

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 4 MARCH 1975

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 4 MARCH 1975

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S SEPARATE REPORT

DEPARTMENTAL AND OTHER ACCOUNTS

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his separate report upon certain departmental and other accounts for the year 1973-74.

Ordered to be printed.

CIRCULATION AND COST OF "HANSARD"

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Chief Reporter, Parliamentary Reporting Staff, of his report on the circulation and cost of "Hansard" for the session of 1973-74.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Air Pollution Council of Queensland for the year 1973-74.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

Orders in Council under—

State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organization and Environmental Control Act 1971-1974.

Racing and Betting Act 1954-1974.

Irrigation Act 1922-1973 and the Water Act 1926-1973.

Water Act 1926-1973.

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1971.

Harbours Act 1955-1972.

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

Beach Protection Act 1968-1972.

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1974.

The Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Acts, 1944 to 1967.

Rural Fires Act 1946-1973.

Regulations under—

State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) Act 1960-1970.

Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1973.

Land Tax Act 1915-1974.

Irrigation Act 1922-1973.

Harbours Act 1955-1972.

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

Local Government Superannuation Act 1964-1974.

Primary Producers' Assistance Act 1972.

By-laws under—

Harbours Act 1955-1972.

Education Act 1964-1973 (North Brisbane College of Advanced Education).

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1974.

Reports—

Southern Electric Authority of Queensland, for the year 1973-74.

Law Reform Commission on a Bill to amend the Criminal Code in certain particulars.

Dumaresq-Barwon Border Rivers Commission, for the year 1973-74.

Special Report under the Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

NEW PORT FOR BRISBANE

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

(1) With reference to the proposed new Port of Brisbane at Fisherman Island, will the copy of the report laid on the Table on February 27 be made available in public places in the Bulimba, Lytton and Wynnum electorates so that residents who could be adversely affected by the port development can obtain factual information on the development?

(2) Will local residents whose homes may be affected by access roads and other port developments have the right to object to the proposals?

(3) What is the estimated daily number of semi-trailers and other transport vehicles which will use the port's roads?

(4) Will traffic to and from the port use the existing Lytton and Wynnum Roads or will a new road be built? If so, has consideration been given to a proposal for a new road along the foreshores far removed from residential areas?

(5) Will the interstate railway line be connected to the new port and, if so, have any land resumptions been mooted for road or rail purposes?

(6) Will local residents be given representation on the proposed new port authority?

Answers:—

(1) "Copies of the Port of Brisbane Strategic Plan can be made available on request to Public Libraries in the Bulimba, Lytton and Wynnum Electorates."

(2 to 4) "Planning of main arterial roads leading to the port area is the prerogative of the Brisbane City Council. Consultants with experience in the fields of engineering, economic and environmental planning, will be engaged by the Port Authority to produce a master plan

of development for the extended port facilities on the Fisherman Islands. These consultants would conform with the council's overall planning requirements for road location throughout the metropolitan area. It is estimated that up to 500 vehicles per day will travel to and from the port when the new terminals are in full operation."

(5) "The Port Authority considers interstate rail connection an essential facility. The route of this line has not yet been determined and so it is too early to forecast the need for land resumptions."

(6) "No."

MITSUBISHI AUTOMATIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM

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

With reference to the Mitsubishi Automatic Transport System (M.A.T.), in respect to which the Government last year invited a detailed proposal from the manufacturer's agent in Australia, John Holland (Constructions) Pty. Ltd., has this proposal yet been received and studied by the Government and, if not, when will it be received?

Answer:—

"No proposal has been received by me, nor am I in a position to indicate an anticipated date for such a submission."

COMMONWEALTH CHILD-CARE PROGRAMME

Mr. Lane, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Community and Welfare Services,—

In respect of the Commonwealth Government's child-care programme and the recent statements by Mr. Hayden, Minister for Social Security, and Miss Peggy Banff, of the Creche and Kindergarten Association, claiming lack of co-operation by the State Government, was a request received from the Commonwealth for the State to set up a consultative committee on the matter and, if so, has this yet been done?

Answer:—

"The comments on the issue of child care made by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, the Honourable W. Hayden, M.P., earlier this year had been unwarranted, mischievous and completely without foundation. It is a matter for some regret that a responsible Federal Minister should make such irresponsible statements and in so doing, seek to mislead parents on the issue of child care and pre-school education. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer, the Honourable Sir Gordon Chalk, K.B.E., LL.D., M.L.A., released a statement on January 20, 1975, in reply to the comments made by Mr. Hayden and Miss Banff wherein the position was

placed in its correct perspective and for the information of the Honourable Member, I quote the following from Sir Gordon's statement—"Sir Gordon said that the Prime Minister had been advised by the Premier that he (Sir Gordon) would be available for discussions with the Commonwealth Minister concerning the details of the program and a suggestion had been made as to the composition of the Queensland Committee to deal with the matter. This had not been entirely acceptable to the Prime Minister and, following the Prime Minister's letter indicating what would be acceptable to him, a further communication was forwarded to the Prime Minister a fortnight ago indicating Queensland's acceptance of his proposals and indicating that we would be approaching organisations representing interests which the Prime Minister had suggested should be represented on such a committee. These approaches had been made by letter on January 10. This shows quite clearly that Queensland has co-operated in this matter and that the matter of the formation of the consultation State committee is well in hand. However, in the meantime the Commonwealth Government had not followed up the offer that Sir Gordon would be available for discussions with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister. The claim by Miss Banff, of the Creche and Kindergarten Association, that the Queensland Government was jeopardising the development of child care centres, was equally misleading, Sir Gordon said. "The facts of the situation present a confused picture which is made more difficult by the reluctance of the Commonwealth to engage in frank discussion aimed at resolving points at issue". The main difficulties arose from two sources Sir Gordon said. First, Commonwealth policy on pre-school and child care had gone through a series of changes in the past six months and the present policy was not at all clear. Secondly, the Commonwealth had indicated that it wished to pursue a 'flexible' policy but the implications were that there were no firm bases for developing long-term plans. The Commonwealth had even indicated it might subsequently choose to withdraw funds from projects initially supported if its policy changed further. "This is no way to undertake solid planning for community needs", Sir Gordon said. Sir Gordon also noted that while there was a need for child care facilities, this had to be balanced by the need for pre-schools also. However, the Commonwealth had increasingly turned away from pre-school education. He said it was interesting to note that in spite of all the Commonwealth Government talk little of a concrete nature had been achieved. It had initially set up a Pre-Schools Committee and subsequently as a result of lobby group pressures asked the Social Welfare Commission and the Priorities Review staff to look into the matter. Finally it had set up a Childrens Commission with

most distorted terms of reference. 'It is surely significant that Mr. Hayden conveniently fails to mention how Queensland got on with the job of providing free pre-schooling, (aspects of which are unique throughout the world for their progressiveness) long before the Commonwealth came forward with ideas of any kind. In fact we had a large number of units in operation before the first of the promised money came to hand. Moreover, Queensland has not only maintained its high level of funding to approved kindergartens, but has continually increased its grants to the point where today we are providing 100 times, not per cent., but 100 times more than was given to kindergartens by any Labor administration in this State. Our policy is to continue to assist approved kindergartens to exist and progress in their own right, while State Pre-Schools are established throughout the entire State, not in any way in competition but to provide an additional high quality facility for those who choose to use it. Even the new child care centre opened by Mr. Hayden at Inala was funded not as a result of Labor Government initiatives but through legislation prepared by the previous Liberal-Country Party Federal Government.' Sir Gordon added. 'Since the date of the release of that Press statement, the Committee, the membership of which was satisfactory to the Prime Minister, has met and made recommendations to Cabinet. Such recommendations have been conveyed by the Honourable the Premier to the Honourable the Prime Minister.'

CONCESSIONS TO CATTLEMEN

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

(1) As a practical way of assisting cattle-men in Queensland, will he allow the sale of unbranded calves irrespective of weight, so long as they are still sucking their mother, and thus save branding costs?

(2) Will he waive the fee on the submissions of stock returns?

(3) Will he reduce the ridiculously inflated price of cattle dips?

Answers:—

(1) "I am prepared to look at individual applications for exemption from branding in the circumstances outlined by the Honourable Member for Mackay, also at an industry application if sponsored by an organisation such as the United Graziers' Association. In either event it would be on the understanding that cow and calf be sold together and not as separate lots."

(2) "It is not proposed to waive assessments levied on stock but it has been agreed that payment thereof be subject to short-term deferments and the item included in the low interest loan scheme already announced."

(3) "Whether the price of cattle dips is ridiculously inflated is of course, a matter of opinion. However, it is not within my authority to vary the price of these goods."

KALAMIA, INKERMAN AND PLEYSTOWE SUGAR MILLS

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

Is he prepared to provide financial backing for the canegrowers of the Kalamia, Inkerman and Pleystowe mills to purchase those mills on a co-operative basis from Australian Estates, similarly to that provided by previous Queensland Governments to other groups of growers in Queensland and, if so, in what way is he prepared to assist?

Answer:—

"I understand that representatives of cane growers supplying the three mills controlled by Australian Estates Company Ltd. saw my colleague, the Minister for Primary Industries, prior to his departure overseas. Mr. Sullivan pointed out to them that they would need to put forward a fully documented proposal if public monies or guarantees to the extent of \$47 million were to be involved. I would point out that it is almost 50 years since a Queensland Government provided financial assistance for the purchase or establishment of a sugar mill. Until such time as a definite proposal is put forward, I am unable to indicate what, if any, assistance could be given. I would point out for the Honourable Member's information that the Inkerman Mill is owned by Pioneer Sugar Mills Ltd. I presume the Honourable Member is referring to the Invicta Mill in his Question."

DRUG PROBLEMS

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

(1) How many prosecutions have been pursued by his department against drug pushers in the last 12 months?

(2) How many of these have resulted in convictions and what sentences were imposed?

(3) With the escalating drug problem in Brisbane, is a squad of 14 policemen adequate and would the morale of the squad be enhanced if numbers were increased and a rotating training scheme in drug problems for all police was instituted?

Answers:—

(1) "During the twelve month period February 1, 1974 to January 31, 1975, 74 prosecutions were undertaken in respect of offences involving possession of dangerous drugs for sale or supply."

(2) "Of the 74 prosecutions referred to above, 51 convictions were recorded, one person was acquitted and no evidence was offered on five charges. The 17 remaining charges have not been finalised. Of the 51 persons convicted, 25 persons were sentenced to imprisonment ranging from two and a-half months to five years, 19 of these persons receiving sentences of 12 months or more. Fines ranging from \$25 to \$900 were imposed in 20 instances, fines of over \$500 being imposed on 15 occasions. Four persons were admitted to probation, one admitted to the care of the Department of Children's Services and one person being discharged on entering into a bond."

(3) "Every member of the police force is charged with the responsibility of ensuring the laws of the land, irrespective of whether they apply to drugs or not or any other matter, are enforced. The number of persons on the drug squad therefore should not be the main factor in adequately coping with the drug problem. It is considered that the number of persons attached to the drug squad is adequate when viewed in the light of availability of personnel for over-all police enforcement. I have no knowledge that the morale of members of the drug squad is anything but high. Training of all members of the police force in matters relating to drugs is a continuing process within the Police Department."

BRISBANE PUBLIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM

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

(1) What is the current situation regarding the Transport Study for the Brisbane Metropolitan Area and has it produced a solution to rail-passenger transport problems, either with underground services or with above-ground monorail?

(2) As public transport, especially with buses as operated by local authorities, appears to be most inadequate in outer suburbs, what steps has his department taken to specifically correct this situation?

Answers:—

(1) "I am pleased to be able to report a considerable measure of achievement in the implementation of proposals for the upgrading of urban public transport in the Brisbane Metropolitan Area. The Metropolitan Transit Project Board has been constituted. An executive chairman with experience in transport in the United Kingdom has been appointed and has commenced duty. It is planned in co-operation with the Commonwealth to spend 70 to 100 million dollars on upgrading urban public transport in Brisbane over the next four to five years. The project is based on the electrification of 80 per cent. of the suburban rail network and includes features such as—additional

trackage on the northern suburban rail corridor; the cross-river rail link; the purchase of new electric passenger trains; additional parking facilities at several railway stations; the provision of facilities for bus transfers at stations; modern all-weather protective shelters for 'walk and ride' and 'kiss and ride' commuters; and the purchase of new and additional modern diesel buses for use by the Brisbane City Council, costing nearly seven million dollars. Construction of a tunnel as the first stage of the cross-river rail link is well under way. A consortium of consulting engineers has been appointed to design and supervise the construction of fixed works associated with the electrification project. I recently announced that nearly \$500,000 would be spent in the next five months on interchange facilities at eight Brisbane railway stations, namely—Oxley, Darra, Sandgate, Ferny Grove, Mitchelton, Nundah, Petrie and Enoggera. The interchange concept is a major support element in Brisbane's rail network and will provide improved transfer facilities for pedestrians and bus and car riders. Other Brisbane stations will be selected and submitted to the Metropolitan Transit Project Board for approval and it is anticipated that over two million dollars will be spent on Brisbane interchanges during the next few years. The Wilbur Smith Public Transportation Study contains a proposal for a city underground link to the electrified rail system but this is not included in the initial programmes. No recommendations favouring a monorail system have been submitted for metropolitan operations. However, I would invite the Honourable Members' attention to today's Question by the Honourable Member for Merthyr in respect to the Mitsubishi Automatic Transportation system which is not a monorail but an elevated system."

