslander at this time—the

rapid drying up of liquid funds in what was once a very healthy, stable economy and the unfortunate prospects of unemployment for the ordinary citizen. These, together with runaway inflation, are the principal indicators of a mismanaged national economy that have been foisted on the Australian people in just under two years of a Federal Labor Government.

No-one can deny that some credit restriction was needed—but it was needed not now but last year. It is certainly not needed now. The national economy had been severely overheated by the excessive exuberance of the Labor Government in its first 12 months in office after 23 years in the wilderness—resulting in unprecedented cost inflation.

But what we can argue and have argued very strongly about is that the credit contraction should not have been applied so hard, so late and for so long. Just as their over-enthusiasm for their socialistic policies in the initial 12 months of office caused the overheating of the economy in the first place and was left on too hard and for too long; so now the corrective medicine is administered too late, too hard and too long.

The Labor spokesmen casting around desperately for a glib excuse for the crippling inflation have claimed that the problem is world-wide and they are not to blame. This is not only absolutely incorrect but it is also deceitful.

Any economist worthy of the title recognises that the fundamental cause of inflation in most parts of the world today is the tremendous increase that has taken place in fuel costs. Overseas oil prices have rocketed in a very short time to about \$9 a barrel, and all those nations who depend on this high-priced power source are helpless against the effect that its costs are having on their economies. On the other hand, in Australia something like 70 per cent of our oil requirements are locally produced at a cost of only \$2 a barrel, and it is therefore not the high fuel costs that are causing inflation in this country.

Inflation in this country is a malady that is self-inflicted by the Canberra Labor Government. It cannot be passed off as something that is unavoidable because the rest of the world is suffering similarly. The Labor Government fails to appreciate that the economy of any nation is always in a delicate balance. It requires fine tuning by experts. In Australia in the last two years it has got the treatment from ham-fisted amateurs, who have wrecked it. They have not taken in time the advice of Commonwealth Treasury and Reserve Bank experts who had steered the Australian economy steadily over the last three decades or so through a world war, booms and disasters and had left it just two years ago one of the strongest in the world.

It is a well-known fact that a Labor Government always likes to flex its muscles once it gets into power. I have seen several examples of it during my 27 years in Parliament. It always likes to show who is boss once it has made the grade, irrespective of the consequences and, quite bluntly, to hell with whoever gets hurt—"They were all exploiters anyway, making profits".

It should be clear to the Labor Government by now, after this very expensive lesson that the people of Australia have had to learn, that you can't let amateurs fool around with the economy. You can't turn the confidence of the people off and then on again when the mistake is realised. You can't chase away the much-needed capital (and, heaven only knows, we have seen it chased away in the last two years) and then expect it to rush back in again at the snap of your fingers, unless, of course, it comes from some other nefarious source—from Red China, for example, the Federal Government's latest new-found Communist friend. You can't expect the ordinary fellow to work with the same enthusiasm knowing that, when through his extra efforts his salary or wage gets above \$5,000 a year, Big Brother at Canberra then starts to hit him with penalty taxes, about which much has been heard in the last few weeks.

The management of the economy is as much an exercise in psychology as it is an exercise in the manipulation of supply and demand, but this subtlety is lost on this queer mixture of horny hands and academic theorists that now pervades the halls of Canberra. We can all see around us now how this mismanagement is affecting us. It is a shame that so many people had to be hurt before what was happening was realised. One has only to look at the unemployment figures to see what has happened in Australia as a result of the Federal Labor Government's actions.

The credit squeeze, the tariff cuts and other Labor economic masterpieces are closing down clothing factories and throwing thousands out of work. There was a demonstration in Ipswich this afternoon against the closing down of a certain clothing factory. The Federal Government's actions are closing down part of, and threatening the rest of, the once-mighty motor industry in Australia—the backbone of the post-war Australian economy. They are shutting off funds for private housing and throwing thousands more onto the unemployment market, destroying the Mainlines (welcomed with glee by the Camerons), the Cambridge Credits and now causing considerable difficulty to one of Queensland's biggest builders, K. D. Morris.

The local authorities cannot raise the capital funds approved for them for their very important sewerage works, water supply, road and street works, and for electricity development and so forth. Hospital construction works are in danger. At the end of September local authorities had found only

22 per cent of the funds required by them for their approved capital programme, compared with 54 per cent at the end of September last year. In addition, last year there was no fear that the balance of the funds would not be found—money was still reasonably plentiful. This year, however, the prospects are that the funds will not be raised and the capital programme will falter and fail. One has only to listen to the statements made by the Lord Mayor about the problems in the metropolitan area because of the inability of the Brisbane City Council to raise the necessary loan funds.

This will mean first of all a severe retrenchment of labour on local authority and other construction jobs, followed by God knows how long a period of stagnation, weed-covered, abandoned, and incomplete public works, and eventually thousands of dollars wasted on expensive re-establishment and recommencement of the works.

The State Government recognised the seriousness of this problem months ago and set about accumulating its cash resources to assist the local authorities in the most practical manner possible—in other words, conserving cash for what we knew would be this critical time when the Government would be desirous of keeping works going and men employed.

I announced in introducing the Budget that we would offer some \$45,000,000 to our local authorities to help them fill their loan programme. At the time of the announcement I had already offered \$7,000,000 to councils and local bodies to keep their works programmes rolling, and today councils will have in their possession letters offering further loans of \$15,000,000, bringing the total cash assistance from the State Government so far this year to \$22,000,000. Further offers will be made as councils continue to advise me of their loan position.

The position is that the councils have the works in hand; they have the borrowing authority to proceed; they have the men and materials to get on with the job; they are keen to get on with it, but they cannot raise the loan funds.

The State Government was not prepared to stand idly by and see many shires lose their valued and experienced staff. The Australian Government has talked a lot about what it would do for local government but to date there has been little tangible evidence of real support. The Queensland Government's offer of loan funds is a practicable gesture—and, as I said this morning, a very welcome shot in the arm for local authorities in Queensland. The money being released will be applied to keep road works, sewerage, water supply and hospital works going and provide continuity of work for the men employed.

The offers today included \$6,000,000 to the Brisbane City Council. This will enable the council to carry out considerable work within the city area and so continue its very

large work-force. The works on which the money is being spent also attract a free State Government subsidy of up to 40 per cent. In effect, then, the release of the loan offer to Brisbane alone will mean up to \$10,000,000 of additional works.

The Lord Mayor has been trying desperately to obtain financial assistance from all sources with little success or prospect. He has approached the Commonwealth Government from all angles but to date no help has been provided. In fact under the Commonwealth Government's Regional Employment Development (aptly named RED) scheme no unemployment funds are to come to Brisbane at all. That is a shocking state of affairs.

The Commonwealth Government having created the dole situation throughout Australia, what then do we find it doing about relieving it? It first of all rejects the State Government's offer of assistance with its expert administrative machinery and experienced officers to get projects selected, money allocated and men back in work. It instead decides that the Camerons, the Cairns, the Connors and Haydens will say first of all which areas are to get the unemployment moneys—and large areas of Queensland including the Brisbane metropolitan area are not favoured by these honourable gentlemen, as was demonstrated recently.

These four Commonwealth Ministers are the ones who will select the projects and direct the labour, and in their misguided conception of what is needed urgently in the areas of unemployment, they immediately exclude street works, kerb and channelling and weed control. Those are the guide-lines laid down for things that shall not be done. Has anyone ever heard anything so ridiculous?

Next they set up masses of inexperienced administrative machinery to advise them. What is the result of their efforts? After nearly two months of procrastination and tub-thumping, not one RED cent has come to the areas of unemployment. Small tentative approvals have been given to three favoured areas only—but more importantly men are still unemployed and their ranks are growing daily.

I have tried to indicate the manner in which this country is being run at the present time. The surprising thing about it all is that the Commonwealth Government could damage Australia so much in such a short space of time.

The one hope for Australia while Labor continues in power in Canberra is for the States to remain strong and as financially independent as we can possibly make them. We just might be able to ride out the storm until the next Federal election when Labor for sure will be out on its ear. We will then be able to start the massive task of reconstruction of the economy of this once strong nation.

These are the responsibilities facing the people of Queensland and of Australia, and I am certain that when the opportunity comes

they will shoulder those responsibilities. Tonight I have endeavoured to draw the attention of Queenslanders to what has occurred in this State in recent times and to indicate that it is the Queensland Government's pledge to keep every man and woman in employment. We will do all we can within our financial resources to do that, but I am sorry to say that a similar intention has not been evinced by those in office in Canberra. As I have said, I believe we will be able to weather the storm and ensure a better State for our people to live in.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (10.1 p.m.): This is the second and final Appropriation Bill for the year 1974-75. In addition to providing for expenditure as set out in the Budget documents, it makes provision for the first two months of the ensuing financial year so that the Government will have Supply and be able to carry on after the end of the present financial year.

Following the Budget debate, this would normally be another opportunity to discuss the fiscal policies of the Queensland Government. However, all honourable members realise that this is an exercise in futility. All of us know that Parliament is about to be dissolved and that the dissolution will occur less than 24 hours from now.

Mr. Porter: Well, you asked for it.

Mr. TUCKER: I am not crying about it. All I am saying is that there is not much point in speaking at length to this Bill. Incidentally, what I said earlier was that if the only means of getting Queenslanders back to work was an election, then let us have an election. I am pleased to see that we will be having an early election, because after it we will be able to re-employ those people who are presently out of work.

A week or so ago the Treasurer claimed that he was not able to give any more money to local authorities. Suddenly, however, today he is able to say, "Take this largesse—this \$15,000,000—from me, because this will help the poor people in Queensland." What a bleeding-heart Treasurer! I might say that I have no argument to offer against his move. However, his political chicanery is apparent to everyone.

Last week the reluctant political dragon of Queensland, if I might use those terms—the Premier—struck in his own way and announced the forthcoming election and the date as 7 December. He did this after months of vacillating in all directions, after months of nail-biting, indecision, spluttering, stuttering, stopping and starting, and after months of picking the political petals, so to speak. He had been saying, in effect, "He loves me. He loves me not. It's off. It's on again. Wait till I see what Sparkes thinks. How can we stymie Sir Gordon Chalk? It's on. What does Evans say? It's off." Who has the Premier been kidding? Who does he think he has misled in the last

month? I say to all here, and to everyone outside, that he has been easier to follow than a freshly castrated elephant through snow. Every one of us was well aware of what he was up to. Such action by a man who claims to have a strong moralistic outlook is politically and morally obscene. We have witnessed the spectacle of the Premier of our great State being manipulated in every way by people who do not even belong to Parliament.

Mr. Porter: Give us your policy.

Mr. TUCKER: I shall do that at the right time. I certainly will not be pushed into it by the honourable member for Toowong. I doubt whether the crusty, conservative honourable member for Toowong will make it back here. Whether he wins or loses, it is possible that he will not have the energy to walk up the stairs to the Chamber.

I have a few more observations to make this evening, although I have no wish to prolong this lacklustre debate.

Mr. Chinchin: It lacks lustre, all right.

Mr. TUCKER: I certainly have not been speaking for long. The honourable member has his own answer. Over the last half hour I have been trying to gain some ideas and comfort from the Treasurer.

Sir Gordon Chalk: I can tell you that you would not get much comfort from that.

Mr. TUCKER: In the past few years while he has controlled the Treasury the people of Queensland have not gained much comfort.

Mr. Porter: We have not done too badly.

Mr. TUCKER: I cannot hear the honourable member. Would he mind speaking up and taking the plum out of his mouth?

Tonight the Premier proved what I have been saying for many months, namely, that the job has become too big for him. He is out of his depth when it comes to sound economic management of the State. His blunders will take tremendous time to rectify after I take over his portfolio on 7 December. (Government laughter.)

At least I have been able to ginger up something; Government members have come back to life. I thought they were dead.

Only a few days ago we witnessed a prime example of the Treasurer's mismanagement and his apparent willingness to distort the truth politically. It was shown that, as a result of a decision in another place, \$10,000,000 would be added to the Bill for our railways. It is well to remember that the railways began a shameful plunge into chaos when the Treasurer, as Minister for Transport, abandoned the rail electrification scheme. Wherever he has been there has been chaos. After being turfed out as Minister for Transport and beefing at the

Premier for the position of Treasurer he brought chaos to that area and spread it throughout Queensland. I repeat that as Minister for Transport he abandoned the rail electrification scheme fostered by a Labor Government. He also made other decisions that were not in the best interests of Queensland. He is still making decisions that are not in its interest.

I mentioned the additional \$10,000,000 debited to the railway account. The Treasurer budgeted for a \$43,000,000 deficit in the railway account. He was reported in a responsible newspaper as having said that he did not include the extra \$10,000,000 in his deficit. If he was wrongly reported, no doubt he will say so later.

Sir Gordon Chalk: No, that is quite true.

Mr. TUCKER: He is supposed to have said that he did not include the extra \$10,000,000 in his deficit. Why should he? The idea of forward planning is not in his Government's frame of reference. He is able to pluck these amounts out of the air. If it is an extra \$10,000,000, that is just too bad; he did not mention it, but he will be able to look after it. That is the way he frames his Budget.

The Treasurer admitted that he did not plan for this extra \$10,000,000, which I think was added because of rising costs—that is what he said—but he claimed that his Budget provided sums to cover that amount so that he would not have to put up rail fares and rail freights. He said that he had the extra \$10,000,000 to cover that. What rot is this when he claims he has \$10,000,000 hidden away somewhere?

Sir Gordon Chalk: I've got more, too.

Mr. TUCKER: The Treasurer's statement is already based on money that he does not have; money he hopes he might get. I speak, of course, about royalties that he hopes will be paid by his former friends in the mining industry. I emphasise that they are his former friends.

Sir Gordon Chalk: They are still my friends. I had lunch with them.

Mr. TUCKER: That may be, but I think the Treasurer says that hopefully.

He has the hide to expect us to believe that somewhere in this Budget of his is an extra \$10,000,000 that will avoid the need to increase rail fares. Quite frankly, the Opposition does not believe him, and I do not think the people of Queensland will believe him.

Sir Gordon Chalk: You don't look too far.

Mr. TUCKER: I looked at the Budget, and so did my colleagues. I looked at it with dismay—many times. There are two ways in which the Treasurer could provide the \$10,000,000. He does not seem to be

prepared to ask his multi-national friends to pay increased freight on mineral haulage, which is what he should be doing; so the idea ultimately is to put up the fares and freights. Make no mistake about it; if the Government is returned, that is one of the first things it will have to do. The Government will not increase mineral haulage charges, so the Treasurer will be forced—and he probably has it in mind already—to put up fares and freights. The only alternative open to him is the introduction of a consumer tax.

Mr. Lane: Is that what you would do?

Mr. TUCKER: The honourable member will have to wait and see. I will have a chance at least to put forward my ideas.

I repeat that that is the only alternative the Treasurer will have. He is marking time now. He claims to have balanced his Budget, or near enough. However he is already \$10,000,000 down, and the only means of overcoming the deficit, if his Government is returned, will be to introduce a consumer tax and raise fares and freights. We will watch the position, because I am quite sure that when the Parliament rises tomorrow that will be his intention. We will endeavour to head him off, but there is no doubt that that is what he has in mind. He is not announcing it yet. It is an excellent example of the political deceit to which this Government is prepared to stoop. I believe that people should be told what the Premier and the Treasurer intend to do if they are allowed to stay in Government.

My colleagues and I intend to tell the people about that. Just as the Premier says he will tell his story, I will tell them up and down the State that the Government intends to increase rail fares and rail freights and ultimately to introduce a consumer tax. Every one of my colleagues will quote that throughout the length and breadth of Queensland.

Mr. Lee: Fred will be leader in seven weeks because you won't be here.

Mr. TUCKER: He would be a good leader, too.

Mr. Lane: He would be a vast improvement on you. You lose your temper. You lose your cool too easily.

Mr. TUCKER: If it were anyone but the member for Merthyr, I'd be worried. Here we have an example of a political idiot accusing me of losing my cool. He is one of the greatest loud-mouths in the Chamber. "River Murray" Lane! He is devious and shallow and he has a big mouth.

I noted in the Press today that the Treasurer has stolen one of my ideas on unemployment relief. This is not unusual. It has happened often. The Government is bereft of ideas and spends its time attacking Canberra and cribbing the ideas of others.

Sir Gordon Chalk: What did I pinch today?

Mr. TUCKER: What I said a little while ago, and I can tell from the Treasurer's red face and his worried look—

Sir Gordon Chalk: You're looking at the wrong face.

Mr. TUCKER: Either that or his blood pressure is rising again. Nothing is coming forward from the Government.

I said earlier that, in his Budget, the Treasurer made \$45,000,000 available to bankrupt local authorities. Under the terms outlined by the Treasurer, only bankrupt local authorities were eligible for loans from that allocation at that time. As honourable members know, I have said that when I become Leader of the Government in a few weeks' time, I will make the \$45,000,000 available immediately, especially for unemployment relief. I am not saying that tonight; I said it weeks ago in a positive statement so that it could not be claimed later that I did not originate the idea. The Treasurer's sudden decision to release \$15,000,000 of it is a prime example of what I mean.

What did our very original knight in the Government do? He borrowed my idea. Today we read that he has abandoned his unsympathetic terms in favour of my much more realistic proposal. He has now decided to release \$15,000,000 of that amount to help keep thousands of men employed. I have no argument with that. It is a great idea. But I say it was an idea I put forward weeks ago. I commend the Treasurer on his action but I condemn his lack of foresight. This money could have been made available weeks ago. It certainly could have saved a lot of heartbreak at that time. It is only when pressure is applied that the Government does anything at all. Before this it has said at all times, "Blame Canberra." Now that it has been pushed into action it has shown that certain action can be taken. As I said weeks ago, the Government could and should take the initiative to overcome unemployment. There are other areas it could move into.

Sir Gordon Chalk: You haven't taken a trick yet.

Mr. TUCKER: I have been watching carefully and I would say that the Treasurer has not taken a trick from the Premier. The Treasurer has been left far behind by the Premier, who has put it all over him for the past 17 years.

The Treasurer has an excellent opportunity to borrow some of my other ideas to overcome unemployment. We on this side of the Chamber have appaluded his recent move. I understand it is not entirely his fault that the Government cannot come up with any ideas of its own, because the Premier has no ideas of his own. I suppose all Ministers must bear some of the blame. These tired old men in the Cabinet have forgotten what an idea is. Their average

age is close to 60; the average age of Opposition spokesmen is less than 50. I think that is a point which should be made.

The Government has shown that it is not interested in people, jobs and security of employment. However, by his action in releasing \$15,000,000 of the \$45,000,000 specially allocated in the Budget, the Treasurer has acknowledged that unemployment is a problem to which the State Government can apply initiatives. I thank the honourable gentleman for that acknowledgement. I will make a point of mentioning it many times during the election campaign. I will tell the people the effect of the Treasurer's statement in his Budget speech, and then point out how, in the course of only a few weeks, he has somersaulted. I will also give details of other initiatives that I and other honourable members on this side have suggested which the Premier and the Treasurer have refused to take.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Who is advising you—Frank Crean, or Whitlam?

Mr. TUCKER: I certainly would not want the honourable member for Windsor to advise me.

I understand that the Premier has had my proposals evaluated by public servants in the few days during which he has been preparing his campaign speech. I expect him to include some of my proposals in his policy speech on Monday night, and then attempt to claim them as his own. If honourable members pay attention on Monday night, they will hear them come out. It will then be claimed that they are the Premier's ideas.

Mr. Alison: Give us some of your ideas.

Mr. TUCKER: If the honourable member had been reading the newspapers—and I realise that it must be difficult for him to do that—he would know that I have already given my ideas. I suggest that he go into the library—it is well known that he does not frequent the library—and read what I have said.

I intend to announce more of my ideas in my policy speech, so that the Treasurer will have time to borrow them and include them in his own speech two days later. He is struggling, so I will give him some new ideas for his speech. I do not mind if he stays behind me and uses them in his speech. Good luck to him. That is the only way in which he will present anything to the people of Queensland—apart, of course, from blaming Canberra, which both these beauties, the Premier and the Treasurer, do on all occasions.

Mr. Alison: I simply can't wait for your policy speech.

Mr. TUCKER: Possibly you cannot. Your efforts in Maryborough leave much to be desired.

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

Mr. TUCKER: I would hang my head in shame if I were the representative for Maryborough and I had allowed it to deteriorate as it has over the past two years. The honourable member supposedly has the ear of the Government, but his electorate is one of the poorest in Queensland. I would not be interjecting and shouting if I were the honourable member. I would hang my head in shame. I say to the honourable member that he should get out and give somebody else a go. Jock Anderson will put him out at the coming election.

Because of his ambition to roll the Premier out of office, the Treasurer will attempt to make a speech that will take the spotlight from him. It will be an interesting exercise to watch the two of them and hear what they say about one another.

Mr. Frawley: You will be up in the public gallery.

Mr. TUCKER: That has been said to me many times over the past 15 years. I will take my chance. I suppose it will happen some day; but I have had a pretty good run, and better men than you have tried to knock me out of my electorate. I am referring to decent men—men who have not got a foul mouth and a foul mind like you have.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the honourable member is not now addressing the Chair in those terms.

Mr. TUCKER: I am speaking to the honourable member through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I certainly would not say that you have a foul mind. I think yours is the purest in the House.

Only a few days ago the Premier and so-called leader of the Government announced here that he had capitulated to pressure from the Treasurer and his unruly backbenchers to hold an early election. Much of the hidden money in the recent Budget and in this Bill is for the election campaign. The people will be paying for it—let there be no mistake about that! As the Premier made so painfully obvious in his announcement to the Parliament, several hours after his announcement in other places—he did not announce it here first—the election is not being called in the interests of the people of the State but in the interests of personal, political ambition.

Government Members: You challenged us.

Mr. TUCKER: Do they think my challenge made him do something?

Government Members: Yes.

Mr. TUCKER: I am glad to hear it. Apparently I do have some effect on him in some direction. I will issue a few more

challenges to him in the course of the next few days and see if he will take those up, too.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: If they put it to me one at a time, I might be able to answer them.

Mr. Frawley: Come up to Caboolture and try yourself.

Mr. TUCKER: I fly with the turkeys, not the willy-wagtails.

In the climate of an intolerable unemployment situation because of the State Government's unceasing political vendetta against a Government of another political leaning in Canberra, in the face of rising prices because of this State Government's stubborn refusal to use means at its disposal to curb prices, in the face of unsurpassed neglect of local authorities because of this State Government's refusal to help, in the face of an unprecedented threat to the big cities because this State Government has no decentralisation policy to encourage industry and development away from urban areas, and in the absence of any initiatives on behalf of the people this State Government was elected to represent, an election is called for reasons of personal political ambition, and for no other reason. I hoped that I would have been able to challenge the Premier into something, but I cannot believe that I have been successful in doing that. The election is being called for expediency. It is being done long before it needs to be done. It is being done for personal, political ambition, and for no other reason. The people in Queensland are the ham in the sandwich.

Mr. Lane: Do you want an election or don't you?

Mr. TUCKER: It is not for me to decide. It has already been decided for me.

The Treasurer made this fact obvious when he told a meeting of supporters and candidates that he wanted an early election, and that if an election was called this year he could topple the Premier and become leader of the coalition. Of course, it will be a coalition in Opposition. It is not so very long ago that the Treasurer was going around saying that he needed an early election if he was going to topple the Premier. Now, of course, Government members say that the election is being called because of my challenge to the Premier to hold an early election. They forget about the pressure that was brought by the Treasurer, day after day and week after week, on the Premier. Would they say that the Treasurer had absolutely nothing to do with an early election? The Treasurer told his supporters, "Don't worry about bread-and-butter issues; just concentrate on attacking Canberra." That was what he said. The Premier made it obvious that he, too, had accepted the Treasurer's demand to divorce the Government from any

interest in bread-and-butter issues—it has been divorced from them almost since it was elected—and to concentrate on attacking Canberra, which it has been doing month after month and year after year.

In his ridiculous grandstanding, time-wasting exercise in this House when he announced the election, the Premier said that Queensland faced grave problems as the result of restrictive socialistic policies of the present Federal Labor Government. Those are his words. I say it is nonsense, and the Premier knows it is nonsense. It is a pity he is not in the Chamber now to have something to say—if he can ever say anything when separated from his public relations man. So the misled Premier will take his misled Government into an election on the issue of blaming Canberra for Queensland's ills for which he and his pathetic Government alone must take responsibility—and the people once again will be forgotten by the Premier and his cohorts.

Mr. Miller: Do you disagree with Dr. Cairns?

Mr. TUCKER: I have the greatest admiration for Dr. Cairns. I believe he is one of our political stars. I say that without equivocation.

Mr. Frawley: You have to say it.

Mr. TUCKER: Leaders of industry of the honourable member's political colour have said it, and I could quote them by the score.

Mr. Frawley: Do you believe you are the chosen one, the leader of the victors to the promised land?

Mr. TUCKER: That decision can be made by others, not by me. The Labor Party is interested in bread-and-butter issues, just as it is interested in people, in jobs, and in the security of employment—matters which this State Government has no interest in, and which it tends to neglect even further the longer it remains in office. I say we must not let it remain in office.

In a moment I will speak of the unsavoury methods this Government has used in an endeavour to pay for its party-political campaign, but first I want to speak of what people have been subjected to by way of election predictions.

The possibility of an early election has been canvassed publicly since March. I spoke about it at the start of my speech. These predictions of an early election started about March, and since the first report literally dozens of newspaper articles dealing with it have appeared. One day an election was predicted, and the next day the Premier was quoted as saying that he was not ready for an election. Those newspaper reports were not based on idle fancy, but on well-planned Government leaks.

Mr. Frawley: You went through this before.

Mr. TUCKER: I am saying now that these were well-planned Government leaks—and the honourable member for Murrumbidgee would be the greatest leak of all times.