(2) "A considerable improvement should be evident as the interchange programme comes to fruition as it will enable a simplification and rationalisation of bus services to be put in hand in problem areas. The Government is taking positive steps to preserve the status and improve the performance of private operators and in co-operation with the Bus Proprietors' Association we are examining a scheme so that fares can be held and services will remain economically favourable."

DRUG SUPPLIES FOR CHEMISTS

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

(1) Is he aware that the Storemen and Packers' Union members have been on strike for two days, thereby delaying drug supplies to chemists?

(2) Is he also aware that from February 27 Queensland Druggists Ltd. is being picketed and that chemists who have contacted me cannot obtain urgent drugs?

(3) What action is proposed by his department in this important matter of maintaining health and essential services to the public, especially when life-saving drugs are involved?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "I am informed that the industrial dispute to which the Honourable Member refers has now been settled. Drug supplies to the Queensland hospitals system were not endangered in any way."

FLOOD PREVENTION, GREATER BRISBANE AND BRISBANE VALLEY AREAS

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

(1) What is the latest position concerning work in the Greater Brisbane and Brisbane Valley areas in relation to flood prevention?

(2) Has any money been set aside for such a project?

(3) For this financial year, how much money has been spent (a) directly and (b) indirectly on flood prevention and (c) how much other money has been allocated for this work?

(4) Of the money spent, how much was contributed by (a) the local authorities, (b) the State Government and (c) the Commonwealth Government?

(5) Of the money which is allocated for future work, how much is the responsibility of (a) the local authorities, (b) the State Government and (c) the Commonwealth Government?

Answers:—

(1) "As the Honourable Member would be aware, the Brisbane City Council is responsible for the works to be carried out on Oxley Creek, Kedron Brook and Breakfast Creek and their tributaries. The Queensland Government commissioned consulting engineers to produce preliminary drawings for works on these creeks and subsequently handed these over to the City Council to be used as a basis for the preparation of working drawings and contract documents with a request that all works be completed in about five years. As early as December 1972 the State Government requested the Commonwealth Government to contribute to the cost of these works on the basis of 40 per cent. Commonwealth, 40 per cent. State and 20 per cent. City Council. However, as no statement of policy or commitment was forthcoming, it was decided in November 1973 that, to avoid inordinate delays, the State and the Brisbane City Council would go ahead on the basis of the State subsidising the cost at the rate of 33½ per cent. In December 1974 the Prime Minister finally agreed to the Commonwealth

meeting 40 per cent. of the cost and the State Government then agreed to match the 40 per cent., leaving the City Council to meet the remaining 20 per cent. I would point out that this arrangement is conditional on the completion of a satisfactory agreement between the two Governments and negotiations are proceeding in this regard. Work has progressed to date to the point where the City Council has received tenders for a new dam on Enoggera Creek and the planning and design of other works is well in hand. The Wivenhoe Dam will provide also for flood mitigation for the Brisbane River. Design work has commenced, resumptions are proceeding at a satisfactory rate and necessary relocation of services (roads, bridges, etc.) are in hand."

(2) "In the current financial year, the State Government has allocated \$5,270,000 for Wivenhoe Dam and the Brisbane City Council has provided \$2,666,625 for works connected with the Brisbane creeks. As the position presently stands pending finalisation of the agreement with the Commonwealth, the State will reimburse the Council one-third of its expenditure on approved works."

(3) "(a) To February 27 expenditure of State funds on Wivenhoe Dam amounted to \$2,965,749. The latest figures we have on Brisbane City Council expenditure indicate that to January 31 \$770,905 had been spent. (b and c) I am not clear on the meaning of the Honourable Member's Questions but I believe that I have effectively answered them in the earlier part of this reply."

(4) "(a) Two-thirds of the approved Brisbane City Council expenditure. (b) All Wivenhoe Dam expenditure and one-third approved Brisbane City Council expenditure. (c) Nil."

(5) "The existing allocations for the work on Brisbane Creeks have been made on the assumption of Brisbane City Council meeting two-thirds and the State one-third. This will, of course, be subject to adjustment in terms of the proposed Commonwealth/State agreement and it could be expected that such adjustment would operate retrospectively in respect of all expenditure on the works. Cost of financing the Wivenhoe Dam is presently accepted by the State as its responsibility pending the outcome of an approach to the Commonwealth for assistance and discussions that are taking place with local authorities regarding the operation, control and financing arrangements."

USE OF BRISBANE RIVER FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked
The Minister for Marine Services,—

As many rivers in other parts of the world are extensively used for the transport of passengers and cargo, thus relieving congestion on the highways and roads

in those areas, will he initiate an inquiry into the feasibility of a much greater use of the Brisbane River and associated waterways for public transport and commerce?

Answer:—

“A study of the potential of the Brisbane River and its contribution to urban public transport was referred to by the Honourable the Minister for Transport in his Answer to the Honourable the Member for Merthyr on September 3, 1974, to a Question in this House and I would refer the Honourable Member to Hansard of that date. The use of the river to handle port cargo will be included in a study about to be commissioned by my Department of Harbours and Marine to prepare a five- and fifteen-year plan for the port of Brisbane.”

PLAYING FIELDS FOR BULIMBA STATE SCHOOL PUPILS

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

Concerning my request of September last year to the previous Minister for Education to have an area of land off Lytton Road, Bulimba, made into recreation and sporting fields for Bulimba State School pupils, what is the present position?

Answer:—

“Investigations are being made into the possibility of acquiring additional land for the Bulimba State School, particularly the undeveloped land owned by the Brisbane City Council at the corner of Taylor Street and Lytton Road. No decision has yet been made, but on receipt of a definite proposal for acquisition the Honourable Member will be advised.”

FINANCIAL AID TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES

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

(1) With reference to the article in *The Courier-Mail* of February 27, referring to the serious financial plight of local authorities in Queensland, what immediate action does he contemplate to overcome the shortfall in finance, particularly to those fifty shires and municipalities where little or no distribution of funds was made?

(2) If unemployment in a shire is the key to obtaining finance, will the lack of funds create unemployment and likewise an escalating problem?

Answers:—

(1) “I assume that the Honourable Member is referring to the recent distribution of unemployment relief grants by the State. Other unemployment relief moneys are of course being distributed by

the Commonwealth Government under its Regional Employment Development (RED) Scheme. Whilst the deficiencies and inconsistencies of the RED Scheme are obvious, many Local Authorities will no doubt receive grants under that scheme. For additional immediate assistance to Local Authorities, an Interim Committee has been constituted, consisting of representatives of the Treasury and Local Government Departments, and the Local Government Association of Queensland, with a view to an urgent recommendation to Cabinet on the distribution of a sum of \$3.5 million to Local Authorities this financial year. This distribution will be in the form of unconditional revenue support grants. Annual allocations are proposed for the year 1975-76. I must stress that these funds are additional to moneys already made available to Local Authorities under the State's capital works subsidy scheme.”

(2) “The number of registered unemployed is always an important factor in determining allocation of unemployment relief grants, but it is an unfortunate defect of the Commonwealth's RED Scheme that Local Authorities have had to retrench experienced staff (including staff in the Local Government Superannuation Scheme) due to lack of funds, and then seek to obtain RED funds to employ other inexperienced people from the unemployment register. However the State distribution has been given greater flexibility to avoid such retrenchments as far as possible. The problem of retrenchments due to inflation will need to be met in a variety of ways, including greater assistance by the State and Commonwealth Governments, higher Loan Council allocations, and not excluding higher rates and charges. I cannot see any simple solution to the problem.”

TRUANCY IN SCHOOLS

(a) **Mr. Dean**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) What were the total numbers of truancies reported in (a) 1973 and (b) 1974 in (i) primary schools and (ii) high schools?

(2) What measures are taken to deal with persistent truancy?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) “Reports of truancies would be dealt with in a number of ways, according to the circumstances in each case. A case of mild truancy—‘wagging it’ for the day on a riverbank—would be dealt with by the school principal and/or parents, and the punishment would no doubt fit the crime. A more serious case might be referred to the Police who could, if the circumstances warranted it, prosecute the child's parents for failing to comply

with the provisions of the Education Act. I myself am authorised to launch such prosecutions if necessary. Where a child persistently truants, welfare officers or the Juvenile Aid Bureau could be called in to assist. Again depending on the circumstances, the child might be given medical or psychiatric treatment for say, school phobia, or he or she might be taken into care and control by the Director of Children's Services. If the child were near the school-leaving age, and supporting medical or other evidence suggested that exemption should be granted, I would consider exemption for the child. Because truancy cases are handled in different ways and at a variety of levels, no statistics on truancy reports are kept in my department."

(b) **Mr. Dean**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Community and Welfare Services,—

(1) What numbers of truancy cases did his department handle in (a) 1973 and (b) 1974, in (i) primary schools and (ii) high schools?

(2) How many cases were referred to the Juvenile Aid Bureau?

Answers:—

(1) "Truancy is a matter which is dealt with under both the Education Act and the Children's Services Act. As defined by the Children's Services Act, a child who 'being under the school leaving age as provided for from time to time by law is regularly absent from school without reasonable and adequate excuse' is deemed to be in need of care and protection. In the 12 months to June 30, 1973, 14 applications were made to Children's Courts for orders for care and protection alleging these grounds. They were in respect to 9 males and 5 females. To June 30, 1974, 9 such applications were made (8 males and 1 female). Details of the age and sex of these children are in table 15 of the Annual Report of the Director, Department of Children's Services for the two respective years. Complaints to the Department of Children's Services alleging neglect of children in which truancy was the main concern numbered 122 in 1972-73 and 80 in 1973-74. Other cases which came before courts or were referred to the department for any one or more of a number of reasons could have involved truancy. Poor school achievement and/or truancy are in evidence in a significant number of children who are admitted to care and protection, placed under supervision, or committed to the care and control of the department. It is therefore impossible to quote a realistic numerical picture of the true incidence of truancy in the community. No separate figures are kept in relation to primary or high school children."

(2) "In the first six months of the Juvenile Aid Bureau's being part of the Department of Children's Services, to June 30, 1973, members of the Juvenile Aid Bureau cautioned 55 males and 27 females for habitual truancy. The bureau did not bring any children before the court specifically alleging truancy in this period. In the 12 months to June 30, 1974, members of the bureau cautioned 66 males and 39 females and brought one male before the court for habitual truancy. As stated in the 1974 Annual Report of the Director, 'a large number of children coming to the notice of the bureau were truanting from school at the time of committing offences. The truancy figures quoted refer only to those cases where truancy was the only known problem at the time of the complaint.'"

EMPLOYMENT OF APPRENTICES

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

(1) What is the latest situation regarding applications from employers for permission to retrench apprentices or employ them for less than their full working week?

(2) What has been the result of the dedicated efforts of the Apprenticeship Office to place apprentices?

(3) How many were allotted in January and how did that compare with January, 1974?

(4) What was the total allotted in the seven months to January 31 and what is the comparison with a similar period in the previous year?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "I would like to stress that every effort is being made by the apprenticeship authorities to ensure apprenticeships are continued. Any retrenchments of apprentices or the employment of apprentices for less than their full working week have been caused by the monetary policy of the Commonwealth Government thus depressing the building industry and by its tariff policy in allowing a flood of cheap furniture imports against which local manufacturers are unable to compete. The following details are relevant to this matter and relate to the period ended February 20, 1975—number of employers who have sought assistance, 129; number of apprentices involved, 506; number of apprentices placed in alternative employment—(a) without subsidies, 3; and (b) with subsidies under the National Employment and Training System (NEAT), 65; total, 68; number of apprentices continued in employment with subsidies, 216; number of apprentices placed in technical college classes with subsidies, 65; and number of

apprentices still in employment and whose cases are under investigation in regard to applications for assistance received from employers, 157; total, 506. I am very happy to say that in January, 1974, 456 apprentices were allotted by the Apprenticeship Office, but in January, 1975, 510 apprentices were allotted. Queensland employers should be congratulated that between July 1, 1973 and January 31, 1974, 1,725 apprentices were allotted by the Apprenticeship Office, but during the period July 1, 1974 to January 31, 1975, 2,041 apprentices were allotted despite the prevailing economic problems."

ATTENDANCES AT STATE HIGH SCHOOLS

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

In 1974 and 1975, how many students attended State high schools, and at which schools, after the completion of their primary studies at Seven Hills, Mayfield, Cannon Hill, Carina, Belmont, Camp Hill, Mt. Gravatt East and Seville Road State primary schools?