However, it is obvious that during that time the biggest leaks were the Premier and the Treasurer themselves. If anyone doubts that, he has only to look at the front page of the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 22 October. There is a responsible report in that newspaper of a meeting of National Party and Liberal Party leaders held on the previous day. Only four people attended that meeting, namely, the Premier, the Treasurer, the National Party President (Mr. Sparkes) and the Liberal Party President (Mr. Moore). It was supposed to be a secret meeting. In the "Telegraph" report, the Treasurer and Mr. Moore were said to have declined to comment on the meeting. There were four there, and the Treasurer and Mr. Moore were said to have declined to comment. Mr. Sparkes was reported to have said that the meeting was cordial, but he would not go into detail.

The only person who was not reported as declining to comment was the Premier, and as we could tell from the very red faces on the other side of the Chamber when this report appeared, it was obvious that it was factual. The only person left to leak the details in an attempt to embarrass the Liberal Party members who walked out of the coalition meeting after threats of blackmail were made was the Premier himself. The only conclusion to be drawn is that the Premier was the leak. By a simple process of elimination we can see where these leaks to the Press came from.

Mr. Miller: What are you trying to prove?

Mr. TUCKER: I am not "trying" to prove; I am "proving" that Government members cannot rely on their Premier. He ratted on his three colleagues. I am proving this not only to the House but to the people outside as well.

Mr. Porter: You're certainly proving something.

Mr. TUCKER: Government members do not like it. Four people had a secret meeting and upon its conclusion three of them said they would not comment, yet the matter was leaked to the Press. When it comes to loyalty, I wonder how the Premier can claim to be loyal.

In my Budget speech I referred to the huge sums of money that the Government intended using for election propaganda. I referred, for example, to the 64.7 per cent increase in spending by the State Public Relations Bureau. I directed my comments particularly to the item of \$163,168 under "Miscellaneous Expenses". I pointed out that the Budget of the Public Relations Bureau provided for 72 per cent more than the sum expended by the bureau last year. I bring these facts to the notice of the people

of Queensland to show them how their money is being used for the purposes of fighting an election.

Huge unspecified amounts in the Railway Department's budget obviously were allocated to the Government's election campaign. This is where the election funds as well as a lot of the election propaganda are coming from. The people of Queensland are entitled to know this.

As well, there is the cost of operating the Premier's aeroplane, which is used mostly as his personal taxi between here and Kingaroy and also to fight election campaigns. Although it was purchased with the taxpayers' money, the Premier uses it to fight an election campaign against the 48 per cent of the electors who voted for the Labor Party.

These huge propaganda allocations were bad enough; today we learn that the State Government spent an additional \$1,300,000 on public relations propaganda exercises. Apparently it is prepared to waste money on propaganda while it refuses to spend money on the provision of jobs. This is another matter that I will be bringing to the notice of the people of Queensland.

Mr. Miller: How much did the Brisbane City Council spend on public relations?

Mr. TUCKER: The Brisbane City Council is quite justified in following the example set by the Queensland Government. How can the council be castigated for having done so?

Mr. Lane: When will you qualify for a free trip to Peking, like Burns and some of his mates?

Mr. TUCKER: When the honourable member makes a sensible interjection I shall reply to it.

In the list of agencies and consultants that received these huge sums from the taxpayers, the amounts paid to one particular organisation, Le Grand Advertising Pty. Ltd., should not be overlooked. That company was paid more than \$500,000 by the State Government. And it is probably looking for more. A big portion of all this money goes to trying to build up the Premier's image. We can all understand why that is necessary.

In the past few days all the public relations officers in the State Government have been gathered together like all the King's men, trying to put the Premier's declining image together again. In addition to his Under Secretary, his two Assistant Under Secretaries, his personal Press adviser and his image-maker, the Premier has at least 45 people at his disposal for public relations purposes. That number does not include photographers and the many clerks and typists attached to all these people. Let some honourable member say that that is untrue. Let somebody say that he is not surrounded by these people. Government members are

amazingly quiet now. The last time I tried to get information like this, I was told that \$170,000 was the sum spent on all the public relations people and others around him. Almost all of these people are engaged in writing the Premier's policy speech and preparing films to show the electors. All of this is being done at Government expense.

Mr. Porter: That's quite right.

Mr. TUCKER: Why should it be quite right? Why should the people's money be used to make films and get this propaganda machinery moving? Why should not the National Party be spending its own money? What is the Liberal Party doing about it? Why does it allow the Premier to spend this huge sum on propaganda and public relations? Why hasn't it done something about it? Why hasn't it enough intestinal fortitude to say something about the virtual army of image-makers surrounding the Premier who are frantically engaged, at great expense, in trying to write his policy speech?

I challenge the Treasurer tonight to tell Parliament and the people of Queensland the size of the bill for the Premier's image-building campaign. Seeing that a challenge was accepted on another occasion, I ask the Treasurer to accept this one and tell me how much money is being spent by the Premier on image-building. Let the Treasurer tell the people how much they are paying so that the Premier can electioneer on behalf of his multi-national party. The Treasurer has nothing to worry about in this matter. I know that, like me, he has only one private secretary and one Press officer.

Sir Gordon Chalk: You're right.

Mr. TUCKER: I know that to be true.

Why should the Premier be surrounded by about 45 people when the Treasurer and I have only one Press officer? The Premier sits in his castle surrounded by a huge number of public relations people. Does the Treasurer think it fair that the Premier should have an army of people to back him up? I do not know how he could. He should tell the House and the people the cost of the Premier's promotion exercise.

Mr. Frawley: You will blow a gasket in a minute.

Mr. TUCKER: That will be my worry, not yours.

Unless the Treasurer is under the Premier's thumb, his public conscience should force him to say what money is being spent in this way by the Premier. It should also force him to say how many people surround the Premier at the present time for the purpose of image-making, writing his speeches and formulating his Bills. I will be listening carefully to hear what the Treasurer says to that.

Mr. Marginson: You will get nowhere.

Mr. TUCKER: We can get nowhere by asking the Premier.

I said at the beginning of my speech that, with an election imminent, it would be an exercise in futility to debate this measure at length when Parliament will be dissolved within 24 hours. The focus is now on the hustings. We have known for the last week that it is outside, not here. People are leaving Parliament House and moving out into the electorates; they are already beginning the electoral fight. Anything I really wish to say will be said by me in my policy speech and in the weeks ahead as I campaign throughout the State. I am not here to put forward any other ideas. If the Treasurer wishes to take any points from my policy speech, good luck to him.

In conclusion, I say that on its record this Government deserves to be beaten and will be beaten on 7 December. If it continues to advance the theory that Canberra must be blamed, I can assure it that the people of Queensland will not be impressed. They are already getting sick of that issue. It is a spurious argument, as we will show in the weeks ahead. Make no mistake that after 7 December the Australian Labor Party will be on the Treasury benches and the coalition parties will be in Opposition.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer) (10.47 p.m.), in reply: Over many years in this House I have heard a number of replies to introductory speeches on Appropriation Bills, but never before have I heard such a recitation as we have had this evening. I think it would be fair to say that the Leader of the Opposition did not touch on the Appropriation Bill for even two or three minutes.

At the outset he said that the Bill was an exercise in futility. That comment could be applied very appropriately to his contribution. It was indeed a complete exercise in futility. If the Appropriation Bill is an exercise in futility, what does the Leader of the Opposition want? Does he want Parliament to be dissolved, as he said, without funds being made available and without any protection being given to those who are employed by the Government?

The Bill provides sufficient finance to enable a continuation of the activities of this State through to the end of this financial year. Consequently, it is necessary now to have a Bill such as this. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition does not even desire the State to continue. After all, he is following the policy of the centralist Government in Canberra—eliminate the State, eliminate its spending and allow these matters to pass over to the Commonwealth Government. That is not the desire of the majority of the people of Queensland. Consequently, it is necessary to present this Bill.

Then he drifted immediately to what might be termed his grandstanding for the coming State election campaign. He made a great

play on why the election was being called. He was the one who, in this Chamber, challenged us to go to the people, though not on the grounds that he indicated tonight. He challenged us to go to the people on the issue of unemployment. That is the challenge that we have accepted. He will know throughout the campaign just exactly where the unemployed are in this State. Because of circumstances brought about by maladministration in Canberra many people who were employed only a few weeks or months ago are unemployed at the moment. Many of those people will indicate to the Leader of the Opposition how they feel about this challenge.

Then he tried to score capital out of certain other matters. When I interjected that he had not taken a trick all night, he skipped off onto other issues. Let us look first of all at what he said about the \$15,000,000 of loan funds made available to the people of Queensland today. He said this was an idea stolen from him. He said that when the Budget was brought down I had said that these funds would be made available only to bankrupt councils.

It was not a question of making funds available to bankrupt councils or of making funds available in line with an idea advanced by the Leader of the Opposition now. Immediately after the Budget was brought down, letters were sent to all local authorities in Queensland asking them to indicate how much loan money had been approved by Loan Council and how much money they had been able to raise up to the time of their replies. This was the process that we went through. It was not a question of waiting to thieve some idea from the Leader of the Opposition.

We immediately proceeded to get the information. It was not a question of waiting for only one or two local authorities to reply. We desired to give a fair percentage to all local authorities so we waited until the majority of the replies were to hand. Having received those replies and having decided it would be advisable to release \$15,000,000 now to ensure employment in those areas where local authorities indicated that there would be a lack of funds between now and Christmas, we immediately proceeded to provide, on a percentage basis, what we believed would be sufficient funds to enable those local authorities to at least keep their men in employment until about February of next year.

We have indicated to the local authorities in the letters that went out today that they are at liberty to come back again in January and indicate whether they have been able to raise funds from any other source to continue to the end of their financial year. If they have not been successful and if we are satisfied that they have genuinely approached those who have been their lenders in the past, we will have a further look at their positions and I am sure that additional

funds will be made available to them to retain people in employment far beyond the end of February.

This is not something that was thought up overnight or as a result of some idea put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. The whole procedure was given birth to during the time of the Local Government Conference in Brisbane. On the afternoon of that conference I said I realised that only 15 per cent of the necessary funds of local government had been raised and I indicated that we would do what we could to ensure the continuation of their men in employment.

I have pointed out that it was not a question of our following the Leader of the Opposition. In fact he was trying to follow what we had started. He then attempted to make some point out of the announcement last week that a further increase in the wages of railway employees had been granted. This will cost the railways some \$10,000,000. He then proceeded to say that I had stated that the increase would not affect the State's deficit. It is true that it might affect the deficit of the Railway Department; on the other hand, it is not really an additional \$10,000,000.

If the Leader of the Opposition had studied the Budget, he would know that over \$90,000,000 is provided in the Treasurer's reserves for the purpose of meeting award increases as they occur. It is not a question of whether it is going to be in the railways today, the teaching section tomorrow, or in the hospital service or some other department next week. In providing protection for the future, one does not allocate a particular sum to a certain department. The money is provided in a lump sum and held in reserve to meet anticipated increases in wages. That was done last year; it has been done over a number of years.

I have sat at Loan Council meetings and Premier's Conferences when there has been some argument on this question, and quite a number of other States have found themselves in very difficult financial circumstances because they have not made provision similar to that made in Queensland. Again that gives the lie to the story put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. Funds have been provided; the Government has anticipated certain increases in wages. Consequently, although I regret the fact that another \$10,000,000 will be added to the railway deficit, the increase is in accordance with the findings of the Industrial Commission and the Government has provided for it.

The honourable gentleman then attempted to make some type of political platform for the coming election by saying that the Government would increase fares and freights immediately after the election. Let me remind the Leader of the Opposition that there have been only two increases in rail freights in the last eight years; on the other hand, rail freights were increased eight times in the last five years that Labor was in

power in this State. That is an indication that National-Liberal Governments have been prepared to ensure that both the man on the land and the city traveller are provided with transport at reasonable cost. I believe that the Government has set a pattern that is in the best interests of the people of Queensland.

Again I give the lie to the claim by the Leader of the Opposition that immediately the Government is returned—and there is no doubt in my mind that it will be returned—it will take action to increase rail freights. The Government has pledged itself to implement the Budget, and it will meet its obligations in relation to what it has undertaken to do.

The Government is condemned because the Premier and I, and also other Ministers, have criticised the Federal Labor Government in Canberra. I invite the Leader of the Opposition to read this morning's paper and see who criticised Canberra. Not the Government in this Chamber, but Mr. Egerton—he criticised it in the South. Mr. Hawke also has criticised it on several occasions, and in fact he said this morning that, unless something was done in Canberra within the next two weeks, the Government would fall.

That is the type of statement that one hears; yet the Leader of the Opposition blames the Government of this State and says that all it can do is attack Canberra. It is not a question of attacking Canberra; it is a question of the Federal Labor Government, by its actions, bringing to the attention of the people its inability to govern Australia as a Government.

Let me turn to one or two other matters. The Premier is now in the Chamber, having been at a dinner this evening. He did not have an opportunity to hear the criticism that was hurled at him by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that the Premier had been putting it over me for 17 years. It has not been a matter of the Premier putting it over me at any time. In fact, I was in Cabinet before the Premier, so it was not a matter of his putting it over me for 17 years at all.

It is true that there is a responsibility on the Premier as the leader of his party, and on me as leader of the Liberal Party, to hammer out between us on many occasions matters of policy that are enunciated by our parties. Consequently from time to time we have had our differences. No-one denies that. But we have been able to rule and run this State in such a way that its economy today is the best of any State in Australia.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Sir GORDON CHALK: It is by that co-operation and that type of understanding that we get a Government that is helpful to the people.

Reference was made to money for an election campaign. I sat in Opposition just as I have sat in Government, and I know the workings of a party in power. There

is a responsibility on a Government to present its policies. If a record of the Government is prepared by some persons inside a department who are charged with that responsibility, that is part of the record of the Government of the day, and not of a particular political party.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the election was some kind of personal political planning. It is not an election for personal political planning at all. It is an election for the purpose of "pointing Percy at the porcelain." That is the situation. That is exactly what will happen on 7 December.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about quite a number of other things. But they are not matters that I need to make apologies for. They are matters of vital importance, and in presenting the Appropriation Bill I outlined those particular issues. This is the last Appropriation Bill before the House dissolves. This is the Bill which will provide the necessary finance to enable the State to carry on until such time as this Government is returned to the Treasury benches, as it will be, when we on this side will be able to continue to steer this State through the difficult times which I know are ahead. The time will come when the people of Australia will be given an opportunity to rid Australia of the Federal Government that has brought these inflationary conditions to this country and has created the unemployment to which we will make considerable reference when we accept the challenge of the Leader of the Opposition to go to the people, and when we give the people an opportunity to have their say as to what type of Government they want in the State of Queensland.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

At 11.3 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307 I shall now put the question under consideration, after which all questions necessary for the passage of the remaining stages of the Bill will be put without amendment or debate.

Motion (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 8, both inclusive, schedule and preamble, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Sir Gordon Chalk, read a third time.

TREATIES COMMISSION BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.7 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

When I introduced this Bill, I gave a concise and accurate outline of its purpose. When listening to the debate on Tuesday night after I introduced the Bill, it was quite clear to me that the members of the Opposition had not taken the trouble to concentrate on my explanatory remarks.

After reading the Press reports of a statement made in the Senate in Canberra by the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Senator Willesee), it was obvious that the Minister had offered his observations without having taken the trouble to obtain details of this legislation. Senator Willesee obviously spoke from the pinnacle of ignorance. Let me explain once again the constitutional aspects of this legislation.

My first sentence when introducing the Bill was—

"The purpose of this Bill is to provide a link in the chain of processes in the field of international treaties and conventions in so far as these matters affect the constitutional authority of the Parliament of Queensland."

For the benefit of honourable members opposite, I emphasise the words—

"in so far as these matters affect the constitutional authority of the Parliament of Queensland."

No words could be clearer or more explicit. To infer or claim that Queensland intends to set up its own foreign service is arrant nonsense. Then I went on to say—

"The negotiation of treaties is, in practice, a matter for the Commonwealth Government."

Let me emphasise my next sentence—

"This State does not seek to interfere in that area."

If these statements are not sufficiently clear for honourable members opposite or Senator Willesee, let me go a little further and quote more of what I said—

"However, to have effect in domestic law a treaty generally must be implemented by legislation. The Commonwealth Parliament has the power to enact the necessary legislation in fields wherein that power has been conferred upon that Parliament by the Commonwealth Constitution. The State Parliament has the exclusive power to enact it in fields wherein that legislative power has not been conferred upon the Commonwealth Parliament."

That ought to be clear to all honourable members.

Is it too much to ask that the Government in Canberra recognise the authority of the Parliament of Queensland? Is Senator

Willesee saying that he denies the right of the Parliament of Queensland to exercise its constitutional authority?

It has been reported in the daily Press that Senator Willesee stated that the Treaties Commission will cost the Queensland taxpayers an estimated \$500,000 a year. This is another piece of arrant nonsense. Whilst I am not aware of the basis of his calculations—obviously they are based on what the Commonwealth would do—I must be charitable and say it is incomprehensible.

If Senator Willesee were genuinely interested in learning the facts, I would be prepared to send him a copy of the Bill free of charge, but, if his comments to date are indicative of his attitude, I am not prepared to waste the 10c it would cost to post it.

I am surprised that Senator Willesee should refer to the Commonwealth Constitution. I say this because since 2 December 1972 all States have had the clear impression—quite rightly—that the members of the present A.L.P. Government in Canberra are either not aware of the provisions of that Constitution or, if they are, they have no intention of abiding by them. Since they came into office they have made every endeavour to avoid, bypass or subvert them.

I would respectfully suggest that Senator Willesee buy, at 55c a piece, a number of copies of the book "The Australian Constitution". This number should be sufficient to enable him to make a copy available to each of his colleagues in the Senate, and to the Prime Minister and to each of his colleagues in the House of Representatives. He should then exhort them to study the contents and to comprehend the provisions to ensure that they have the requisite knowledge to enable them to comply with the spirit and principles of federation.

It is all very well for Senator Willesee to pontificate on doctrinaire matters. This practice has been going on in Canberra for almost two years, to the regret of thinking Australians. My Government in Queensland is concerned with the realities that affect the everyday life of each citizen. It is because we evince concern for the people of Queensland that my Government has their support.

When I speak of the realities that affect the everyday life of the citizens of Queensland, I refer to those matters that come within the constitutional authority of the Parliament of Queensland. To mention but a few, there are the questions of the recognition of foreign wills, adoptions, enforcement of maintenance orders and similar matters of day-to-day legal administration.

I cannot understand the attitude of honourable members opposite when they make the charge that this Bill has sinister connotations. Now that they have had an opportunity to study its contents and to relate them to the details I provided in my introductory speech, surely they can come to the only logical conclusion, namely, that it is the

clear intention of this legislation to protect the constitutional authority of this Parliament. That is why I challenged the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. Newton: We don't want you to make up our minds for us.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: We will see where members of the Opposition stand.

Mr. Newton: You might do that in the Liberal Party, but you won't do it in the Labor Party.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Opposition will back out on this one, that's for sure. I'll bet the Opposition will back down.

Mr. Newton: Wait and see.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: We will see where members of the Opposition stand. If they come to any other conclusion, I can only question their sincerity in their obligations to this House and to the people of Queensland who elected them.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.16 p.m.): As I said at the introductory stage, it has taken the Government some 17 years to suddenly realise the necessity for such a Bill.

Mr. F. P. Moore: Don't you know that there has been a change of Government in Canberra?

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: It has taken a Labor Government two years to bring it to a head.

Mr. TUCKER: I think the Premier used the phrase that the Bill was necessary, "... to protect the constitutional authority of this Parliament." It appears that formerly, there was no need to protect the constitutional authority of this Parliament. The Premier and his colleagues apparently have the impression (as disclosed by their interjections) that everything was all right while there was a Conservative Government on the Federal Treasury benches, but it is not all right now that there is an Australian Labor Party Government in that sphere.

Government Members: A socialist party Government.

Mr. TUCKER: Is that the position exactly?

Government Members: Yes.

Mr. TUCKER: The interjections indicate a fair resume of the whole business. They make me realise that we are getting back to the same shabby, old, blame-Canberra idea.

The same argument has been advanced in this State ever since the Government in Canberra changed. I remind the House that it is a properly and democratically elected Government, elected twice by the people of Australia. The main point is that the Queensland Government will not accept that the Australian Government is a properly elected

Government. I wonder where it will end. I deplore the fact that the Premier and those who follow him blindly should continue to adopt this attitude. Quite frankly, Queensland is suffering as a result. And it will continue to suffer if that kind of paranoiac approach continues. How do we head it off? To whom do we speak? All we can do, apparently, is head the Premier off, or get the Government out. Queensland is losing in every way.

Mr. Chinchin: Why?

Mr. TUCKER: Because there is no co-operation.

The Governments of New South Wales and Victoria do not adopt the same approach. There is not the same confrontation by them, although I know that differences of opinion occur between them and the Australian Government in Canberra. It is to be expected that the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria will be against the A.L.P. Federal Government, and, perhaps, the Opposition in Queensland, but they display their opposition in a predictable, fairly reasonable way. The attitude adopted by the Queensland Government, and particularly by the Premier, is completely unreasonable. Fear tactics are used continuously to create the impression that a big ogre in Canberra is coming suddenly to take over the people of Queensland so that they will disappear. This and similar legislation has been dreamed up by the back-room boys backing the Premier—the massive numbers I talked about a while ago who surround him and who have to justify themselves by some means or other. Not only are they here, but six of them are in England and other places. The Lord only knows what they are costing the State of Queensland in this confrontation.

That is why I speak as I do. This proposal is just another link in the chain of confrontation. It may not hurt the present coalition Government, but I say that it is hurting the people of Queensland collectively. There must come a time when the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues accept that a Government of a different political colour is in Canberra, and that co-operation with it should be sought. Federal Ministers come north and are snubbed. When they want to have dialogue, to use that terrible expression, there is none here. What is happening? The State and the Commonwealth are drifting further and further apart. Perhaps people on each side are guilty of misstatements, but the situation is created by the provocative actions of this Government.

I ask: how long can the Government continue to divide Queensland and the rest of Australia in this way? There is nothing surer than that a division is taking place. Forgetting the hustings for a moment, I deplore that approach. If I headed an Australian Labor Party Government in this State and there was a Liberal-National Party Government in Canberra, I would be ashamed to adopt the present Government's attitude.

In all sincerity I make that statement, because the final losers are the people of Queensland. It is only natural that once confrontation and suspicion are built up, we blow ourselves wider apart.

Surely to goodness we can exchange blow for blow in this House—sometimes it is pretty hard and pretty tough—and then afterwards talk to one another outside as decent human beings. However, at the present moment that is not the Queensland Government's approach to Canberra. People could swear to God that Federal Ministers had the plague and ought to be shunned from every direction. Is that good government? Is that the way in which the Queensland Government should be acting?

To everybody listening tonight, I say that the guilty man is the one who does not seem to be able to alter his opinions at all—the Honourable the Premier. If he thinks he can gain some small, early political advantage from this, that may have been his reason for introducing the Bill; but it will not be long before people begin to say, "How long can this continue? How long can we continue to throw this type of suspicion on the Federal Government?"

I repeat that this Bill is a shabby trick. Quite frankly, I do not think that much will come of the legislation. The main advantage that the Government seeks from it is in the reports of it that are flowing through the media. People are again being made to fear that something awful is about to happen. It is just like the business of the Queen of Queensland; of appeals to the Privy Council; of talk of seceding from the Commonwealth; and of talk about fighting New Guinea up in the Torres Strait. It was not long before sensible people sat down and found a solution to the territorial problem to our North. But for that, in no time flat we would have been fighting Michael Somare and his followers.

Frankly and sincerely, I say that I am worried about the approach of this Government, and the path that it is following. One day the chickens will come home to roost. One day the people of Queensland will begin to challenge whether in fact confrontation is necessary.

I have perused the Bill, which is a very short one. I will put the Premier out of his misery by telling him that we had it in Canberra's hands in no time at all. There is no need to worry about the 10c that had to be spent on postage. We made sure that our colleagues saw it immediately. It is a very small Bill and at this moment it could probably be called an enabling Bill and nothing more than that.

Mr. Miller: Why did you send it to Canberra?

Mr. TUCKER: Because it is anti-Canberra. I work in collaboration with my colleagues and I am a loyal member of my party. I would rather send the Bill to Canberra than

take the chance of my colleagues being wrongly informed by the media—and I am not reflecting on our local Press.

A commission is to be set up and I am asking who will be on it.

Mr. Frawley: Not you; that's a certainty.

Mr. TUCKER: That is right, not me. I can understand that.

Who will be on that commission? Will it be a conservative like the honourable member for Toowong? Is that the type of person who will be on the commission? If so, the Lord help Queensland. Will Mr. Butler be on the commission? He has the ear of the Premier all the time. Will they be the types of men we can expect to have appointed to the commission?

Mr. Frawley: Who would you have—Hugh Hamilton?

Mr. TUCKER: That is the type of idiotic interjection that the member makes all the time.

Who will be on the commission? Will it be obvious that they will set out to have another confrontation with the Federal Government? I would not be surprised if the most arch conservatives in this State found their way onto the Commission.

I consider this to be enabling legislation. It is the legislation that will flow from the suggestions of the commission that we will really have to fight because it will be anti-Federal Government. I do not believe there is any need to protect the constitutional authority of this Parliament at this stage. Anyway, it has certainly taken the Premier a very long time to do something about it.