Answer:—

"I table the information sought by the Honourable Member."

Paper.—Whereupon Mr. Newbery laid upon the Table of the House the information referred to.

BEEF LOAN SCHEME

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

(1) With reference to the State Government Beef Loan Scheme announced on February 18, which indicated that producer loans would be made available at 2½ per cent. interest, what is the total amount available and how much of this amount is being provided from money distributed to Queensland at the recent Premiers' Conference by the Commonwealth Government?

(2) What are the specific details of the terms and conditions of such loans, in view of the lack of information presently available to beef producers?

(3) How many applications for loans have been (a) received, (b) granted to date?

Answer:—

"I would ask the Honourable Member for Rockhampton to re-direct his Question to my colleague the Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service."

MOCK AUCTIONS

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

(1) With reference to an article in the *Sunday Sun* of February 23 claiming that the law on mock auctions was being blatantly disregarded, will he carry out an immediate investigation into these claims in order to protect unsuspecting consumers?

(2) Can mock auctions still be legal in Queensland regardless of the 1973 legislation if a large sign stating that "the sale is not an auction" is displayed at the site of the sale?

Answers:—

(1) "The subject matter of the article to which the Honourable Member refers was already being investigated prior to the Question asked by the Honourable Member."

(2) "No."

TRIALS LISTED FOR SUPREME AND DISTRICT COURTS HEARING

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

(1) In view of the recent publicity surrounding the business of the courts in Queensland and, in particular, attending the criminal jurisdictions of these courts, how many (a) civil and (b) criminal cases are at present listed for hearing in (i) the Northern District, (ii) the Central District and (iii) the Southern District of the Supreme Court?

(2) How many (a) civil and (b) criminal cases are at present listed for hearing in (i) the Northern District, (ii) the Central District and (iii) the Southern District of the District Court?

(3) Do these figures represent a sudden upsurge in the numbers of civil and criminal trials awaiting hearing in the courts of this State?

Answers:—

(1) "Time has not allowed information to be obtained from the various district registries so that the particulars furnished herein for civil matters refer only to Brisbane, Rockhampton and Townsville. Cases listed for hearing at the Supreme Court are as follows—

	(i) North- ern District	(ii) Central District	(iii) South- ern District
(a) Civil—			
Matters for which dates of hearing have been allocated	27
Matters for which dates of hearing have not been allocated ..	61	24	318
(Current sittings of the Court at Rockhampton have just been completed).			
(b) Criminal	25	5	49 "

(2) "Details in respect of the District Court are—

	(i) North- ern District	(ii) Central District	(iii) South- ern District
(a) Civil— Matters for which dates of hearing have been allocated ..	18	..	73
Matters for which dates of hearing have not been allocated ..	200	61	1,061
(b) Criminal	72	37	201 "

(3) "In respect of the civil jurisdiction of the Supreme Court there has been a substantial and gradual increase in the matters entered for hearing in Brisbane. There has been no sudden upsurge in Rockhampton. The figures for Townsville are higher than usual but it is considered that these might not indicate a permanent trend. In respect of the civil jurisdiction of the District Court, there has been an upsurge in the number of actions commenced and therefore in the number of matters awaiting trial in Brisbane. There has been no sudden upsurge in Rockhampton but it is considered there has been a sudden upsurge in Townsville. In respect of criminal jurisdiction a sudden upsurge in matters awaiting hearing in the Southern District of the Supreme Court is indicated, and a more gradual upsurge in the Southern District of the District Court."

PROBATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. Scott-Young, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) What amount of money was collected by the State during the financial year 1973-74 for probate and succession duties?

(2) Will he give a dissection of this tax in respect of the numbers of estates and the amounts paid in the various brackets which attract the duties?

Answers:—

(1) "\$21,114,240.77 (as shown in the printed Estimates for the current financial year)."

(2) "The amount represents duties paid on estates of previous years as well as provisional payments of duty on estates which were not finally assessed at June 30, 1974. The information sought is not available. However, the following is a

schedule prepared from statistical records of the net value of estates which were assessed during 1973-74—

Net Value of Estate	Number of Assessments
\$1,000 or under	296
Over \$ 1,000 up to \$ 2,000 ..	301
Over \$ 2,000 up to \$ 5,000 ..	954
Over \$ 5,000 up to \$ 10,000 ..	1,698
Over \$ 10,000 up to \$ 20,000 ..	2,229
Over \$ 20,000 up to \$ 30,000 ..	820
Over \$ 30,000 up to \$ 40,000 ..	328
Over \$ 40,000 up to \$ 60,000 ..	309
Over \$ 60,000 up to \$100,000 ..	231
Over \$100,000 up to \$150,000 ..	116
Over \$150,000 up to \$200,000 ..	38
Over \$200,000	58
Total	7,378

Of this number, 2,744 estates were exempt from duty."

IMPORTS OF SOUTH AMERICAN CANNED MEAT

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

(1) Is he aware that canned meat is being imported into Australia from South American countries?

(2) As the dreaded foot and mouth disease is prevalent in some of those countries, can he give an assurance that there is no possibility whatsoever of this disease being introduced into Australia from such sources?

(3) What steps can be taken to prohibit these imports?

Answers:—

(1) "I am aware that subject to prescribed certification canned meat can be imported into Australia from any other country in the world. I therefore accept the Honourable Member for Balonne's assertion that canned meat is being imported from South America."

(2) "Prescribed certification is to the effect that: (i) the animals from which the canned meat derived were subjected to ante mortem and post mortem veterinary inspection at the time of slaughter and were found free from infectious and contagious disease; and (ii) in the course of manufacture every portion of the contents of the cans has been heated to a temperature of not less than 100°C. Details of the temperature of the heat applied to the cans and the length of time for which the cans were exposed to that

heat, have to be supplied and the Chief Quarantine Officer at the Australian end has to be satisfied that they were such as to ensure of the heat treatment requirement being met. In these circumstances, I am assured by my departmental veterinary advisers that there is no risk of Foot and Mouth Disease being introduced per medium of canned meat."

(3) "Prohibition of imports of canned meat is a matter for the Commonwealth Government. As I have already indicated such a prohibition could not be supported on the grounds of disease risk."

FIAT CARS SPARE PARTS SHORTAGE

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

(1) Is he aware that the Fiat car distributor, Annand & Thompson Pty. Ltd., is selling cars at 17 agencies and outlets in Queensland whilst holding minimal or inadequate supplies of spare parts?

(2) If so, and as their advertising suggests otherwise, is he aware that many people, some even covered under warranty, have had their cars held in repair yards awaiting parts for months, with no protection from the elements?

(3) In the interests of industry in this State, will he take the appropriate remedial measures to allay the fears of Fiat car owners?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "No."

(3) "If the Honourable Member is aware of persons whose Fiat vehicles have been held in repair yards for months awaiting parts, he might consider suggesting to them that they submit all details of the matter to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, in order that appropriate enquiries may be made on their behalf."

DAIRYING AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

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

(1) To what degree did butter production fall, and how many dairy factories closed, in 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74?

(2) What acreage has been lost to dairying and what was the total acreage and number of farms which were amalgamated in those years?

(3) Has whole-milk production increased and is the per capita consumption of milk and dairy products generally increasing?

(4) Are New Zealand dairy products imported into this State and, if so, in what quantity?

(5) What is the estimated quantity of butter and other dairy products imported into Queensland from other States?

Answers:—

(1) "The production of butter and the number of butter factories operating in each year is shown in the following table:—

Year	Tons Manufactured	No. of Butter Plants
1970-71 ..	18,442	32
1971-72 ..	17,360	31
1972-73 ..	15,838	30
1973-74 ..	11,514	21 "

(2) "Figures on the acreage lost to dairying are not readily accessible. A survey in 1971-72 indicated that a total of 182,000 acres was lost to dairying in that year. Also during that year, the number of farm amalgamations and acreage involved was as follows:—

—	Area	No. of Farms
	Acres	
Amalgamated with dairy farms	38,000	129
Amalgamated with non-dairy farms	20,000	58 "

(3) "The amount of whole-milk produced has increased slightly. Total farm production during the period 1970-71 to 1973-74 is shown below:—

Year	Gross Butterfat Production	Total Market Milk Used
	lb.	Gal.
1970-71 ..	61,997,073	49,956,776
1971-72 ..	58,697,619	48,764,064
1972-73 ..	58,432,162	52,238,027
1973-74 ..	51,078,553	51,820,498

The per capita consumption of milk decreased by 4.5 per cent. during 1972-73 due mainly to the dropping of school milk which accounted for 4 per cent. of the decrease. During 1973-74 the consumption of milk dropped by a further 5 per cent. due probably to the state of the economy, flood problems and strikes which held up supply. The per capita consumption of butter is falling steadily and the consumption of cheese is increasing steadily. Also the amount of dairy product going into ice cream and yoghurt etc. is increasing."

(4) "The total import of dairy products into Australia from New Zealand consists of approximately 1,000 tons of cheddar cheese per year. A small quantity of this cheese is probably being marketed in Queensland."

(5) "In 1973-74 approximately 8,000 tons of butter were brought from interstate, the majority of which came from Victoria. Some movement of cheese, ice cream, flavoured milk lines, etc. occurs between States. No record is available of this movement."

STOCK RETURN LEVIES ON CATTLE GROWERS

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

(1) For the financial year ended June 30, 1974, how much did his department receive from cattle growers as a result of stock return levies?

(2) For what specific purpose are cattle growers taxed by way of this levy and on what are the moneys received from these taxes expended?

(3) In view of the current beef crisis and of the Government's claimed concern for cattle growers, will the Government act to relieve the plight of cattle growers by abolishing this levy?

Answers:—

(1) "It is not practicable to give a figure for cattle to the exclusion of horses, sheep and pigs. However, assessments levied on stock in 1973-74 realised an amount of \$1,490,799.60."

(2) "Specifically, assessments levied on stock are applied to the payment of all expenses incurred by the Governor in Council or the Minister in the execution of the *Stock Act* 1915-1974 as well as to the provision of such husbandry services to the cattle, sheep and pig industries and to such other animal industries as the Minister may from time to time determine. I must mention that assessments levied on stock are endowed from Consolidated Revenue at the rate of \$2 for every \$1 collected. Details of the purposes to which the Stock Fund is applied will be found in the Queensland Agricultural Journal for January-February 1975 at page 50."

(3) "It is not proposed to abolish stock assessments but short term deferments of payment and inclusion of this item in the low interest loan scheme for beef producers have been agreed upon during the present market crisis situation."

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS FOR PALMERSTON HIGHWAY

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

As the Palmerston Highway needs rebuilding at the earliest possible time because it is a very important outlet for various products from the Atherton Tableland and is likely to be closed during periods of heavy and prolonged rains and thus cause great inconvenience and added expense to the various industries, will he make urgent representations to the Commonwealth Government for financial grants for this road?

Answer:—

"An additional \$84,000 has been allocated from funds received at the recent Premiers' Conference and works on this road will be given priority consistent with future funds. I can assure the Honourable Member I will continue to press for adequate funds from the Commonwealth Government on this and other important arterial roads."

NATIONAL COMPANIES BILL

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

(1) In view of the intention of the Commonwealth Government to introduce a National Companies Bill this year, has he yet received from the Commonwealth Government any details of the proposed Bill?

(2) If so, does the Bill conflict with the constitutional rights of the States?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "Judging by the contents of the Corporations and Securities Bill, which is now before Federal Parliament, I have little doubt that the National Companies Bill will interfere in areas of traditional and accepted State jurisdiction as well as creating unnecessary duplication and confusion in the community. There is absolutely no justification for a centralist-oriented National Companies Bill. Through the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission, of which Queensland is a foundation member, uniformity in Company Law is rapidly being achieved in the few areas where differences remain."

LIMITATION ON BENEFICIARIES UNDER AGE OF MAJORITY ACT

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

Will there be any limitation on persons between 18 and 21 years benefiting directly and immediately from estates or trusts after the Age of Majority Act comes into force?

Answer:—

“After the commencement of the Age of Majority Act it will be possible for a person 18 years or over to give a valid receipt to a trustee for exchange of a property held in trust. However the age at which a beneficiary becomes entitled to receive money or property held in trust depends upon the wording or construction of the will or other instruments creating the trust. For example if a testator who died in 1970 gave a legacy ‘to X’ (who happened to be under 21) the personal representatives of the testator would not have paid it over to him until he was 21 and able to give a valid receipt. After the commencement of this Act the legatee if 18 or over would be freed from this disability and could thus give a valid discharge because he would be no longer an infant. However, if a testator made a will in 1969 which gave a share of his estate ‘to X on attaining his majority’, X will only take on attaining the age of 21. This will be so even if the testator does not die until 1980. It is the date of execution of the will and not the testator’s death which is relevant. If the provisions of the Act were otherwise the effect would be to defeat the testator’s intentions. Money being held as a result of an order or directions, such as a Court Order, in relation to money recovered in any proceedings or as a result of any compromise or settlement of a claim for money or damages can be paid to an 18 year old after the commencement of the Act.”

APPOINTMENTS TO HIGH COURT

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

- (1) How many Queenslanders have been appointed to the High Court of Australia since its inception?
- (2) When was a Queenslander last appointed to the High Court?
- (3) How many of the current High Court Judges were chosen from the States of South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania?

Answers:—

(1) “Three—Sir Samuel Walker Griffith, Sir William Flood Webb, and Sir Harry Talbot Gibbs.”

(2) “Sir Harry Talbot Gibbs in 1970.”

(3) “None.”

NEW STATE SCHOOL, BAYVIEW HEIGHTS, SOUTH CAIRNS

Mr. K. J. Hooper for **Mr. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

- (1) In view of the increasing student numbers at the two existing high schools in the Cairns area, what is the position in

relation to the programming for establishment of the third high school at Bayview Heights, South Cairns?

(2) Has tenure for the site been secured, access granted and planning approved and, if so, when will construction commence?

(3) On what future date can student enrolment be expected for the new school year?

Answers:—

(1) “There are no plans for the establishment of a new State high school at Bayview Heights in the immediate future.”

(2) “Tenure for the site has not yet been secured. The Department of Works has requested the Land Administration Commission to take action to secure the site by the process of resumption.”

(3) “Predicted enrolments for the two State high schools in Cairns for 1976 are: Cairns, 1185; and Trinity Bay, 1200. Principals of both schools will conduct an enrolment survey for 1976 some time during the third term of this year.”

BOAT HARBOUR, CAIRNS

Mr. K. J. Hooper for **Mr. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Marine Services,—

(1) Further to his Answer to my Question on September 4, 1974, have applications for registration to receive tendering documents closed for the proposed construction of the boat harbour at Cairns?

(2) If so, when were tenders called, when was the contract let, who were the successful tenderers and when will the work commence?

(3) What is the present estimated cost and what are the approximate dates for completion on each aspect of the contract?

(4) How many stages of the overall project does this contract cover?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “Tenders were invited from registered tenderers on November 13, 1974, and close on July 17, 1975. The registered tenderers were:—Dillingham Development Company; Thiess Properties Pty. Ltd.; and Broadlands Properties Limited.”

(3) “This information can only be determined after tenders close.”

(4) “The whole project has been included in the tender documents.”

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

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

(1) How many cases has the Small Claims Tribunal dealt with since July 1974?

(2) Of these cases, how many were settled between the parties rather than by official decision?

(3) How many cases have been heard in Rockhampton and what were the results of those cases in brief?

Answers:—

(1) "739 claims have been finalised by the Small Claims Tribunal for the period July 1, 1974 to and including February 27, 1975. 958 claims were filed in the Registry during this period."

(2) "317 claims were withdrawn by the claimants."

(3) "The Referee has visited Rockhampton on three occasions since the Tribunal commenced and 16 claims have been finalised at that centre. Of the 16 claims finalised, eight orders were made in favour of claimants, seven were withdrawn and one dismissed."

V. & N. HOME IMPROVERS PTY. LTD.,
BRISBANE

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

Is a firm known as V. & N. Home Improvers Pty. Ltd., Brisbane, registered with the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and, if so, who are the directors of the firm and what is the paid-up capital?

Answer:—

"A company V. & N. Home Improvers Pty. Limited was incorporated in this State on January 10, 1973. According to the latest returns filed in the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, the directors of the company are Vincenzo Festa and Maria Festa of 26 Franklin Street, Nundah, and the paid-up capital of the company is \$2."

(b) **Mr. Yewdale**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

(1) Has the Consumer Affairs Bureau received any complaints about a firm known as V. & N. Home Improvers Pty. Ltd., Brisbane, and, if so, how many and what was the nature of the complaints?

(2) What are the results of the endeavours of the bureau to resolve the complaints?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Except in special circumstances in which it is considered that the naming of a trader in this House is warranted, it is not my intention to provide details of complaints received by the Consumer Affairs Bureau against any organisation or firm. The fact that one or even a number of complaints may have been received by the Bureau against a particular enterprise does not necessarily indicate that it is operating in an unethical or unlawful manner, and it is clear that in certain circumstances the supplying of details concerning complaints received by the Bureau could condemn a trader without justification. In so far as complaints received in regard to the firm mentioned by the Honourable Member, the Consumer Affairs Bureau was able to obtain full redress in some cases whilst with respect to other cases, the situation was either clarified or the complainant advised to seek legal advice or to lodge a claim with the Small Claims Tribunal and in some instances claims were lodged accordingly."

FLOODING OF COMET RIVER BRIDGE,
CAPRICORN HIGHWAY

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

(1) Is he aware of the flooding of the Comet River bridge on the Capricorn Highway for a period of six weeks over the Christmas holidays and that the bridge is again flooded, which could seriously jeopardise the operations of the relatively new coach service to the central highlands?

(2) What action will he take to remedy this recurring trouble spot?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "I have already taken action to have the planning for a high level bridge over the Comet and Dawson Rivers expedited so that when funds are available the construction can commence."

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY
COMMISSION

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

Is he aware that a Bill was introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament last week to create an Australian National Railway Commission? If so, what effect will this legislation have on the operations of the Queensland Railways and other forms of transport within Queensland?

Answer:—

"Yes. The main purpose of the Bill is to provide for the establishment of the Australian National Railways Commission

and to broaden the functions and responsibilities of the Commonwealth Railways (to be termed the Australian National Railways) including the take-over of State Railways when required. The Bill also provides for general amendments to the present Act to bring it into line with current commercial practices. While Queensland has no intention of handing over its railway system to the Commonwealth Government I am concerned that railway operations and indeed those of established road transport services could be affected by provisions in the Bill which purport to empower the Commission to transport passengers and goods by land otherwise than by rail. An examination of the Bill conveys the impression that these amendments give the Commission very wide powers and its entry into passenger and goods haulage by road might be anticipated also in States where the Commission does not operate a railway system. It would seem the Bill gives the Commission the right to operate road services in a very open field—buses, taxis, hire cars and trucks—possibly without having to observe the requirements of existing State laws in the matter of the payment of relevant fees and charges. My concern in this regard stems from the inclusion of a section in the Bill which will grant exemption from all taxation. Furthermore, as the provisions of the Bill appear to encroach on States' Rights it will be closely scrutinised. I would hope that during the Debate in Federal Parliament the intentions of the Bill will be adequately and satisfactorily clarified and if necessary restated in order to give assurance that the rights of the States will be protected and no injustice is done to other operators of transport services. I am sure Honourable Members on both sides of the House share my feelings of grave concern that much of the Bill represents another attempt by the Commonwealth Government to infringe State's Rights."

FORFEITURE OF GENERAL ELECTION DEPOSITS

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

(1) How many unsuccessful candidates forfeited their deposits at the General Election on December 7, 1974?

(2) What was the total revenue gained from the forfeiture of the deposits?

(3) How many unsuccessful candidates at the 1972 General Election forfeited their deposits?

Answers:—

(1) "63."

(2) "\$2,520."

(3) "77."

APPOINTMENT OF NURSES

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

(1) How many nurses were recruited from overseas for service in Government hospitals during 1974?

(2) In the same period, how many student nurses in Government hospitals completed their training and obtained qualifying certificates?

(3) How many of these had their appointment as a sister deferred and for what periods?

Answers:—

(1) "Forty-nine registered Nurses took up duty in Queensland Hospitals during 1974 as a result of the Department's recruitment campaign in Canada. Of course many registered Nurses from overseas who have come to Queensland of their own volition are working in Queensland Hospitals but the numbers are not known."

(2) "498."

(3) "The Department is unaware of any such instances and in any case the information is not available in the Department."

COMMONWEALTH-STATE CO-OPERATION ON DRUG-TRAFFICKING CONTROL

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

With reference to an article in *The Courier-Mail* of February 27 headed "Coastguard for drug control", as the matters emanate from a recent Senate Standing Committee Report on Health and Welfare, what overtures have been made by the Commonwealth Government to appropriate Queensland Government authorities for co-operation and advice on these important social issues, which are presently well catered for in Queensland?

Answer:—

"Until the particular report is studied it is difficult to comment specifically. Narcotics smuggling is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. However, in the other areas of drug control Queensland has been and is very active. Under the previous Federal Government, the National Standing Control Committee on Drugs of Dependence was established, and Queensland has always sent representatives from the Police and Health Departments to meetings of the Committee and has implemented the recommendations emanating from the Committee's deliberations. Queensland workers have been active in kidney research and our Division of Youth Welfare and Guidance is one of the foremost in Australia in the matter of counselling parents and children with psychiatric problems. Should an approach be made

from the Commonwealth, the Queensland Health Department would be interested in any plans to improve the health of Queenslanders who suffer from these conditions."

APPLICATIONS FOR PHARMACEUTICAL
ADVISER

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) How many applications were received for the position of Pharmaceutical Adviser to the Government?

(2) Were all applicants afforded an interview and, if not, what was the reason?

(3) Who was the successful applicant?

Answers:—

(1) "Eighteen."

(2) "The Director-General of Health and Medical Services appointed a Selection Committee to advise him in this matter. Members were—Deputy Medical Superintendent, Royal Brisbane Hospital; Senior Health Officer, State Health Department; The Acting Head of the Pharmacy Department, University of Queensland; and The Chief Inspector of Drugs and Poisons, State Health Department. The Committee first carefully examined all applications to determine possible appointees. All Queensland applicants whose qualifications and experience in any way indicated they might be suitable for the position were interviewed. Three interstate pharmacists with outstanding qualifications and experience were also interviewed."

(3) "The position was first offered to Mr. K. M. Henderson who declined the appointment. It was then offered to Mr. Frank Ryan who holds a Diploma of Hospital Pharmacy Administration, is a Fellow of the Society of Hospital Pharmacists, an Associate of the Australian Institute of Management, and at the present time Chief Pharmacist, Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne. Mr. Ryan has indicated his acceptance."

TRAFFIC SIGNALS, IPSWICH ROAD—
RUDD STREET INTERSECTION, OXLEY

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) Is he aware that traffic signals were promised for the Ipswich Road and Rudd Street, Oxley, intersection during the 1972-73 financial year?

(2) Is he aware that this accident-prone corner is one of the ten busiest intersections in Queensland?

(3) Has money now been allocated from the Commonwealth Government to install the traffic signals?

(4) In view of the continuing high accident rate at this intersection, will he expedite the installation of the traffic signals?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "A scheme for this intersection has only just been approved on February 13, 1975, by the Commonwealth Government after several months of discussion. The work will be commenced this financial year."

MARANOVA RIVER WEIR

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Water Resources,—

What was the result of the investigation carried out by the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply into the proposal to build a weir on the Maranoa River near Mitchell?

Answer:—

"In the course of preliminary surveys along the Maranoa River in 1947 a number of possible weir sites were noted in the vicinity of Mitchell. Results showed that storage capacities would be limited to about 500 acre feet which is considered inadequate for irrigation and probably insufficient for industrial purposes. A number of sites on the river some 10 miles upstream of the town and on a tributary have also been briefly examined. Insufficient information is available about these sites to enable their potential to be assessed at this stage. I would suggest to the honourable member that, if he wants to learn something about the West, he should talk to the honourable member for Warrego."

BURNETT RIVER BRIDGE, BUNDABERG

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

(1) Has maintenance work on the traffic bridge over the Burnett River at Bundaberg either ceased or been cut back? If so, what is the reason?

(2) When will a new bridge be built to replace the present one to relieve the traffic congestion?

Answers:—

(1) "Maintenance has had to be limited on this bridge due to rising costs and the reduced allocation of Commonwealth funds on rural arterial roads. A recent allocation of funds for unemployment relief may allow some additional work to be carried out on the Burnett River bridge in the near future."

(2) "The severe reduction in Commonwealth funds for rural arterial roads does not allow a new bridge to be programmed at present."

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE FOR THE ACHIEVEMENT OF HUMAN POTENTIAL

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

(1) What are his department's views on the Australian Institute for the Achievement of Human Potential?

(2) Does he intend to have the methods used evaluated so that the Government can provide assistance to families who desire to go to America for initial treatment and also to visit specialists from America in Brisbane to continue with the treatment?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "This Institute for the Achievement of Human Potential was established some twenty years ago in Philadelphia and is known briefly as the Doman/Delacato method. One would expect that if their claims for its effectiveness had been substantiated over this long period then the method would be more generally used. There is nothing new in what is done other than to involve willing parents in a highly intensive programme. Only a relatively few parents have the interest, motivation and the resources to use the programme which is said to be continuous activity in one form or another for the child over some eighteen hours each day and every day. To achieve this the parent has to organise a work-force of relatives, friends and neighbours and this is impracticable for all except a few. The treatment is so intensive that the rest of the family have to merge their personalities for the benefit of the one child and this could have a detrimental effect on other members of the family. The method has not been formally or officially evaluated. One or two of these children have been observed over a period here in Brisbane. A tentative evaluation is that the progress of the children is far from promising and that the techniques are wide open to criticism. On the evidence available so far it is not considered that to provide assistance for families to go to America nor to consult such specialists as come to Queensland would be justified. Use of the method is not supported by neurologists, physiotherapists or any other profession closely involved with these patients. I hope to make a statement to the House on this matter in the near future."