As I said, the Bill is rather innocuous. I hope that in his reply the Premier will tell us who will be on the commission and what their jobs will be. It is a very small Bill. There is nothing really in it of itself. It is its hidden aspect—the legislation that will flow from it—that we will have to watch.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (11.29 p.m.): In this second reading, we have heard an even worse presentation of the case for the Opposition than we heard at the introductory stage. What we have had from the Leader of the Opposition—and I presume he speaks for the Opposition—is a servile, centralist, lickspittling, anti-Queensland, pro-Canberra speech. He has tried to blandly pretend that nothing at all has happened in Australia in almost the past two years—that there has been no change whatever since the Federal Government came to office in Canberra in terms of our constitutional relationships with the central Government. This is so absurd and utterly contrary to fact that I imagine anyone hearing or reading his speech would literally laugh him out of the Parliament and probably out of his seat at the next election. He does not ever

speak as a member of the Queensland Parliament; he always speaks as a member of the Labor Party, which is dedicated to wrecking the Federal system.

He says that this Bill is another example of the unrealistic attitude that apparently is unique to this State. The plain fact of the matter is that literally every stance this State has taken to protect the State's rights against the Federal crowd has been followed by the other States, and on many occasions—on several vital occasions—it has been followed by Labor States. So the suggestion that this Government is unrealistic or unique is quite contrary to the facts.

The suggestion that what we are doing all the time with legislation such as the Bill that is before us at the moment is engaging in confrontation is again an absurd travesty of the facts. It is like the thug who says to the victim he is mugging, "Hand over your valuables or I'll bash you. And if you force me to bash you, it will be your fault, not mine." That is the approach he applauds in the Federal Government. They are the ones who initiate the confrontation. They are the ones who try to burke the Constitution. They are the ones who try to totally reverse the partnership that the Constitution says should exist between the central Government and the States. And because we resist it, because we do what the Constitution of Australia requires us to do and what the Constitution of this State requires us to do—the Constitution that honourable gentlemen opposite are sworn to uphold—we are supposed to be instituting confrontation. It is so absurd, so wrong and so ridiculous as to be beyond my understanding that the leader of a party could possibly pose that as a reasonable argument.

Mr. Miller: Do you think he understands the Constitution?

Mr. PORTER: I think he understands what loyalty and discipline are in his own party—and that is about the lot.

The honourable gentleman talks constantly about the necessity for our accepting what the elected Australian Government tries to force upon us. I remind him once again that on the day the Australian Government was elected, the Senate also was elected by the same voters, in the same polling booths and on the same issues. And the voters of Australia voted in his Australian Government by the narrowest of margins and voted a majority against the Australian Government in the Senate, and they did that for a very good reason. Under our Constitution, the Senate is as vital a part of the Government of the day as the House of Representatives.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I invite honourable members opposite to read the Constitution and find out. So the decision of the electors was not the one that the honourable gentleman always pretends it is. The decision of the

electors must be seen in its totality, not just the part of it that it suits honourable members opposite to keep on talking about.

As an extra piece thrown in, let me remind the Leader of the Opposition once again that on that same election day four referendum questions designed to change very substantially the Constitution and ease the flow of power to the centre were rejected.

Mr. R. E. Moore: They were deceitfully worded.

Mr. PORTER: Very deceitfully worded; but the people of Australia, and particularly the people of this State, were wise enough to know what was being attempted.

All the dreadful nonsense in the discussion of this Bill to suggest that, after being elected so narrowly and with the Senate elected on the same day against it, the central Government has a sort of natural right to prevail against the Government of this State and we should automatically bend the knee to it and yield—this, I think, is not only preposterous but despicable. It certainly has no place in an Australia which believes in a free society and a partnership in power between the central Government and the State Governments.

There has been a quite ridiculous over-reaction by Federal Ministers in the Press this morning, and the Premier referred to it when introducing the second reading of the Bill. From the Canberra socialists, we have Senator Willesee suggesting that it would cost \$500,000 to run this commission. I gathered from an interjection by the honourable member for Lytton that he is probably the bright spark who put that proposition to the Federal Government. \$500,000! To do what? They must be besotted with the "Blue Poles" mentality.

Mr. Burns: I will show you how.

Mr. PORTER: I will be delighted to have the honourable member show us how the proposal contained in the Bill will cost this State \$500,000 a year.

Senator Milliner then suggested that the Bill meant the creation of a Queensland foreign service.

Mr. Burns: That's right.

Mr. PORTER: Obviously here again we have the fountain-head for these remarkable propositions from Canberra.

The absurdities are so tremendous that one wonders whether one is dealing with elected representatives in a Parliament or some children who have been seeing too many Disney cartoons.

Senator Willesee, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, said that what Queensland was attempting to do with this Bill was futile, anyhow. Of course, the A.L.P. centralists have said exactly the same thing of every move we have been forced to take. They have said the same thing about every step

we have had to take to check their insensate drive to wreck the Federal system and annihilate the States and plunge us into economic disaster. They have been proven wrong on every occasion. As I said at the introductory stage, every time that Mr. Whitlam, Senator Murphy and anybody else has tangled with the Premier and this State Government on these issues of who had the proper power in the various areas, they have been done like a dinner. They will be done again on this occasion on this issue.

We have to recognise that all we are getting from the Canberra Government today—and the reason why we take the various steps, including this Bill—is this quite insane attempt to fasten on all of us the intolerable shackles of a monolithic bureaucratic control, which is the hallmark of every miserable Communist and socialist country that honourable members opposite and their ilk seem to admire and cherish. There is a very good reason why they admire them, and why they want us to follow suit. There is a very good quote by Karl Marx. He is a gentleman that we should bear in mind because Dr. Cairns, the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, has admitted that he is a Marxist. Karl Marx has said—

“Democracies will always seek to establish a dispersed system of government. We must fight against this because only by complete concentration of power in a unitary system can we hope to achieve control.”

That is what the exercise is all about. That is why we should be concerned about it. That is why we must make every move we can, and use every endeavour we can, to ensure that this will not happen to Australia, and will not happen to the people of Queensland.

When the Leader of the Opposition pretends that we are eccentric, that we are paranoiacs, that we are lunatics, that we are foolish, that we are absurd and that we are making spectacles of ourselves throughout Australia, let him bear in mind that what we are doing is stopping this drive to fasten on Australia, and on Queensland, the Marxist, collectivist, centralist system—something that every poll that has ever been taken has shown that the people of Australia and Queensland do not want at all. They will not have a bar of it. So all these attempts have to be made to try to do it through the back door. The use of the treaty-making power of the Commonwealth is one of the ways by which the Commonwealth Government will attempt to avoid the expression of the will of the people through the ballot-box.

I believe that the Premier made crystal clear more than 18 months ago what was going to happen in this country, and what we had to do in order to protect ourselves and the people it is our sworn responsibility

to protect. In May 1973, after the Federal Government had been in office only a few months, the Premier said—

“Could anyone in Australia still believe that the Federal Government considers itself a partner in government with the States?”

“If any doubts were held, surely the events of the past six months would have dispelled them.”

Much happened in that six months, but infinitely more has happened since. So there is no question about it; this State has got to take whatever steps it believes desirable and viable to ensure that it can hold to its sworn responsibilities. We have been right so often. The approaches that we made to ensure that our right of appeal on constitutional matters to the Privy Council would not be swept away by unilateral action by the Commonwealth (which it attempted to do) were joined in by every State in the Commonwealth, including the then Labor States of Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania.

The necessity to make sure that the Queen remains the Queen of Queensland is, of course, part of the same operation—to ensure that overnight the central Government will not unilaterally move to provide a Governor-General who will suddenly emerge as literally the president of a republic.

I think it was early last year when we stymied the attempt by the Federal Government—again quite unilaterally, again against our wishes and without any consideration for the people involved—to shift the Torres Strait islands away from us to New Guinea. We stopped that. Had we not taken—

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I am not quite sure who it is but apparently an honourable gentleman opposite thinks that's rather funny. The plain fact of the matter was that Mr. Whitlam and his cronies wanted to hand over the Torres Strait Islanders lock, stock and barrel, body and soul to another Government, despite the fact that they did not want to go. And we stopped it. If I remember rightly, we created the Town of Torres. We took steps to stop that.

Every move that they have made we have stopped—we have checkmated them—and the Premier has taken a leading part in it.

And one should never forget the leading part we took in the famous Gair affair, an episode that I am sure honourable gentlemen opposite would always like to see decently buried. They loathe having it exhumed. But the plain fact is that it was another attempt to stack the Senate by a dirty back-door method. It was stopped from here. Not only was it stopped from here but it then produced the election of May of this year, which has proved to be the disaster point for the Whitlam Government.

There is no possible doubt that when the political history of this period is written, the downfall of the Marxist socialist centralists will be found to have commenced from the day that this State, through its Premier, took the lead in standing up against them. Everything has flowed from that point.

This Bill is an important one. It provides the State with effective machinery to enable it to assess the effect that international treaties may have on our domestic areas and then to take whatever steps the Parliament may decide should be taken. The rabid men in Canberra, of course, will always misuse constitutional power while they are there, if they are permitted. They have tried to do so in many other ways. Therefore, we have to make sure they cannot do it in this area. If they make an international treaty, say, with Cuba, and part of the treaty is that Cuba will supply us with all the sugar we want, are we then to accept that in one fell swoop the Federal Government, by virtue of its treaty-making power, can wipe out our sugar industry?

Mr. Newton: That is another Aunt Sally that you dreamed up.

Mr. PORTER: Well, is it not a possibility under the suggestion that Senator Murphy has made that the treaty-making power will take precedence over any State legislative power; it will prevail? That is what he said. It is exactly the same thing. So we are making quite sure that if there are challenges in this area, they will have to challenge us, which is infinitely better than our having to wait to challenge them.

We are keeping faith with the people of Queensland and we will continue to do so and to make things as tough as possible for those who want to disperse and break down the institutions in this State. The Federal system has served this country well. It has given us stability, progress and affluence, which made us one of the most envied and respected nations in the free world—that is, until 2 December 1972. All that has gone. Our economy is in tatters; our affluence has been transformed into despair; we are threatened by hyper-inflation; we have the worst unemployment in years; we have a nation that is now rent by schisms and divisions fomented by the very Federal Government that rants about national purpose and unity. It is the same Government in Canberra in which the caucus constantly confronts the Cabinet, where Cabinet Ministers have thrown aside the essential notion of collective Cabinet responsibility, and where every Cabinet Minister has a knife out ready to plunge into the back of his fellow Cabinet Ministers as he tries to carve out his own private little empire. This happens constantly down there.

The Deputy Prime Minister constantly contradicts the Prime Minister, and vice versa; we see Minister against Minister in ceaseless conflict for individual gains; we hear of threats made to chaps that they

will be sent to London; we have Mr. Connor saying what the power and energy policy will be and we have the Prime Minister releasing information that it will be another policy. In plain terms we have in Canberra a Government that can do nothing in terms of real government but is bringing the country to the most desperate and parlous situation that we have known since the dark days of the depression of the 30's.

This Bill in the circumstances that have been created by this insatiable voracious A.L.P. centralist Government is not only justified but also necessary. It is one more addition to the protective wall that we have had to build in order to keep out the wreckers who want to smash by any back-door method they can dream up the Federal system that alone, in my view, guarantees that we remain one strong prosperous and united nation, a nation in which our differences as well as our similarities are recognised and in which we can be welded together for ever greater strength.

The Bill will be applauded by every Queenslander who believes that he can be a Queenslander and an Australian while remaining a Queenslander.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (11.48 p.m.): It has been a sorry spectacle in the two years that I have been in this Parliament and since the Labor Party was elected to office in Canberra to watch the honourable member for Toowong turn into a withered, twisted old man. He continually goes through his Groucho Marx routine, and, except for the cigar, even looks like him. He struts his tired second-hand party routine and old party-hack propaganda, trotting out Marx and Engels time after time. He has not yet made a speech that has not been directed at either the Brisbane City Council or the Federal Government. I have not yet heard him speak about State matters.

Tonight I wish to refer to the Premier's introductory speech, in which he said, among other things—

"The negotiation of treaties is, in practice, a matter for the Commonwealth Government."

That statement is one of the few statements on which the Premier and I are in agreement. It is clear that under the Commonwealth Constitution the responsibility for foreign affairs rests with the Australian Government. This has been confirmed by practice since federation. The Premier then went on to say—

"This State does not seek to interfere in that area."

What a contrast the Premier's comment is to the bitter speech that we have just heard from the honourable member for Toowong! The Premier said, in effect, that Queensland does not wish to interfere in the negotiation of treaties. We do not know, of course, what treaties are envisaged in the Bill, and

later on I shall put forward a few suggestions as to what I think is envisaged in it. The Bill itself gives no definition of the word "treaties".

I am told that legislation for treaty-making does not exist at Federal level, and that the Australian Government could legislate under section 51 (29) of the Commonwealth constitution to establish procedures for treaty-making, or alternatively could arrange for explicit instructions from the Crown to State Governors that they are not to engage in treaty-making functions. I am also told that the Commonwealth Government could enact legislation to ensure that treaties should be approved by the Governor-General in Council.

Most constitutional lawyers agree that under section 51 (29) of the Commonwealth Constitution the Federal Government's power to legislate is wide. It is true that in the past such power has not been fully exploited, nor has it been tested to the limit in the High Court. I should imagine that that is what this legislation is all about. I predict that we will see the commencement of a series of lengthy court cases to hold up decisions on the international scene.