BUNDABERG POLICE STATION STRENGTH

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

What reductions in the strength of the force at the Bundaberg Police Station have been made or are intended to be made under the rearrangement of the Bundaberg Police District?

Answer:—

"With the excision of five police divisions from the previously constituted Bundaberg Police District, some compensatory reduction in strength of Bundaberg Police Station must be considered. This station has been reduced by only one Senior Sergeant to date and no firm decision has been reached at this stage as to the extent of any further reduction. This aspect will be reviewed in the light of workloads and staff adjustments associated with the operations of the restructured Police Districts generally."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

DRUG-TRAFFICKING ON GOLD COAST

Mr. Melloy: I ask the Minister for Police: In view of the claims made by his colleague the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads that he is in possession of information relating to the drug racket on the Gold Coast and the alleged activities of the so-called "Mr. Big", and in view of the reflections he has cast on the efficiency of the Queensland Police Force in this regard, will he inform the House as to the true situation on the drug scene and as to what action either has been or will be taken?

Mr. Hodges: I have discussed this matter with my colleague. The names he has mentioned to me are well known to the police. As a matter of fact, both persons were charged recently.

ALLEGATIONS IN "PORT NEWS" ABOUT WHISKY AU-GO-GO CASE

Mr. Melloy: I also ask the Minister for Police: Has his attention been drawn to the allegations appearing in today's "Courier-Mail" as made by the father of one of the victims of the fire at the Whisky Au-Go-Go night club and published in the magazine "Port News"? In view of the serious implications of these allegations, what action has he taken or does he propose to take?

Mr. Hodges: Nil.

ACCIDENTS AT STONEY CREEK BRIDGE

Dr. Scott-Young: I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Following the 14th fatal accident at the Stoney Creek bridge, just north of Townsville, on 3 March 1975, will he expedite the erection of "Give Way" signs on both approaches and, at the same time, initiate moves to have the bridge altered and so save further loss of life?

Mr. HINZE: Yes.

FREE TAXI-CABS FOR DRUNK ABORIGINES

Dr. Scott-Young: I ask the Minister for Community and Welfare Services: Is he aware of the proposal that funds be

provided from his Vote for the use by Aborigines in Townsville of taxi-cabs to convey them to Anzac Park so that they can participate in booze sessions in this beautiful park to the exclusion of the public in general?

Mr. HERBERT: I certainly have no intention of following the racist policies of Senator Cavanagh in providing special facilities for Aborigines in Central Australia. I doubt that he had contacted the taxi community when he made this suggestion. What he is doing, of course, is building up a case for a white backlash. How anyone can justify the use of public funds to take drunks home to their free hostels is something I cannot understand, and I am quite sure that the population of Queensland cannot do so. I have no intention of entering into that. The only way in which the money should be used is to buy a couple of extra police paddy-wagons and treat these people the same as white alcoholics.

SITTING DAYS

SESSIONAL ORDER

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

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business.”

Motion agreed to.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

SESSIONAL ORDER

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

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, on each sitting Wednesday a period shall be allotted until 1 o'clock p.m. for discussion of matters of public interest on which any member may address the House for ten minutes. If the discussion is still proceeding at 1 o'clock p.m., it shall be terminated by Mr. Speaker.”

Motion agreed to.

TIME LIMIT OF SPEECHES

SESSIONAL ORDER

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

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the following amendments to the times allowed for certain speeches shall apply:—

(1) Under Standing Order No. 37A (Disallowance of Proclamations, Orders in Council, Regulations or Rules):

Mover of the motion, fifteen minutes; seconder of the motion and any other member, ten minutes; Minister in reply, twenty minutes. Total time allowed, two hours.

(2) Under Standing Order No. 109 (Time Limit of Speeches):

(a) Paragraph 4—In Committee on a Bill, Motion or Estimate—substitute ‘ten minutes’ for ‘fifteen minutes’.

(b) Paragraph 8—In Committee on the introduction of a Bill—substitute ‘twenty minutes’ for ‘twenty-five minutes’.

All other provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 37A and 109 shall continue to apply.”

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

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

“That the Standing Orders Committee for the present Parliament consist of the following members:—

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, Mr. Burns, Sir Gordon Chalk, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Mr. Hodges and Mr. Melloy.”

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY, REFRESHMENT ROOMS, AND PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS COMMITTEES

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

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

“That the Library, Refreshment Rooms, and Parliamentary Buildings Committees for the present Parliament be constituted as follows:—

Library: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ahern, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Frawley, Mr. Gygar, Mr. Wright and Mr. Yewdale.

Refreshment Rooms: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cory, Mr. Dean, Mr. Greenwood, Mr. K. J. Hooper, Mrs. Kippin and Mr. Lowes.

Parliamentary Buildings: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanson, Mr. Hartwig, Mr. Moore, Mr. Muller, Mr. Porter and Mr. Yewdale.”

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

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

“That a Committee be appointed for the present Parliament to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing to be executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and

arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members.

That such Committee consist of the following members:—

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alison, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Jensen, Mr. Jones, Mr. Miller and Mr. Powell.”

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Officials in Parliament Act 1896–1971 in a certain particular.”

Motion agreed to.

AGENT-GENERAL FOR QUEENSLAND BILL

INITIATION

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to provide for the office of Agent-General for Queensland.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill relating to the number of Judges of the Supreme Court and, in connection therewith, to amend the Supreme Court Act of 1921.”

Motion agreed to.

DESCRIPTION OF WOMEN (REFERENCE TO CONDITION IN LIFE) BILL

INITIATION

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to provide for the abolition of any requirement that a woman describe herself or her calling by reference to her condition in life.”

Motion agreed to.

QUEENSLAND INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Minister for Health): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 1945–1969 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.12 p.m.) I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Officials in Parliament Act 1896–1971 in a certain particular.”

This is an important Bill, the purpose of which is to increase the size of the Queensland Ministry from 14 to 18 members. I foreshadowed this legislation when the new Ministry was sworn in after the tremendous anti-socialist vote in the State election last December. Its introduction also follows a promise I made in the Government policy speech during the election campaign last year. I said then that on the return of the Government there would be a review of the portfolio responsibilities of my Ministers. That promise was made because of the tremendous work-loads now being shouldered by Ministers and because of the complexities of modern Government.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Your Government is like the Portuguese army—all generals and no soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will soon be disarmed if he does not come to order.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is more than could be said for honourable members opposite. They haven't many of any ranks in their army.

The activities of all Ministers have greatly expanded in recent years. My own portfolio, for example, presently encompasses matters involving the environment, conservation, pollution, urban development and regional planning, which just a few years ago it did not include.

Mr. Houston: Is that why the position is so bad?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is why the people voted for us and why they did not vote for the party of which the honourable member for Bulimba is a member.

As the honourable member for Lytton knows very well from his new responsibility as Leader of the Opposition, great demands are made on his time and, one might also say, on his labours. My Ministers and I travel about the State continually, keeping abreast of modern developments and the requirements of people wherever they may live or work in Queensland. It must be remembered that Hobart is closer to Brisbane than is the top end of Queensland, to which my Ministers and I travel from time to time. Never before in the history of our State has there been such a coverage by members of the Queensland Cabinet.

Our people, our problems and our resource developments are scattered over an area eight times the size of Victoria. Even such a compact State as Victoria has three more Ministers than the present Queensland Government.

The policies of the present Commonwealth Government have, of necessity, increased the work-load on my Ministers and on senior officers within the Public Service to a tremendous degree. The diversity of work and the volume of problems being encountered by the Queensland Government, and indeed, by all State Governments as a result of Commonwealth policies, which change direction week by week, have considerably exceeded those of previous years. Hardly a week passes without my Ministers and senior Government officers being involved in meetings in Brisbane, Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne and other capital cities of Australia and, indeed, from time to time it has been necessary for representatives to go overseas to deal with legal matters.

Even now, despite the Commonwealth's restrictive policies, there is tremendous development taking place in Queensland that gives purpose and meaning to my Government's policy of fostering decentralisation. The magnitude of this development may be seen in the comparable expenditure figures for 1969, when the Queensland Cabinet was last increased, and the value of major projects under way this year. I am now hopeful that we can add to these a multi-million-dollar aluminium smelter in Central Queensland.

Current development projects in Queensland in both the public and private sectors have an estimated capital value of well over \$3,500 million, which is more than double the figure for 1969—an interval of just five years. This decentralised investment heavily involves every Minister and, indeed, senior Public Service officers in the planning and construction of the Government's own works and development programme. At the same time they are also involved in the planning and provision of back-up facilities, services and amenities for major multi-million-dollar private projects.

There is constant discussion with the Federal Government over State rights (which has taken a great deal of my own time

and that of the Attorney-General, other Ministers and officers), constitutional matters and attempts to make inroads into matters which traditionally have been State responsibilities. This has enlarged the work-load on many Ministers. It is taking up a great deal of my time and theirs.

The growth in State Government expenditure also merits an increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers. I see the honourable member for Port Curtis nodding his head in agreement. State Government expenditure under all headings in 1969 was about \$865,000,000. The estimated expenditure in the current State Budget is about \$2,200 million. Queensland has tremendous potential and is making a major contribution to the nation's economy. It is important that we have sufficient Ministers to adequately and efficiently carry out their responsibilities on behalf of the people of Queensland.

When this proposed increase was first announced, the Leader of the Opposition said it was anti-city and that the Cabinet would be overloaded with country Ministers. For the first time, however, the Government is now in a position to give ministerial representation to every region in the State. The strains and stresses placed on the present Cabinet have been too onerous for far too long and this Bill will allow a sharing of the work-load and can only result in better and even more effective government.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (12.14 p.m.): This is a Bill to authorise the Premier's predetermined decision to increase the size of State Cabinet from 14 to 18 members. It is a Bill presented in difficult economic circumstances that will inflate Queensland public spending at a time when the Premier is telling the Australian Government to deflate its expenditure.

About the kindest comment I can make on this legislation is that it is an exercise—a highly expensive exercise—in jobs for the boys. It is legislation designed to widen the scope of Liberal-National Party lurks and perks.

The Premier complains of appointments by the Australian Government. But I believe a list longer than my arm—longer than both arms of the Premier—could be compiled showing political preference in diplomatic, judicial and other appointment fields, by Liberal-National Party (or Country Party) Governments, both in Queensland and outside it. This Bill falls into that category.

This increase in Cabinet is a payoff to some of the Premier's cronies, and Queenslanders, through Consolidated Revenue, will be forced to meet the financial account for his favours.

There is no necessity for this Bill; there is no mandate for it. When the Premier toured Queensland before the 7 December election calling on Canberra to cut its spending as a measure against inflation, he never mentioned a word of his own ambitious

intentions. His silence was conveniently short-lived. The votes were still being counted in Cook and Mt. Isa when he announced the decision that has prompted the legislation before us today. Rarely have we seen such accelerated deception. Rarely have we experienced such sudden proof that, with the Premier's exaggerated power of the moment, the public purse is to be plundered and pirated to provide unwarranted authority and coalition comfort for the chosen faithful.

The Opposition deplores this wasteful legislation. So, too, do most of the leading newspapers of Queensland. In fact, according to reports, it is even denounced by the Government's own Liberal member for the electorate of Townsville. I hope other Liberals will join with their colleague from Townsville if he pursues his announced intention to cross the floor and vote against this legislation of his own Government.

Only two months ago this Government was complaining—in fact, it was almost crying—that certain Public Service employees would be stood down unless Federal money was urgently made available. Now, in convenient contrast, we find almost bottomless funds are there in the Treasury for this highly-inflationary excursion in ministerial empire-building. One wonders whether the Premier was establishing a propaganda ruse for rank-and-file Public Service decreases so that he could finance personal ministerial increases.

Only 2½ years ago this same Government, without pre-election warning or post-election logic, ruthlessly reduced the numerical representation of the Brisbane City Council (Australia's largest local authority) by 25 per cent. Now, with the same lack of warning and logic, it plans to increase the size of its own Cabinet by an even larger percentage, to the point it will be almost equal in size to the entire Brisbane City Council—front-bench and back-bench combined.

Since 1963, the number of members in this Chamber has increased by seven, from 75 to 82. With the passage of the Bill before us today, we will have experienced, during the same period, a corresponding rise of seven in the strength of the Cabinet. In other words, for every new electorate created in Queensland over the past 12 years to meet population growth, we have been rewarded with an extra Cabinet Minister to equalise parliamentary growth.

Following this legislation, Queensland, with a population of 1,890,000 and with 82 parliamentarians, will have the same number of Cabinet Ministers as New South Wales, with a population of almost 4,700,000 and with 157 parliamentarians. We will have more Ministers than Victoria, with almost twice our population. Under this Bill of the Premier, Queensland will have one Cabinet Minister for every 4.5 members of State Parliament and for every 105,000 of population.

By comparison, New South Wales has a Cabinet Minister for every 8.7 parliamentary members and 260,000 of population, and the Australian Government, which the Premier constantly accuses of excessive expenditure, has only one Minister for each 6.8 parliamentarians and 500,000 of population.

The application of Parkinson's Law to the Cabinet by the present National-Liberal Government has been excessive. The Cabinet is being used as a vehicle to keep the Premier's hold on power. From today we will have seven more State Ministers than South Australia, six more than Western Australia (which is larger geographically) and eight more than Tasmania.

This ministerial build-up has been accompanied by a veritable tidal wave of lurks, perks and privileges. Seven years ago, when the Premier prematurely assumed his present office, there were two ministerial press secretaries. Now there are 14, and soon after today's Bill is passed no doubt there will be 18. They are backed by a team of almost 30 departmental press officers, most of whom this Government has no compunction in using for party-political purposes.

There are chauffeurs, State Government cars and research officers, and the Premier even has his own pilot and his own television cameraman. He has just started his personal TV series at Queensland's expense.

"The Courier-Mail" recently estimated the extra surface cost of these new ministerial additions, in terms of salary rises and personal staff, at \$200,000 in the first year. I stress that this is a very conservative minimum figure. The actual additional expense, when we consider trips, extra departments, public service promotions and other incidentals will, I believe, run into millions. Yet this is the Government that preaches economic restraint, the Government that castigates Canberra for excessive public spending.

This decision by the National Party was conceived in greed and partisan patronage. It was framed in hypocrisy and is being passed, through temporary numerical strength in this Chamber today, without necessity.

"The Courier-Mail" said, in an editorial last December—

"That arch-critic of Canberra antics, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, has left himself open for some of his own medicine with the increase he has made in his Cabinet."

The editorial continued—

"Four more ministers cannot be justified."

For once, I agree with "The Courier-Mail". The increase cannot be justified and it should never have been mooted, let alone enforced.

The Liberal member for Townsville, who has stated publicly that he will vote against this Bill, said in "The Townsville Daily

Bulletin" that his own coalition Government should come to its senses and not become intoxicated with power. He added—

"The new Departments will undoubtedly be centred in Brisbane so the centralism of Canberra will be rivalled by the centralism of Brisbane."

I agree with Dr. Scott-Young—something I rarely do. This Cabinet—the largest in our State's history; indeed the largest in any State's history—contains no representation for the Far North, the Far-North West, the Far-Central West, or the Far-South West. Two-thirds of the Cabinet live within 250 miles of Brisbane, and the farthest north a Minister comes from is from Ayr (and he was the last chosen).

This is the Government that claims that the disgraceful gerrymander in Queensland is justified to preserve representation for the West and Far North; yet, in the same breath, it excludes these areas from its own powerful inner administrative body.

I ask members to cast their minds back to the State Cabinets of Labor Governments before 1957. There was always northern and western representation. We can remember Ministers from Longreach and from the Atherton Tableland.

We have no Minister from Townsville, our second largest city. Education has been downgraded to a junior portfolio administered by a last-minute appointee to the Ministry. Environmental affairs remains a governmental back number. Once again the so-called Liberal ginger group—including the member for Clayfield, who was regarded by Sir Robert Menzies as having Federal ministerial potential—have been given the not-so-conservative "raspberry" by their own leader.

It appears certain that one Liberal Minister is there not because of support from his own leader but because the Premier regards him as a Cabinet vote for the National Party.

I say nothing personally against the four Ministers elect but they are to become members of a Cabinet of favouritism.

Mr. Lee: You're engaging in personalities.

Mr. BURNS: One does not need to go into personalities; it is a question of the extra numbers. They will be members of a Cabinet of favouritism, hand-picked by the Premier, Deputy Premier and a few of their allies.

This Cabinet increase occurs not because it is needed, not because it will improve Government in Queensland, not because some of the beneficiaries have done anything to deserve their handsome rewards. This Cabinet increase occurs because the Premier and his deputy must repay support from good friends in the past, because they want to ensure that, by throwing a few large crumbs now at public expense, they will maintain the same caucus support from the same good friends in the future. Let us examine the political preliminaries to the increases that necessitate this legislation.

"The Courier-Mail" said the "new four" derived from a political numbers game between the Liberal and National Parties. In other words, Queenslanders are to pay a bill that will, in the final budgeting, amount to millions of dollars simply because two coalition partners are suspicious and distrustful of each other. All I can say is, if coalition means friendship, Queenslanders are being overcharged heavily and often for an occasional handshake.

The "Telegraph"—Ian Miller was the reporter—told of crucial talks, which I understand lasted six hours, between the Liberal and National Parties to determine the new Cabinet. At these talks were the Premier, the Treasurer, the deputy National Party leader, Mr. Camm, the deputy Liberal Party leader, Mr. Knox, and, of course, no fifth column of political intrigue would be complete in our State without those two architects of outside pressure, Bob Sparkes (National Party) and John Moore (Liberal Party.) This secretive six—the four politicians and the two frustrated ones—sat down behind closed doors and decided what, to its mind, was best for Queensland in Cabinet matters over the next three years. This secretive six made the decisions outside of Parliament which we are asked to endorse inside it today.

I cannot see why this secretive six is so essential. Why can't the elected members of the National and Liberal parties elect their own Ministers in the same way as A.L.P. Governments do at present in Canberra, South Australia and Tasmania? Why is this right denied members who talk piously of parliamentary freedom? We can only presume that they may differ with their masters and may diminish the tight, narrow control that personal patronage tends to preserve.

Of Mr. Sparkes, the National Party State President, the "Telegraph's" Ian Miller once wrote that he was a "power figure who picked off State Cabinet Ministers almost at will." Ian Miller said, "He does not beat about the bush telling Country Party politicians they should toe the line."

Mr. Moore, the other parliamentary outsider at these very recent critical and crucial talks is, of course, best known for his abortive intrusion early last year into parliamentary business in an attempt to axe Mr. Nigel Drury for Federal Liberal preselection in the blue-ribbon Brisbane seat of Ryan.

These two men are the advocates of the faceless manipulators within their Liberal and National Parties. They helped to pick the Cabinet. They are the front-line exponents of outside control. Through this legislation today they are exerting greater power than the elected Government—a selected Cabinet by a directed Parliament.

In simple terms, this Parliament today is asked to rubber-stamp the secret judgment of a furtive conclave—a secretive six comprising four parliamentarians, all obsessed with power, and two outside political dis-cards who glamourise under the self-sought

titles of hatchet men. This Parliament is asked to say, "To hell with public necessity; to hell with administrative expense; to hell with the rights of representation of thousands of Queenslanders in vast areas of our State in the North and North West." We are asked to close our eyes to logic, to close our eyes to responsibility. We are asked to say yes so that a few of the Premier's sparse number of cronies can feather their nests and Bob and John can retain their dubious prestige as kingmakers.

The A.L.P. does not believe that the people of Queensland should pay for intrigue; it does not believe that they should pay for egotistical experiments by power-hungry outside individuals. Certainly we do not believe that the public purse is the slush fund for the purchase of power in this Cabinet or the joint Government party room, for the purchase of power in the National Party Management Committee or the Liberal Party State Executive.

As I said at the outset, we oppose this legislation. More importantly, we oppose its objectives and its motives. We find it a sinister exercise by a greedy Government. I ask the Government—I ask the Premier—at this late stage to reconsider it. I ask the Government and the Premier to re-examine it.

Let them re-arrange their Cabinet responsibilities, if necessary, and review areas of authority and increase influence in certain fields, if that is needed. If a reshuffle is the answer, then let them have one.

I ask the Government and the Premier to consider these alternatives rather than the present inflationary course of ministerial expansion. At this late stage—this final stage—I ask the Premier and his Government to defer this Bill and the expensive Cabinet increases it proposes. I ask the Premier to practice what he so often professes. He cannot, in all honesty, ask the Australian Government to curb public spending, which it has, when, here in Queensland, he is intent on increasing it for no reason other than personal political patronage.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: Who paid for your trip to China?

Mr. BURNS: I paid for my trip to China. I will give the Premier a copy of the bill.

As I said earlier, I hope that when we vote on this Bill there will be men of conscience from the Liberal Party who will think for Queensland, think as Queenslanders and cast their numbers against it. I hope, for the same reasons, that there will be responsibility from the National Party members. I hope also that the two Independents in this Parliament will join my party in opposition to the Bill.

The Bill has already caused an accommodation crisis in Parliament House. Opposition and back-bench Government members have been robbed of space for the creation and renovation of ministerial suites.

The Bill will increase the already excessive control that the Cabinet of Queensland practises at the expense of this elected Parliament. More and more decisions will be made through the expediency of subordinate legislation. Never before in the history of this Parliament—in the history of any State Parliament—have there been more members, as Ministers, committed through Cabinet solidarity to Government decisions. In a Parliament such as this one in Queensland, which meets for a relatively small number of weeks each year, this concentration of power in a small administrative body is dangerous. It is the medium for dictatorship, and the medium that allows politicians, through secrecy, to enlarge power that they have been unable to secure through popular public support.

We must be wary of any measure that is designed to restrict even further the far too limited degree of open government that still lingers in Queensland at present. This is not parliamentary legislation in the true sense. Today we are asked to rubber-stamp decisions already made; to endorse Ministers already selected; to support extravagant, unnecessary expense already committed; and to endorse the verdict of a closed conclave of six Cabinet selectors, two of whom are not members of this Parliament. We are asked to say yes to pilferage of the public purse for personal political advantage.

This Bill is presented to us here today as the formal enactment of a predetermined fait accompli, a fait accompli in which two of the main conspirators were men who do not sit in this Parliament and officially have never sought entry to it.

Only four of the 82 members in this Chamber—only four of the 14 in the present Cabinet—had any influence on the contents of this legislation.

The parliamentary wings of the Liberal and National Parties were given no say, no vote and not even the courtesy of a recommendation or opinion. They were not consulted.

I ask the Government, at a time when it advises economic restraint to others as a cure for inflation, to take this opportunity to practise in its home domain of Queensland at least a little of what it preaches.

The Opposition says this Bill and what it proposes is entirely unnecessary. We say it has been conceived for underhand reasons which have nothing to do with improved government for our State of Queensland.

We will vote against it if, as I suspect, the Premier rejects my approach for deferment, and we ask the member for Townsville, responsible Liberal and National Party members, and the two Independents to join with us in our protest.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (12.36 p.m.): I rise in this debate in order to place before the Committee my views and the basic nature of my opposition to this increase in the Queensland Cabinet. Firstly, I question

the manner in which the increase has been instituted; secondly, I question the need for such an increase.

As to the first aspect of my concern, it appears that certain elements, whether they tag themselves as the socialist Left or socialist democrats, are determined to undermine the prestige and dignity of parliamentary procedure and to denigrate the Parliament in the eyes of the general public.

I would hope that honourable members opposite would hang their heads in shame lest they, too, should be associated with the outrageous behaviour of a petulant and arrogant man in another Parliament in this country.

This Parliament has great powers, one of which is to legislate to allow for a change in the number of Ministers of the Crown in this State. The procedure for such a change is simple and, to date, has been time honoured. A Bill is introduced setting out the change, the proposal is debated, and this Chamber then votes upon it. Should Parliament affirm this proposal, it is then forwarded to His Excellency the Governor for royal assent. It is then, and only then, that consideration can rightly be given to the persons who will hold the newly created portfolios.

One further procedure has to be followed, namely, the offering of the commission by the Governor, on the advice of the Premier, to an honourable member to become one of Her Majesty's Ministers.

It is disturbing that no part of the protocol that I have outlined has been followed in this instance before the Chamber. The first occasion that I as a member of this Assembly was aware of this proposal was when I read of it in "The Courier-Mail" of 20 December and 21 December as well as in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" of 21 December. It was only then that the rank-and-file members of this Parliament were enlightened as to the Government's intention. But what is of greater concern is the fact that the Press and the honourable members occupying the Treasury benches treated the whole proposal as a *fait accompli*. Without reference to the House it was announced that there would be an 18-man Cabinet and that the honourable members to hold the new portfolios would be such and such.

Not only has this Assembly been insulted by this premature announcement of the Ministry, but also there has been a serious breach of protocol governing the relationship between the Premier and His Excellency the Governor.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Hewitt, and that of the whole Committee to a similar situation that recently arose in New South Wales. When Mr. Lewis assumed the premiership of that State, there was speculation that there would be a change in the composition of the Cabinet. Mr. Lewis refused to be drawn as to the nature of these changes as he believed it was the

prerogative of the Crown to appoint new Ministers and that to publicly announce the names of new Ministers before the parties concerned had received a call from Government House would be a usurpation of the Governor's constitutional role.