The Premier, in his introductory speech, recognised the exclusive practical role of the Australian Government in the treaty-making process, when he said—

"However, to have effect in domestic law a treaty generally must be implemented by legislation. The Commonwealth Parliament has the power to enact the necessary legislation in fields wherein that power has been conferred upon that Parliament by the Commonwealth Constitution."

The next sentence was, however, the vital one. The Premier said—

"The State Parliament has the exclusive power to enact it in fields wherein that legislative power has not been conferred upon the Commonwealth Parliament."

There the Premier is implying that the Australian Parliament is restricted to legislate only in those fields where a specific head of power appears in the Constitution. I do not think the Premier is right. In fact, I think he is deceiving himself.

I am led to believe that successive Federal Governments held the view that the external affairs powers, which are general rather than specific, may be used in fields where no specific head of power appears in the Constitution. That is completely different from what the Premier said in his speech. The Premier has become nationally and internationally known as an arch-disrupter and divider of our once united nation—Australia. He must have had his tongue stuck firmly in cheek when he read his introductory speech and suggested that liaison between the Commonwealth and State authorities in this matter had become—I think the Premier used this word—"incomplete".

Contrary to the Premier's consistent refusal to co-operate with the democratically elected Commonwealth Government, it continues to be a practice of the Australian Government to consult with the States in each instance where State legislation may be affected by a treaty which the Australian Government intends to conclude. This practice has been followed by all Australian Governments, including the present one. The implication that that is not being done is as much a reflection on former Liberal-Country Party Governments—the Premier's colleagues—as it is on the national Labor Government. In both cases history will show that the Premier's statement does not stand up to a fair, objective test.

The Premier spoke also of what I think he called, "multilateral conventions" negotiated internationally. The suggested figure of 60 multilateral treaties annually is rather exaggerated. I am told that those open to Australia to join would be created only at the rate of 10 or 15 per annum at the outside. I am told that the figure of 60 is very exaggerated.

So much for the Premier's submissions to this House in support of the Bill to provide Queensland with its own Foreign Office, a Bill designed to provide an opportunity for the Premier, Porter and Moore of the "Foreign Office" to appear on the international scenes as representatives of the 19 per cent Queensland Government—representatives of 19 per cent of the people of Queensland.

When the Bill is read a little further we find that it is a classic example of government by regulation—executive government which shows contempt for the parliamentary process. The Bill provides for a great deal to be done by orders of the Governor in Council. I hope that the next Government speaker listed will continue in his previous stand again executive government and government by regulation. The decision to have a number of matters fixed by the Governor in Council is clearly a device to circumvent Parliament's authority. It also means that in considering the Bill Parliament is denied any clear idea of the Government's precise intention in utilising the commission.

What are the Government's intentions? If the Government is honest and open, the Premier will be prepared to answer some questions that worry me and other Opposition members. This is an opportunity for him to clear up any misconceptions we hold. For example, while the Bill provides for up to six commissioners, it says nothing about supporting staff. How many supporting staff does the Government intend to employ, and at what level will they be recruited? Earlier, we talked in terms of \$500,000. What is the estimate of the Premier's advisers of the cost of maintaining the six commissioners and their staff? On the same subject, is it proposed that either the commissioners or their staff will travel overseas? Will we send them over regularly? If so, at whose direction? What do we estimate will be the

cost of such visits? On the matter of costs, will the Premier give a firm estimate of the costs of operating the Treaties Commission?

I shall give my estimation of costs. On reading this year's Estimates of expenditure, I found that a Parliamentary Commissioner—our Parliamentary Commissioner—receives a salary of \$26,000 a year. It seems that six commissioners would cost about \$156,000. If we give each of them one secretary and one offider, and estimate them to cost another \$20,000, that will involve a further \$120,000 in all. That brings the total to \$270,000. For the 11 members of the State Public Relations Bureau, including liaison officers, stenographers and everybody else, the allocation for incidental and miscellaneous expenses for one year totals \$163,000. Straight away, without any overseas trips, the trappings of our new foreign office that will have to be set up to implement matters suggested in the clause on the back page of the Bill, we have spent almost \$500,000.

Mr. Porter interjected.

Mr. BURNS: That is my suggestion. I would like the Government to answer it. The honourable member for Toowong has been talking about Donald Duck. He keeps quacking away over in the corner, but he never gives any answers to the questions that have been raised.

Is it proposed that either the commissioner or the supporting staff should enter into negotiation with foreign Governments? If so, are we going to send them overseas? What cost will be associated with those junkets? If the answer is "Yes", such a proposal seems to me to be a deliberate slur on the integrity of the Foreign Affairs Department staff, who are independent public servants, for the negotiation of treaties is the function of that department. I do not know what other members think but I wonder whether a Federal Liberal Government would want the Queensland Government to negotiate directly with foreign Governments and international organisations to obtain this information. It should be channelled through the Government and the Foreign Affairs Department. Why wouldn't a Federal Liberal Government expect that requests for discussions with overseas Governments should go through its Foreign Affairs Department?

In his introductory speech the Premier spoke about co-operation. Unfortunately for him, he was followed in the second reading of the Bill by the honourable member for Toowong, who spoke against co-operation. I submit that the real purpose of the Bill is not co-operation with the Australian Government but in fact frustration and subversion of treaties and agreements that the Australian Government has entered into in the national interest.

A further question I would like answered is: will the commission—and presumably its supporting staff which could well be the

nucleus of a Queensland foreign service—be a precedent for other State Governments? I think the honourable member for Toowong answered that question before I postulated it. If so, does the Premier believe that it is in the national interest that we have seven Foreign Services with, presumably, seven conflicting foreign policies, making a laughing-stock of Australia and Queensland abroad? Unfortunately, it is not a laughing matter.

I feel that this is the first major step towards secession. The Premier spoke about secession early in 1972. It will not be long before being a Queenslander will mean being a foreigner in Australia. This Bill will further promote separation and division. The principal objective of the Bill seems to be to resist any operation of Federal Government authority by means of the use of external affairs power. The objective is to ensure that the State Government legislation will be enacted ahead of Federal Government legislation. That is pre-empting Federal Government legislation and seeking to minimise the effect of section 109 of the Constitution. In so doing, it rejects out of hand the decision of our forefathers, who joined together to set up a Constitution for a united country of Australia; not seven separate Australias, but one Australia.

Let us consider the matters that the proposed Queensland Treaties Commission could act on or interfere with on behalf of our future Queensland Governments. I point out that one must remember that it is not just this Government. This Bill will affect us for years ahead. Although this Government is enacting the legislation, there may be other Governments about whose actions this Government may be very unhappy or disappointed.

I draw to the attention of the House that particular areas in which the commission might be active could include the International Sugar Agreement and the International Commodities and Resources Agreement, which covers such things as bauxite, coal, iron-ore and fisheries—and that is where we get down to the nitty-gritty of what we are doing tonight. It could cover law-of-the-sea matters, including off-shore resources; petroleum and minerals; fisheries; pollution and conservation. Consider the implications on the Great Barrier Reef and the report that has never been tabled in this House by the commissioners who spent years on their investigations. Now we will go to another election after the Government promised at the last election that it would save the Barrier Reef.

The Treaties Commission could also interfere in the fields of human rights and Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. We could have the spectacle of this Government making treaties with South Africa and Rhodesia, because that is the way this Government's politics lean.

I am told that on an international basis we could reach the stage where six separate States—six separate little nations—could participate in international negotiations on law-of-the-sea matters. It could lead to an initiative by Queensland and six separate States on prospective treaties and other international commitments. It could lead to direct Queensland negotiations or negotiations by six separate States with six separate policies in transnational or international agreements.

I remind the House that one of the provisions of the Bill covers research on a functional basis which could lead to a prospective Queensland Foreign Service. This is a shameful Bill. Its second reading is being rushed through at midnight on the last night before Parliament is dissolved and goes to the people.

The Premier said it was to obtain co-operation but the second Government speaker laid the cards on the table. He said, "We don't want to co-operate with National Governments. We want to be separate. We want to secede." And this is the first step on the road to secession.

This is what the Government has been standing up and crying and whingeing about for months. It hates to see the people of Australia vote for anybody who is not of its political ilk. It has now reached the stage where, if it cannot defeat the Federal Government in this country, it will interfere with international agreements and on the international scene.

It will introduce laws to work around the Constitution. It complained about the Federal Labor Government going to the people with referendums to alter the Constitution. It does not need to alter the Constitution. It will slip in through the back door. It will do this in its normal sneaky way. It cannot face the people and front up on the issue so it will do it by the back-door method.

[Friday, 1 November 1974]

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (12.2 a.m.): In his closing remarks the honourable member for Lytton accused this Government of slipping in through the back door to circumvent the Constitution. In the history of this Parliament has there been a more tongue-in-cheek comment than that? After being rebuked by the Australian electorate time after time on referendum proposals and being shown that the Australian people embrace the Federal system—which Government is it that in fact slips in through the back door? Having been repudiated by the electorate, having been told that we would not embrace its proposals, having been told that we would not water down the Constitution and having been told that we would not amend the Constitution in the way it wanted—who is now coming in through the back door?

In all of the overt procedures that the Commonwealth Government embraces, it is that Government and not this one that tries to come in through the back door. I could refer to many aspects where it has muscled in, and probably in latter days where it has muscled in in the most blatant fashion with regard to health administration, to show how it is the Commonwealth Government that tries to come in through the back door. If ever the honourable member for Lytton chose to be shot down in flames, he opted for that when he used those most inopportune words.

Those were his closing comments. In his opening remarks he made some reference to Donald Duck. Donald Duck was the creation of Walt Disney. He was probably one of the greatest masters of fiction of all time—until the early hours of this morning, the first day of November 1974, in the 44th year of my life, when the honourable member for Lytton chose to indulge in fiction with a long, rambling comment on how we would enter external affairs, how we would set up embassies, how we would send people abroad, how we would involve ourselves in foreign treaties and how we would involve ourselves in the expenditure of \$500,000 or more. With great deference to Walt Disney, whom I respected immensely, I say that he has been pushed aside tonight by the new master of fiction, the honourable member for Lytton. If he carves no other niche in the pages of history, he can now be known as the greatest fiction writer of all times.

What is the simple proposition? Since the Constitution was written, there has been contention over section 51 (xxix). Our founding fathers, in their infinite wisdom, gave to the Commonwealth the power over external affairs. I am quite sure that the debates of the conventions of the 1890's would vindicate my statement that they meant external affairs to be external treaties that would not intrude upon State rights.

The writers of the Constitution were imbued with a sense of federalism. They believed in the clear division of power. If they had ever meant that external affairs were to allow the Commonwealth Government to intrude upon State affairs, they would have said so in precise terms. In the absence of those precise terms, we can only say that they meant the words "external affairs" to mean nothing more than that—external affairs. It was not until the judgment of Evatt and McTiernan that the waters were muddied. Evatt, in his well-known High Court judgment, said that external affairs could intrude upon State matters, and in the intervening 30 years there has been uncertainty about the whole question.

Happily, there has not been an attempt to exploit a situation that in fact could have been exploited. But I reminded the House recently—and I do so again now—that the Constitution Convention has lent its attention to this matter. It is gravely

concerned about it, and it believes that the Australian Constitution should be amended to provide a stopper clause, to provide that there should be no flow-on influence and that the Commonwealth's treaty-making obligation should be confined to external affairs, without any flow-on influence—beneficial or otherwise—to the States. It is in that light that we say we should have at least a Treaties Commission Bill.

Notwithstanding the extravagant claims by the honourable member for Lytton, who singularly upstaged his leader, the commission has no authority whatever. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that at this stage of consideration of the Bill one cannot refer to the clauses. But if one looks at the powers of the commission, one does not see any extreme powers. What are the operative words?—"to examine"; "to report"; "to advise" and "to make recommendations"—no more and no less than that.

Any suggestion that there must be some body of men sitting poised over their desks, waiting in hushed expectancy for the moment when an external treaty will be negotiated, and doing nothing else, is, of course, extravagance of the first order. These men, whoever they are and whatever their number may be, will be pursuing their normal activities day by day. But whenever they are called upon to act in an advisory capacity, they will so act. And to suggest that they will cost half a million dollars a year is to insult our intelligence and the intelligence of the Queensland electorate. That electorate is not gullible, and it will demonstrate that on 7 December.

I emphasise again that it is a commission whose singular powers are solely to examine, constitutional Convention, which makes a recommendation. In the light of the action it takes along these lines, Parliament will decide what should be done—whether it will provide enabling legislation; whether it will close the door or whether it will open the door further and enter into additional co-operation with the Commonwealth. These things remain to be seen. But it is nothing more than that. It is merely anticipating the Australian Constitutional Convention, which makes a recommendation that the relevant section of the Constitution should be amended.

Those who chose to criticise the Bill say that it is always Queensland that does these things. I remind the House that four Australian States have acted in concert with regard to a corporations Bill.