It is bad enough that the increase in the Cabinet was publicised in the Press before honourable members were advised; it is worse that the names of the potential Ministers were revealed before Parliament had agreed to the increase and the Governor invited those honourable members to accept their commission.

Any Government should always be mindful of the fact that the greatest threat to its survival lies not in its Opposition but in unrest within its own ranks. This is where the weakness of any Government holds. Uncertainty as to the lines of Government action leads to unrest. Many past Governments have caused their own downfall by "closing-up" on government and developing among their back-benchers a sense of frustration and irrelevance. Any Opposition worth its salt soon realises the situation, capitalises on it and receives dividends in the form of a victory at the next election.

There is a further aspect of the procedure followed in this case that should be of concern to all true parliamentarians. It appears from newspaper reports that the presidents of the respective coalition party organisations have more say on the nature and composition of the Cabinet than do honourable members. It is my steadfast belief that the organisation of a party—or any other outside interest—has no right to interfere in the selection of Her Majesty's advisers. For my part, as a member of the Liberal Party, I believe that the interference by Mr. Moore was not only against the spirit of this Parliament, but was also against one of the tenets of the Liberal Party.

For many years honourable members opposite have been subjected to the accusation that they are under the control of extra-parliamentary interests. It now appears that certain members on this side of the Chamber are to be tainted by the same accusation.

I turn now to my second basic criticism. I fail to see any need for the change in ministerial administration of this State as outlined by the Premier in presenting this Bill. At far less expense, and with greater value to Parliament, a system of Assistant Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries could have been introduced. I remind honourable members that during the last election campaign this Government was able to gain widespread public support for its criticism of the Federal Government's irresponsible and widespread growth of bureaucracy. We are now to repeat this brand of "Whitlamism" in our State's administration.

I suggest that the administration of this State would be best served by the utilisation of Assistant Ministers. These Assistant Ministers would receive no increase in salary, but would be authorised to exercise some of the executive responsibilities of their Ministers. Thanks to the confidence of the Queensland people, the Government has had a large influx of young, intelligent and enthusiastic new members who will have to work hard to retain their seats. And it is only by hard work and participation in government that they will retain their seats. In this way they can become versed in administrative details, in the depth of government and in the foibles of the Public Service, which they will find most frustrating when they get out in their electorates. The introduction of a system of Assistant Ministers would give new members an opportunity to display their talents and assist in the government of the State.

Without suggesting that any member of the Treasury bench is *pas se*, a system of Assistant Ministers would provide a pool of experienced and competent members able to take over the running of this State at a moment's notice. It has been suggested that the increase in the Cabinet strength is needed to relieve the pressures of office and to promote decentralisation of government. If there is too much stress, then why not have Assistant Ministers—a simple procedure, at no cost? Let us be realistic about this whole matter.

I draw honourable members' attention to certain figures I have obtained on the administrative arrangements in other States. New South Wales, with a population of 4,700,000, has 159 members, with 18 Ministers, which gives a percentage of Ministers to members of 11.3.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier must not pass between the Chair and the member speaking.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: Victoria, with a population of 3,500,000 has 109 members of Parliament, of whom 15 are Ministers, making the percentage of ministers to members 13.7. South Australia, with a population of 1,100,000 has 67 members, of whom 11 are Ministers, giving a Minister-member percentage of 16.4. In Queensland, with a population of 1,900,000, we have 82 members, of whom 14 are Ministers, giving a Minister to members percentage of 17.07. It is now proposed, without any increase in population—zero population growth has come into the picture—to increase the Ministry to 18. That will give us the highest percentage in Australia between Ministers and members, namely, 21.95.

Does the Government suggest that the parliamentarians of this State are any less intelligent or diligent than members of the New South Wales or Victorian Legislatures? That is the important question that we must ask ourselves.

As to the argument of decentralisation, I suggest to the Committee that, though Ministers may reside throughout the State, their departments are still, in the main, centred in Brisbane. I could speak at great length on the problems of the North caused by that set-up. Considerable problems are experienced with some departments.

In conclusion, I wish to stress to the Committee my two basic contentions—

(1) That the procedure followed in this matter has been to the detriment of the dignity and authority of Parliament and in breach of the constitutional position of the Crown; and

(2) That there is no need for the increase in the Cabinet, with its accompanying expense, especially when alternatives exist for the better servicing of this State.

I advise honourable members that I wish my dissent to this legislation to be recorded. I also make my position clear to all. I have not and will not come to any arrangement whatsoever with the socialist. He is, I consider, the blood brother to the Communist, the eternal enemy of the free man. I would be misplacing the trust placed in me by my electorate to vote with him against this legislation. I register my dissent and ask leave of the Chamber while the voting is taking place, as I cannot vote in the affirmative and I cannot, in clear conscience, vote with the socialist Labor Party.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (12.47 p.m.): Over the years we have witnessed a decline in the democratic government of this State. Today we witness a further step in that decline through the introduction of this measure. Instead of the democratic process of control of the State by its people, gerrymandering has resulted in minority Governments in Queensland.

Mr. Lane: What about the Speaker in the Federal House? What has happened to him?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MELLOY: To such an extent has a minority Government controlled our State that virtually a dictatorship has been established. Democratic government has been denigrated by the restrictions that have been placed on the Opposition in this Parliament through the denial of proper accommodation and research facilities.

The coalition Government is dominated by the National Party, which won a minority vote, and by a dictator-type Premier as well as by outside dictation to the National Party, which has sought to overthrow the Liberal Party in every field of government. We have seen the National Party marching down George Street in full strength in an attempt to assert authority over the Government. All these things amount to a denigration of democratic government in Queensland.

In addition, democratic government has been denigrated by the domination of Cabinet over the coalition parties. That is a very serious state of affairs. However, while the Cabinet has dominated the coalition parties, the Premier has dominated the coalition Cabinet. In effect, therefore, the result has been a dictatorship in Queensland—through the Cabinet to the members of the coalition and through them to this Parliament. That situation will become worse.

We now have the sorry spectacle of the number of Cabinet members being increased to 18—one to every 4.5 coalition members. Where do the coalition back-bench members, particularly the new ones, think they will fit into the government of this State? What chance will they have of determining what is done in this Parliament when they have to contend with a Cabinet comprising 18 members? It is the Cabinet members who will tell the back-benchers what will happen in this Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Loitering in passageways is not permitted.

Mr. MELLOY: Those back-benchers have won their seats but have lost their democratic rights as members of this Parliament. They will add to their loss if they support this Bill; it will take from them all of their rights as members of Parliament. They need have no fears about that. This Bill will result in government by Cabinet. The back-benchers will provide the numbers to vote either "Aye" or "No" as Cabinet dictates. This is what the outside interests in this State want them to do.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, this move was initiated by four Cabinet members and two people outside Parliament. It is a sop to many members of Parliament prior to the last election who were becoming a little "ructious" and had to be appeased one way or another. There were insufficient vacancies in the 14-man Cabinet for the Premier to do the right thing by them, so he had to move to increase the size of the Cabinet by four members to provide all the hand-outs that had to be given.

The new members of the Government will accede to this request; they will vote for it. At least I suppose they will. The Premier wants them to. However, they should use their heads. They entered Parliament with independent minds and on the first day of legislation this session they are to be led by the nose to create something that should not be created. A Cabinet of 14 members has always provided sufficient representation for every section of the community.

The Treasurer knows what is happening. He has been squirming for years under the domination of the Premier. He has not had the guts to do anything about it. I guarantee that he does not favour the creation of an 18-man Cabinet. I know that many of the older Government members do not

favour it. But what can they do? With the assistance of the new members the Premier will enforce his will against the will of many members of the Government parties who were here before you were elected. Why don't you talk to those members who were here before you were elected? There are many of you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr. MELLOY: The new members will cast important votes at the conclusion of this debate, so I ask them to use their heads and to vote on this occasion in a way that will indicate to their constituents that they are prepared to use their own minds in matters such as this. The people do not want an enlarged Cabinet. They want the country governed and administered by brains, not by a Cabinet of cronies. That is what it will be, and Government back-benchers will support it. They should use their heads and do the right thing by the people who elected them. We in the Opposition number only 11 and cannot do much about it. The new members have in their hands the power to defeat this legislation and call on the Government to use the talent it claims it has. Surely there is enough talent among 14 members of Cabinet and no need to enlarge the number as proposed.

The Premier said in effect, "We are now in a position to provide representation to every section of the community." But this power has always been with the Government. As a matter of fact, at every election the Government has gone to the people claiming that they want to represent every section of the community, and, in their reasoning, they have done so successfully for the last 15 years with a Cabinet of 14, and even fewer. After they have told the people at election after election that they have controlled the State successfully with a Cabinet of 14, why are we now suddenly told that it is necessary to increase the number to 18?

The problem for the Government in the past, which I think they may now be feeling to some extent, is that they have not had on the back benches members with the qualifications needed to fill Cabinet posts successfully. Some who have been promoted to Cabinet have been complete failures. I acknowledge that there are exceptions to what I am saying. I shall not mention names, but members of Cabinet will know those whom I consider to be suitable Cabinet material. Representation of every section of the community could well have been effected by a re-allocation of duties within the present Cabinet. Some Ministers, whom I shall not name, have very little to do, whilst others, I acknowledge, have plenty to do. A re-allocation of duties could have brought about adequate and successful administration of the State. Queensland does not need the 18 Ministers who the Government now claims are necessary.

Among the new members who have recently entered this Assembly there are, I acknowledge, as the Government acknowledges, too, accidents of politics who would not, in ordinary circumstances, be in this Chamber today. But there are others among the new members who must have special talents that could be used in a Cabinet of 14 members. They must look in dismay at some of the present Ministers and think, "If we could not do better than they, and if we could not make a 14-member Cabinet efficient, perhaps we should not be here." I appeal to those new members not to take this matter lightly. This increase in the size of Cabinet will not make them popular in their electorates. They have a responsibility to their electorates to do the right thing in this Chamber, and, if they support this measure, they will have to report back to the people and explain why they did so. There are Government members who are prepared to cross the floor in a vote on this Bill, and I am hopeful that among them there will be some of the new members. As the Leader of the Opposition said, this is a case of jobs for the boys.

Mr. Frawley: That's rubbish!

Mr. MELLOY: When the new members look at the 18 members who are to make up the Cabinet, they must think, "For crying out loud! To think we came in here to be controlled by a Cabinet of 18 that includes some of these fellows!"

Mr. Frawley: Have a look behind you at some of your fellows.

Mr. MELLOY: That is one thing I can say about the Labor Party—we do not have to look behind us. We know what our past is like. We have no worries, and we have the cream of the Australian Labor Party in the Opposition.

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

Mr. MELLOY: Before the luncheon recess, I was contemplating the dismal future of new members of this Assembly. As I said, they have come into the Chamber full of enthusiasm and the desire to do the right thing by their electors, but they are now confronted by a situation in which, if they vote for the motion, they will find it extremely difficult to explain to their electors why they have done so.

The proposed Bill is a confession of the Government's failure to find within its ranks 14 members of sufficient ability to adequately conduct the affairs of the State. Apparently the Government has found that the calibre of the 14 present members of Cabinet is not sufficiently high, and it thinks that increasing the number to 18 will at least give it sufficient collective ability to carry out the duties of Government. I should say that a Cabinet of 14 members is more than sufficient to adequately control the affairs of Queensland.

Another aspect of the proposed Bill on which I must comment is the ability of the State to pay for four additional members of Cabinet and their staffs—chauffeurs, officers, typists, and all those who are associated with them as members of the Ministry. Only recently the Government was crying poverty to the Federal Government and stating that it had insufficient money to pay public servants, that it would have to dismiss certain members of the Public Service if it did not receive more money. In virtually the same breath it is stating that it intends increasing the expenses of the State by creating four more ministerial portfolios. The Government cannot have it both ways. If it does not have sufficient money to pay its employees—and it said it was faced with the prospect of dismissing about 800 members of the Public Service—why in heaven is it coming forward today and saying that it is prepared to add to the cost of administering Queensland by increasing the number of Cabinet Ministers? I just cannot work that out.

I know that not all members of the Government approve of this legislation. In fact, the honourable member for Townsville has stated publicly that he is not in accord with the move to increase the number to 18. It will be interesting later to see how many Government members cross the floor when the vote is taken. I am doubtful whether any of them will, but they may have sufficient intestinal fortitude to remain out of the Chamber when it is taken. The honourable member for Townsville could well do that. I should like to see Government members indicate to their electors that at least they have a bit of guts and have the courage of their convictions. If they think it is not necessary to increase the number of Cabinet Ministers to 18, they should vote against the motion instead of hiding behind the Bar of the House and vacating the Chamber so that they will not be counted. Every member who comes into this Chamber should be prepared to stand up and be counted on every vote that is taken.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. MELLOY: The honourable member for Windsor need not point his finger at me. He is one of the members who are most critical of the Government and the Cabinet, but he never votes against them. I ask him not to point his finger at me.