Mr. Davis: Oh, come off it!

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I shot the honourable member for Brisbane down in flames earlier in the day. Now he is looking for a second blast. He must be punch-drunk, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable member pretended a few months ago that he was an expert on corporate affairs. He has been singularly silent lately. I repeat that four States acted

in concert to pass a corporations Bill. They were completely right in that. Theirs was a great achievement. They established that corporation legislation rightly belongs to the State, not to the Commonwealth. So there is a healthy precedent for what we are doing tonight. But there is also much ado about nothing.

Mr. Lane: Would you say that the honourable member for Lytton was speaking on behalf of Peking or Canberra?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: It is pretty obvious that he has received a brief from somewhere because certainly he has not spoken for Queensland. Anyone who speaks for Queensland must recognise that we have taken a step which perhaps has been long delayed. The Bill sets up a commission to act in an advisory capacity. Until such time as a wiser Australian electorate closes the door and makes sure that this broad interpretation of section 51 (xxix) can no longer apply, this legislation is timely and warranted.

Mr. BALDWIN (Redlands) (12.12 a.m.): I do not think any honourable member on either side could miss the significance of the proposed legislation. It is fashionable for honourable members opposite who wish to fight their way up to the ministerial benches to choose the traditional path of talking about radicalism, the Communist smear and any other irrelevancies to which they can fasten their tongues and turn their small minds whenever Opposition members express an opinion. They seem to conveniently forget that we are members of Her Majesty's Opposition, which has just as much place in the political structure of the State as the parties in the coalition Government have.

Mr. Lane interjected.

Mr. BALDWIN: Let me say to the honourable member for Merthyr, whose mouth is bigger than his brain, that my loyalty is proved by the row of campaign medals I was awarded in war-time, not by sitting on my behind and abusing other people and offering mock loyalty to the Crown and the Commonwealth Constitution. Let him put his money where his mouth is. It is a pity he cannot wear the badge you wear, Mr. Speaker. If he did I might listen to him. I am sorry to have to answer an interjection in such a personal way. If we do not answer that sort of interjection we lay ourselves open to the accusation of accepting what is alleged or having no answer to the interjector.

I was hoping that the honourable member for Chatsworth, who has just spoken, would be here.

Mr. Lane interjected.

Mr. BALDWIN: He will make up his own mind whether or not he wants to be in the House.

The honourable member for Chatsworth referred to the coming consideration by the Australian Constitutional Convention of section 51 (xxix), which is very important to the consideration of the principles of the Bill now before the House. I and other honourable members on this side were at the last meeting of that convention. The honourable member for Chatsworth and I were on the committee that gave consideration to section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

In case the House has the wrong impression from what the honourable member seemed to wish to give—that is, that it was almost definite that some stopper clause would be introduced—I can tell the House most clearly that that would be a moot point indeed because even some of the Liberal members of that committee, representing States with Liberal Governments fully in power, were in support of the idea of leaving that section as it was and part (xxix) as it was because of the possible effects that a stopper clause could have on war-time treaty agreements. This is most important to the consideration of the implications of this Bill before the House tonight.

I agree with the honourable member for Chatsworth that it is a pity that Queensland is to be blocked from attendance at the next session of this Constitutional Convention. However, I have been told—not officially yet but I have come to understand so—that it is going to be deferred. This is a good thing because it will enable Queensland, no matter what happens on 7 December, to at least be represented there.

Mr. Lane: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BALDWIN: There they go again. I can recall quite clearly when the Premier was introducing the Bill to enable the delegation to go from Queensland to the Constitutional Convention how he emphasised the non-party-political aspect of the whole thing. But we see how soon that is exploded, firstly, by what happened at the convention, secondly, by what has happened at the committees, and thirdly, by what hide-bound restricted members of the Government party such as the honourable member for Merthyr have said about it as exemplified in his last interjection.

It is obvious now that we have the Bill in our possession that this is another illustration of the attempted establishment of shadow Australian Labor Government departments. I agree with the honourable member for Lytton that out of this could come a Queensland foreign affairs department, or a Queensland department for external affairs, or a Queensland overseas trade department. It is another overt act of political secession and another expensive essay into idiocy. In fact, if one studies the relevant section 51 and the part (xxix) that was mentioned, one will see that it is not hard to understand what might be the real motives for the introduction of this Bill at this particular time. I would have

been quite sure that, no matter when the State election was to be held, this Bill or a Bill similar to it, would have been put before the House before the next session of the Australian Constitutional Convention.

I wish to comment further and to enlarge on some of the possible subsequent actions that could occur from the adoption of a Bill such as this. One might well say, in looking at it in general, that this State is being dragged along in a treasonous train behind a Premier paranoiac to protect the private interests of a select few and their overseas friends, especially—and I say that this is a most important consideration—with respect to off-shore mining. I agree with the honourable member for Lytton that this is most dangerous in its implications and inferences and that it could well be that this State could be brought into disastrous conflict with the interests of the rest of Australia because of the wishes of the few.

The provisions of the Bill are so wide, general and vague as to enable follow-up legislation to be introduced to commit Queensland to anti-Australian activity or even secession. They are so wide as to make it possible to follow it with legislation challenging section 109 of the Constitution, thereby putting us in a grave position.

Government members show no concern whatever for what happens to the nation; they are concerned only for what happens to their interests in Queensland. They identify the whole of Queensland with their interests, not their interests with Queensland. They see Queensland as their private property, of which they are the sovereign rulers. Why, tonight I heard the Treasurer in the preceding debate utter the phrase “after 17 years of rule”. He sets himself up as the sovereign ruler of this State. His attitude is typical of that displayed by Government members towards the whole of Australia.

I think it was Edmund Burke, in one of his famous speeches to the British Parliament, who, when referring to the French Revolution and its effects on the economy of England, said, “It is quite evidently so that patriotism can be used as a refuge of the rogue and the vagabond.” I would suggest that that remark is applicable to the context of the debate that has revolved around this Bill.

Mr. Sullivan: Why don't you look at us while you make your speech?

Mr. BALDWIN: I will make a parting present of a pocket mirror to the Minister so that he can see why.

Government speakers have predicted that other States will follow the example set by Queensland in this Bill as, they claim, in others. I would suggest that not even Sir Charles Court would be so foolish as to follow the line set by a Bill such as this. I would be willing to take a bet that by introducing this legislation the Government

puts Queensland out on a limb. We in the Labor Party must ensure that it is not sawn off.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (12.24 a.m.): I join with my leader and other speakers on this side of the House in expressing opposition to this Bill.

Mr. Knox: You are opposed to it, are you?

Mr. NEWTON: The little fellow in the Chamber will learn as I go along.

Government members who have participated in this debate, particularly the member for Toowong, have given a clear indication of the Government's intentions under this Bill as well as the likely effects that will flow from it. As I listened to what the honourable member for Toowong said tonight and analysed his every statement, I became even more suspicious of this legislation than I was when it was introduced by the Premier. If we dare to challenge any legislation, we are called anti-Queenslanders. I took strong objection the other night to that charge, and I do so again.

I remind the Premier and Government members that we as parliamentarians take oaths of allegiance to King and country—in latter years to Queen and country. In my case I have always considered the country to be Australia, of which Queensland is a part. Let Government members get away from the continual attacks they level at so-called anti-Queenslanders. I am just as good a Queenslander as I am an Australian, and that goes for all members of the Opposition.

On what has been said tonight, I am wondering if we are not heading for a dictatorship in Queensland. Events in recent weeks, including the demands made by the National Party on the Liberal Party that were referred to by my leader tonight, make me very suspicious about whether the rights of this Parliament are being taken away and the rightful decisions of Parliament are being made in other buildings in this city. The very essence of democracy that we are here to fight for is being whittled away by the Premier and the president of the National Party and the Deputy Premier and the president of the Liberal Party. They determine how this Parliament will operate. For the past 18 years bargaining between them has taken place behind closed doors. These events make me suspicious of any legislation of this nature.

It was clearly stated tonight by the honourable members for Toowong and Chatsworth—irrespective of what the Premier may try to hide concerning this legislation—that what is involved in this legislation is a straight-out confrontation between the Queensland State Government and the Australian Government. There will be no co-operation at all. The stage is being reached when we must warn the people of Queensland about what is going on in the battle of hatred

and bitterness that has been waged in this Chamber ever since the Australian Government was elected to power in 1972. I wonder where Government members were when the same type of Government was in power in the Federal sphere between 1939 and 1949. They had no complaints then. The honourable member for Chatsworth said tonight that this legislation should have been introduced long ago. If the present Government parties had wanted to do anything about it, they had their rights as private Opposition members in this Chamber to put a motion on the Business Paper for the introduction of a private member's Bill.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: Surely you are not comparing Curtin with Whitlam!

Mr. NEWTON: They belonged to the same party; they followed the same platform and policies. The Premier should not try to confuse the issue. He may be able to do that as between the National Party and the Liberal Party, but he has no chance of doing it with the Australian Labor Party in either the Federal or State sphere.

Tonight we heard comments similar to those we heard on Tuesday; it was implied that because this is being done in Queensland the Government will endeavour to black-mail all the other States into following us. They will not follow the Premier. He can get up and say that they follow Queensland on this and that. However, we can well recall the reception that a person in the South closely associated with the Premier received after the election on 18 May. He gave every other State Premier a blast and said that, if they had followed the Queensland Premier blindly, the results on the 18 May election would have been different.

Does the Premier know their reaction? We were down there attending meetings of Constitutional Convention subcommittees. They were laughing at the idea of being dictated to by this State in an endeavour to blackmail them. That is all this Bill amounts to.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: Are you a socialist?

Mr. NEWTON: Of course I am. I believe in democratic socialism. That is the policy of my party. What else is the Premier going to call me? I invite him to have another go, because if he wants to keep this up, I will tell him some things, too. As I have said a few times before, if the Premier wants to get into the gutter, I will get down with him and match him blow for blow.

This Government will not accept the decisions of the people at all. As was pointed out by my leader earlier, the Australian Government has been elected twice to the Treasury benches in Canberra since December 1972. As he usually does, the honourable member for Toowong, in an endeavour to distort the figures, said that we won the House of Representatives but did not get the

same vote in the Senate. The fact is that we improved our position in the Senate at the 18 May election.

The honourable member for Toowong then spoke about the referendums that were put before the people but not carried by them. His own party, which was in power federally for 29 years, did the same thing and its referendums were defeated.

Mr. Miller: So what?

Mr. NEWTON: Government members are attempting to say that, because our referendums were defeated, we are very unpopular with the people. I point out that their referendums were defeated, too; so that throws that argument right back into their teeth.

Of course there is to be no partnership between the present Queensland Government and the Australian Government. That has been our experience for the past two years. As my leader said tonight, Government members are continually painting a picture of fear and gloom. That is to be expected of the Premier and the other Government members who have spoken, because they are hoping that this will win the 7 December election for them. As I have said before, they might be able to fool the people some of the time, but they cannot fool them all the time. The people are definitely waking up to the attitude of this Government, and to how the State is suffering because of its attitude to the Australian Government.

Look at the Aunt Sallies set up by the honourable member for Toowong. One wonders if he ever sleeps when he goes to bed. He must have nightmares all night. Every speech he makes in this House is about what the Australian Government is doing. One would think that the Australian Government had taken all his rights; that he does not even have the right to speak in this House.

He then had the hide and audacity to refer to that famous and wonderful person Mr. Gair and what the Australian Government did for him. He must have a very short memory, for we can well recall what the coalition did for Mr. Gair. When Mr. Gair was defeated, this Government gave him a rosy job till he was elected to the Senate. And why not! When the Government was using him for its own advantage, there was no squealing, but now, because things have changed and the Government does not have that support, it is crying like a stuck pig.

What concerns me more than anything else is the effect the Bill could have on our presently negotiated overseas markets. This is a very important matter. We all know the problems confronting our primary producers.

Mr. Bird: Now, now.

Mr. NEWTON: The honourable member thinks he is the only person who knows anything about the land. I could probably tell him a thing or two if I wanted to. But

I am outlining what concerns Opposition members. There is a danger in this Bill and what can flow from it. My leader correctly stated what concerns us more than anything else.

Mr. Sullivan: Do you think your colleagues in Canberra are aware of the problems confronting the primary producers?

Mr. NEWTON: To be quite honest, I cannot imagine the Minister for Primary Industries, who entered Parliament in 1960—at the same time as many of us on this side of the Opposition—asking such a stupid question. I do not intend to answer him. He should have more sense. He is the person who is supposed to be conducting the negotiations. If he does not know, how the hell does he expect me to know?

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr. Sullivan: I did not think you would defend what they are doing to our primary industries.

Mr. NEWTON: I am not going to waste my time arguing with the Minister.

Mr. Sullivan: If you want to win your seat, don't defend them.

Mr. NEWTON: Finally, let me say—

Mr. Sullivan: It's bloody shocking.

Mr. NEWTON: That's lovely. I hope "Hansard" and the Press got that.

I go along with my Leader in stating quite openly that we are concerned not as much with the Bill as with the legislation that will flow from it. The other matter of concern is who will be the commissioners who will make the recommendations. The point raised by the honourable member for Lytton is a very impert—pertinent one.

Mr. Sullivan: Impertinent?

Mr. NEWTON: It is all very well for the Minister to sit over there and try to correct my English. I know which word I meant to use.

Let me make it clear that what was stated by the honourable member for Lytton is very important. Any legislation introduced here that leaves matters to the Governor in Council is very suspect.

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Justice) (12.39 a.m.): When the honourable member for Townsville West became the Leader of the Opposition after the day of the long knives, he made it clear through the media that he would attack Canberra when he felt justified in doing so. For about a fortnight he tried to change the trend of the A.L.P. in Queensland to give some identity and individuality to it, in the same way as the leader of the A.L.P. in South Australia successfully identified his party

with that State. But it only lasted a fortnight. When the whips got cracking and he was told to pull his head in, he promptly did so. Indeed, one of the interesting features about the performance of the Opposition in this House since the election of the present Leader of the Opposition has been the way in which it has been a toady to Canberra on every occasion. Not only have they toadied to Canberra; we heard from the Leader of the Opposition that no sooner had the Bill been introduced in this Chamber than a copy of it was sent post-haste to Canberra—no doubt so that he could get the advice of the Commonwealth Attorney-General and other centralist Ministers of the Labor Government. Having sent the Bill to Canberra for advice, and having received his riding instructions, he is now proceeding to oppose it. The chickens are surely coming home to roost! The A.L.P. in this State is showing its true colours, as being dedicated to a centralist policy. In fact, one could truly say that it is a suicide squad prepared to hand over all power to Canberra.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the Bill being innocuous. I do not know whether or not he is going to oppose it, but every speaker from the Opposition side of the House has spoken against it. It may be of interest to note that any treaty that this country makes with any other country—and we are not denying the right of the Commonwealth Government to make treaties; the Premier has made it perfectly clear that it is completely within the authority of the Commonwealth Government to make treaties—or any treaty that has been made, or any treaty that will be made, which involves State jurisdiction requires the introduction of legislation in State Parliaments if it is to be valid. It is not much use having a national Government prepared to accept the responsibility of making treaties that the States agree should be its responsibility if in fact it does not check out the substance of those treaties with the respective State legislatures. When such an occasion arises, as it does from time to time—and no doubt there will be an occasion before the end of the year—approval by the Governments of the respective States will be required, and it seems appropriate that there should be a commission to examine treaties. That is in fact what Queensland is setting up under the Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition asked, "Why now and not before?" The answer is very simple. Until now there has been consultation and co-operation by national Governments in relation to treaties. Recently we have witnessed the national Government, without consulting the States, entering into discussions with Governments of other nations on matters involving State jurisdiction. If in fact treaties are made and it is not possible for the Australian Government to honour them because it has failed to get the approval of the States, the treaties

are not worth the paper they are written on. Even now there are quite a number that require State approval—International Labor Organisation conventions, a number of United Nations conventions, and any treaties that involve the sugar industry or other industries that are peculiar to Queensland.

Mr. Davis: Don't talk about the I.L.O.!

Mr. Newton: They have never brought down any decisions from it.

Mr. KNOX: A convention that did away with racial discrimination was passed by the United Nations when a Labor Government was in office in this State. It was not until a Country-Liberal Government came to office that the discrimination in the existing legislation was removed. The only legislation involving racial discrimination that was introduced in this Assembly was introduced by a Labor Government.

Mr. Newton: What was it?

Mr. KNOX: The legislation that proclaimed that a house occupied by a single Asiatic woman was automatically a house of prostitution. That was Labor legislation, and we repealed it. The legislation that provided for permits to be issued to coloured people on banana farms was A.L.P. legislation. We repealed it. The A.L.P. Government could have repealed it because in fact there was a United Nations convention in existence at that time which recommended the abolition of racial discrimination.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will refrain from persistent interjections, otherwise I shall deal with them. I now warn the offenders under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. KNOX: In the time of the A.L.P. Government, there were awards in this State under which Aborigines were paid less than what was paid to European labour. That was tolerated when the A.L.P. was in office. The United Nations convention at the time recommended the abolition of discrimination. The A.L.P. Government introduced legislation that prevented Aborigines from Asia from voting in State elections. We repealed that legislation. Since this Government took office, this State has had nothing to be ashamed of in its record for ratifying and supporting United Nations and I.L.O. conventions.

For the benefit of the Parliament of this State, the Government is setting up a treaties commission. In itself, it will have no executive authority. It will report to Parliament, and its reports will lie on the table of the House so that members can examine the recommendations and suggestions made in them. Because of the attitude of the centralist Government, I have not the slightest doubt that we will be setting the pace in this particular area for Australia, and the

other States will no doubt follow suit. I am sure they will set up similar commissions so that their Legislatures can be better informed. Of course, it will go on the record that the Opposition in this State opposed this legislation. It is not legislation for confrontation; it is legislation to enable the Commonwealth Government to better make treaties for the nation when the State Legislatures and their jurisdictions are involved.

As to the interest of States in overseas matters, it has been accepted for some time that the States maintain offices in the United Kingdom. Several of the States have established offices in the United States and Japan. On more than one occasion the Leader of the Opposition has recommended that we set up offices in Japan, the United States and South-east Asia. He now says that by setting up this commission we are establishing an external affairs department. Nothing could be further from the truth. If we are to play our part in co-operation with the Federal Government in a federation, the establishment of this commission will be a worth-while and progressive step in that interest.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.49 a.m.), in reply: My colleague the Minister for Justice has given a very clear picture of the present situation. He has outlined some very important points in relation to this most important legislation. The honourable members for Toowong and Chatsworth have made very clear statements in connection with the Bill. I thank them.

On the other hand, we have again had a very interesting demonstration of the fight that is being put up for Canberra by honourable members opposite. We have had a very clear indication from them of where their loyalties lie, and where their attitudes and actions will take them.

Honourable members opposite talk in terms of the Federal Government having been democratically elected. Nobody denies that, but they speak as if that gave the Federal Government the right to do anything and everything it wanted to do. It does not give it the right to discard, bypass or subvert the Commonwealth Constitution. It does nothing of the sort. One would expect the Commonwealth Government to act with responsibility and within the constitution of the Commonwealth, but it is acting in every way to bypass it.

The honourable member for Lytton spoke in terms of our trying to comfort the Federal Government, and the frustration of that Government at the attitude we adopt. The true picture, of course, is that the confrontation that we make, or the stand that we take, is for our own rights and those of Queenslanders. Honourable members opposite say, in effect, that there must be

peace at any price, that we must be prepared to step out of the way and let the Commonwealth Government do exactly what it wishes, every time it wishes, in every issue it cares to raise. Surely honourable members opposite know by this time that we are prepared to confront the Commonwealth on every issue in which it seeks to bypass the constitutional rights of this State—and we will continue to do so. The honourable member for Lytton spoke about it being the practice of the Commonwealth Government to consult with the States. How far from the truth can he be? It is not their practice to consult with State Governments. Did they consult with us about giving away the Torres Strait Islands? Of course they didn't.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: They wanted to consult with you, but you would not talk to them.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member has not the courage to face the Torres Strait Islanders. He knows what will be meted out to him. He chickened out.

Honourable members opposite have demonstrated in no uncertain manner where their loyalty lies. The honourable member for Belmont spoke about my good friend and colleague the honourable member for Toowong, and said that he had a nightmare. Goodness me, the Commonwealth Government has given millions of people a terrible nightmare, and it has wrecked the economy of this nation.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member is dead right. We are not prepared to go into partnership with socialists bent on wrecking this nation. What does the honourable member take us for?

Mr. Newton: You have never given them a go.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: They have had two years of a "go". Not many people in this State and nation will give them a go, and many honourable members opposite are in Parliament for the last time tonight. I want them to think soberly of this. Some of them know they are going; a few of them do not know, but they are going because the people will throw them out just as they will throw the Commonwealth Government out. Some of them are not game to go. They have squibbed and chickened out.

I am sorry that this last session at night has concluded on this note, with honourable members of the Opposition again displaying their disloyalty to the State. Unfortunately, that is the decision they have made. They will go down in history for the stand they have taken.

Motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Constitution of Commission—

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (12.55 a.m.): I have some questions to put to the Premier. In his second-reading speech he referred to the cost of this commission and said that the estimates made by Senator Willesee and others were wrong. Will he give a firm estimate of the cost of operation of the Treaties Commission, as set out in this clause? Will he tell the Committee the number of supporting staff it is intended to employ, and at what level they will be recruited?

Mr. Alison interjected.

Mr. BURNS: The Government is asking the Committee to agree to this proposal, so surely we are entitled to ask questions about the commission. Further, is it proposed that the staff appointed to the commission will travel overseas? Is it proposed that either the commissioners or the supporting staff will enter into negotiations with foreign Governments?

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.56 a.m.): The cost involved is not a vital issue. I might say that it will be lower than the cost of setting up the Law Reform Commission. The main purpose of the Treaties Commission will be to play a vital role in the interests of the State. The cost will be small compared with the overall benefits that will flow to the people of Queensland.

Opposition members are only trying to draw red herrings across the trail. The suggestions put forward by the honourable member for Lytton in relation to costs are utterly ridiculous. He mentioned the sum of \$120,000, and the figure of \$500,000 has also been referred to. These guesses are absolutely ridiculous. As I have said, the matter of cost is of no consequence in the light of the value of the Treaties Commission.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (12.57 a.m.): It is remarkable for the Premier to say that the matter of costs is of no consequence. Apparently his view is that we should not worry about the money. People will pay the taxes; someone will pay the bill. Apparently the Premier is prepared to waste money purely for political purposes. I am not satisfied that any consideration has been given to the costs of the commission. Will its officers be sent overseas? Will the commission comprise six members? Will they be sent overseas with their staff? Are matters such as that involved in the cost of setting up the commission?

When the Premier does not know the answer to these questions, it is very easy for him to say that costs do not count. I understand that the Queensland Government obtained the most expensive legal brief in the history of this State before it introduced this legislation. If the Premier had done his homework, he would not make smart remarks against the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs; he would have some facts to back up his statements.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.58 a.m.): The cost will be no more than that of warming up the motors of the Boeing 707 that the Prime Minister uses when he travels overseas.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (12.58 a.m.): Will the Premier tell me, then, how much it costs to warm up the motors of a Boeing 707, so that we can have an estimate of the cost of the commission? I would suggest that the commission cost will be twice that of the Premier's plane, and will include something like \$160,000 for incidental expenses, which sum is allocated to the Premier's Press secretaries.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.59 a.m.): Like most statements made by the honourable member for Lytton, this one, too, is utter nonsense.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Members of Commission—

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (1 a.m.): The Premier stated that this commission is very important. Obviously if it is to usurp the position of the Foreign Office—(Government laughter). Let me put it this way: if it is to be composed of people who can look at treaties, understand them and then report back to Parliament, they will have to be well versed in foreign policies of all sorts. It is highly unlikely that we could put any person at all in such a position and say, "Report back to us on treaties." It is fair to say that they will be specialists in their own sphere.

Mr. Sullivan: Are you looking for one of these jobs after the next election?

Mr. TUCKER: The Minister for Primary Industries has clearly demonstrated that he should not hold a portfolio.

I am making the point that if these men are to work properly as a commission, they must obviously be specialists in this area. Firstly I ask why they are to be picked by the Governor in Council. If they are important enough to have to report on a very important subject I want to know why the Parliament of Queensland cannot appoint them. Through you, Mr. Lickiss, I point out to the Premier that he is supposedly first and foremost for Queensland. Yet the members of this very important commission are

to be appointed by only a section of the Parliament of Queensland; the Premier is disfranchising the rest of us from having a say in their appointment.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: I have a right to put this. I am asking the Premier why the Parliament of Queensland should not have the right to appoint members of this commission rather than the Governor in Council. If the Premier is so keen on being known as a Queenslander why is not the Queensland Parliament being given the right to choose these very important commissioners?

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (1.3 a.m.): I can say that the Leader of the Opposition can leave this matter with every confidence to the Government to decide in the same way as it has made all other decisions.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—Functions of Commission—

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (1.4 a.m.): Clause 6 (a) reads—

“to examine international treaties and conventions, whether or not they are in force at the material time, with a view to assessing their benefit to and effect on Queensland;”

I heard the Minister for Justice say in his speech tonight that all the treaties in existence—all the old treaties as well as any future treaties—will be assessed by the commission. What will happen then? A number of international treaties have been accepted, agreed to and signed over the years by Liberal-Country Party Governments and by the Australian Labor Government. The Government is trying to set up a way of getting around section 109 of the Constitution, to create legal difficulties in the future to delay the process of international treaties between this nation and the rest of the world. I want to know what happens to existing treaties—current treaties—that are covered in clause 6 (a).

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is that clause 6 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. Burns: He doesn't know yet.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Lytton will remain silent while I am on my feet.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, by leave, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 1.7 a.m. (Friday).