All honourable members opposite came into this Assembly saying that they were men of spirit, courage and conviction and that they were prepared to vote for what they thought was right. It must be clear to them that this is an unnecessary move. They must know in their hearts that it is not necessary. They need to speak to only two or three older Government members and they will be put right about this Bill. They will soon be told that it is not necessary. If there were 14 capable Ministers in the

Cabinet, that body would be able to effectively administer the State, so let us not have any humbug about the situation.

I appeal to the new members and ask that they be not led by any outside influences—the remarkable six as the Leader of the Opposition has termed them. Let the new members vote according to their conscience after having discussed the Bill with other members on the Government benches.

The Leader of the Opposition and I have expressed the views of the Opposition. The Bill is not necessary. It is only a matter of jobs for the boys or a matter of recompensing or rewarding those who have served the Premier and his Ministers faithfully over the last few years. The new members will soon realise the values and virtues of earlier elected Government members. Perhaps those earlier elected members realise that once the new members woke up to them they would not be in the race of getting into Cabinet, and therefore that they have to get into Cabinet now before the new members become experienced in the ways of this Parliament.

The Bill is an unnecessary one and we will oppose it.

Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (2.22 p.m.): It is a great pity that the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy did not give to their own Federal leader, Mr. Whitlam, some of the advice they are giving today to the Premier.

I am amazed at the attempted denigration of the four proposed new Ministers.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I can make a speech without interjections. I do not need a written speech. I do not read a Trades Hall brief like a big parrot, as the honourable member does.

The proposed four new Ministers are all men who have given a great deal of service to this Parliament. I abhor the attempts by the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy to denigrate them. Their names were not mentioned, but we all know who they are. They are four men good and true: Mr. Wharton, Mr. Lee, Mr. Bird and Mr. Lickiss.

Mr. Melloy: You're the one who has named them.

Mr. FRAWLEY: They are good men and I am not afraid to stand up here and say just how good they are. They will be an asset to the Cabinet.

Since the election on 7 December the A.L.P. members have done nothing but attempt to drive a wedge between the Liberal and National Parties. The idea is to try to split the coalition. They hope that then they might be able to get in and do some of their dirty work.

Since 1957 Queensland has experienced good, consistent government, in contrast to some of the rotten administration that went on under previous Labor Governments.

On 7 December the people showed just how they felt about this Government and how they feel about the Premier and his Ministers, the men to whom they have given a mandate to carry on this good government for another three years. I venture to suggest that we will be in power for a hell of a lot longer than that judging by the performance put up by some members of the Opposition.

I support this Bill to increase the number of Ministers in the Cabinet from 14 to 18. I refute all suggestions from the Opposition that back-benchers on this side do not have something to do with the running of the Government. Of course we do. Why do they think we have party meetings and joint party meetings? At least we are allowed to rise in the Chamber and express our opinions without fear of political assassination. Today the honourable member for Townsville was game enough to stand up here and say what he thought. I respect his views on this subject, and so do the Premier and Deputy Premier. He will not be assassinated because he had the temerity to stand up here and criticise. We allow that sort of thing in our respective parties.

Mr. Houston: He didn't make Cabinet, did he?

Mr. FRAWLEY: He didn't have to make Cabinet. He is a good man, and he will make his mark in this Chamber before he is finished.

The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition have done nothing but whinge and attempt to draw red herrings across the trail by referring to lack of accommodation and facilities in Parliament House for Australian Labor Party members. Years ago when the A.L.P. was in power the honourable member for Townsville South could not even get a bed in The Lodge.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: A.L.P. members went in fear of the honourable member for Townsville South; they were afraid of him.

To refute some of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition—last year four other Government members and I shared a hot room in this building, and, unlike the Labor Party members, we did not complain and squeal about Opposition members having their air-conditioned room. Now that I happen to be in that room formerly occupied by Opposition members, I am determined to keep it for the next three years.

Mr. Aikens: You might make Cabinet yourself.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I doubt that very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like some comment on the motion before the Committee.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I apologise, Mr. Hewitt.

The State of Queensland is growing fast, and additional Ministers are needed to administer it. In fact, Queensland needs the services of a Minister to watch what goes on in the Federal Government. We need a Minister whose job it should be to protect our State rights. The New South Wales Government has a Minister whose duty it is to keep an eye on the Federal Government, and he watches it very closely.

This morning we heard Opposition speakers utter the cry, "Jobs for the boys!" Listen to this: in Canberra there are 27 Federal Ministers, who have a personal staff in all of 227 persons. They cost the Australian taxpayers the staggering sum of \$2,700,000 a year. The Prime Minister has a personal staff of 20, whose wages last year amounted to \$238,292. Dr. Cairns has 12 on his staff—

Mr. Aikens: Is Junie Morosi working for him?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will come to that in a moment; I could not let an opportunity like this pass without mentioning Miss Morosi. As I was saying, Dr. Cairns has a staff of 12, who cost the nation \$148,377 a year. That figure does not include the salary paid to Miss Morosi, who, no doubt, costs the taxpayers a hell of a lot more than has been admitted.

The Premier's proposal to increase the size of Cabinet is further evidence of this Government's concern for the people, especially the country people. The Cabinet positions are not jobs for the boys; they are jobs for responsible men, and they will be held by responsible men.

I could speak for hours about the jobs for the boys created by the Federal Labor Government and even then I would not exhaust the list. Take Al Grassby, for example. There is a classic illustration of jobs for the boys. On 2 September 1974 he was given the job of special consultant on community relations, at a salary of \$25,000 a year and an expense allowance of \$1,200 a year. When travelling on duty, he is paid an extra allowance of \$31 a day—so he travels on "duty" seven days a week! From this he would earn an extra couple of hundred dollars a week. Furthermore, he is provided with office space in Canberra, has three assistants, and is entitled to the use of Commonwealth cars when visiting capital cities on duty. Because he is on "duty" all the time he has a permanent Commonwealth car.

Mr. Aikens: And I ride my bike to the aerodrome.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I know that for a fact. I will admit that Al Grassby is not entitled to any entertainment allowance, but I understand that now that he has lost Junie Morosi that situation will be reviewed. Now that Dr. Cairns has got Junie Morosi his entertainment allowance will have to be cut down.

In 1973-74 the use by Al Grassby of Commonwealth cars cost \$51,000. And the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have complained about jobs for the boys!

Mr. Wright: Where did you get that from?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I got it from a reliable source.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the honourable member for Murrumba to make these comments in fair rebuttal of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I now inform the honourable member that he is moving away from the Bill and suggest that he come back to it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: We have heard statements made today that these new Cabinet appointments are merely jobs for the boys. I am only trying to highlight the difference between this Government and the Federal Government.

Mr. Wright: You're arguing with the Chair.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not arguing with the Chair. I respect the Chair. I do not go to the local Press and make dirty remarks about the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker behind their backs. As I have said, I respect the Chair.

Since the Labor Party came to power in Canberra it has created countless jobs for the boys for Communists. Listen to this: in November of last year a bloke named Gnatenko, a union representative at the G.M.H. plant in South Australia—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot see the relevance of these comments to the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am merely trying to point out the facts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not have my ruling debated. The honourable member will return to the Bill, and he will not debate my rulings.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I accept your ruling, Mr. Hewitt, but it does seem to me to be wrong that Mr. Doyle, following his defeat after 17 months in Parliament as the Federal member for Lilley, should be appointed to a position in the Federal Department of Labour. That is shocking.

Mr. Wright: You are not supporting the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am supporting the Bill.

Mr. Wright: You are not.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am. I am merely pointing out that the Labor Party should have given to its Federal leader the advice it is attempting to give the Premier and pointed to some of the jobs for the boys that he has handed out. Opposition members should not try to draw red herrings across the track.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY. I do not intend to speak about anything other than this Bill. The Chairman has given a ruling and he is on the right course. Queensland is a fairly large State, and it is a decentralised State. We definitely need more Ministers to traverse it in order to bring government to the people. We have been trying to do that for years. The Premier, by using his aircraft, has taken Ministers to the far Outback, and he will continue to do so. The increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers from 14 to 18 is a step in the right direction. It is a further example of the concern the Government has for the people of Queensland, and I commend the legislation to the Committee.

The Leader of the Opposition and his deputy pointed out how smart the newly elected members are. Of course they are smart. They would not be here if they were not; look at the Labor candidates they defeated! But only a few months ago the Leader of the Opposition was reported in "The Courier-Mail" as saying that all the new members were a bunch of "dills". I do not know that those were his exact words. I throw the lie back in his face today. The newly elected members have enough sense to realise the importance of this Bill, and I commend it to them.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (2.32 p.m.): In view of what the honourable member for Murrumba said about the new members having great ability and so on, I think I should relate a little of the earlier history concerning the number of ministerial appointments in this State. That is of major importance in considering whether or not we require an enlarged Ministry at this point of time. To begin with, in 1898 Queensland had only eight Cabinet Ministers looking after the affairs of State. That number remained constant until 1920 when the then Labor Premier, Mr. Theodore, increased the Ministry from eight to nine. That was an increase of one in 22 years. According to the speeches recorded in "Hansard" at that time, the reason given for the increase was the tremendous development that was taking place in the State. I ask honourable members to note the statement that tremendous development was taking place in the State at that time. When the Premier introduced this Bill he used very similar words.

In 1925, five years later, Mr. Gillies, another Labor Premier, increased the Ministry from nine to 10. His speech and

those made by other members referred to the great State development that was taking place. It was argued that the responsibility of Ministers was increasing.

A period of 24 years elapsed, bringing us to March 1949, before Labor Premier Hanlon increased the Ministry from 10 to 11. I emphasise that on each occasion there was an increase of one, and that the Government of the day decided to increase the Ministry because it was necessary to do so. It was not a matter of appointing two Ministers at a time. If one Minister was needed, one was appointed. I record that between 1898 and 1949 51 years elapsed, and that the tremendous development in the State, the new technologies being applied, and new modes of transport being used were in the forefront of the Government's decision to increase the Ministry. At no time did the Opposition put forward an argument against the Bills to increase the Ministry. They went through quite simply.

The size of the Ministry remained the same until 1963—14 years later. At that time, under Sir Frank Nicklin, the Ministry in the Country-Liberal Party Government was increased by two, which was the first of the double appointments. It was very obvious that the reason why the number went from 11 to 13 was that the Liberal and Country Parties could not agree on which one would receive the extra Ministry. That was the first occasion when rivalry occurred between the Liberal and Country Parties. The compromise arrived at resulted in an increase from 11 to 13. The Ministry remained at that number till 1963—in other words, 14 years later.

The most recent increase was in 1969, when an extra Ministry was created. The same old arguments were used again—increased development in the State, increased expenditure and increased financial responsibility. However, the fact of the matter was that the Government had decided to send Ministers overseas regularly, and because the Cabinet was composed of seven Country Party Ministers and six Liberal Party Ministers, every time a Country Party Minister was out of the State a crisis occurred in Cabinet. Those new honourable members who are intent on study should look through the Press reports of that period. They will find that there were crises in the Cabinet and the coalition every time a Country Party Minister toured overseas. To overcome that position, the Government created a 14th Ministry. However, it was not seven and seven but rather eight and six. As a result, one Country Party Minister could be overseas or interstate without creating problems associated with the rule of Cabinet.

For those honourable members who are not aware of it, Cabinet does not have any recorded votes. However, on some issues voting takes place along party lines and, as has been said, Cabinet becomes dominated by the Country Party. That is why so few

Liberal Party policies are put into effect. I warn the new Liberal Party members that they will be forced into the situation of following like sheep unless they stand up to some of the principles they espoused at election time.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: When I was leader, every one of the Labor Party policies was announced. The only problem was that, because we did not have the numbers, we did not have the chance to put them into effect.

The present proposal is to increase the Ministry from 14 to 18 members, just six years after the last increase. When considering this matter it is important to consider that in 65 years the Ministry was increased from eight to 11—in other words, three more. Those honourable members who can cast their minds back to some period in that 65 years will recognise the tremendous development that took place under various Governments—the tremendous development in communication, radio and TV; the tremendous development in air travel, train travel and motor-car travel; and the types of roads to be used. Even the sittings of Parliament have altered in that period. In spite of that, in that 65 years it was only considered necessary to change the Ministry by an additional three members. Since then the Ministry has already been increased by three and the present proposal is an increase of four; so in 12 years this Government has proposed an increase of seven Ministers.

If the Government considered that a ministerial increase was necessary, at this time last year or even later in the year why was there not a proposal for one or two Ministers? No. The Government had to wait till now. Of course, as I will show later, certain other factors entered into the matter when the Government was considering how many Ministers it required.

Let me recall the portfolios prior to the change of Government, when there were 11 Ministers. First was Premier; second was Justice and Attorney-General; third was Education and Migration; fourth was Treasurer, who was responsible also for Housing; fifth was Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity; sixth, Health and Home Affairs, which included Police; seventh was Transport; eighth, Irrigation and Land; ninth, Public Works and Local Government; tenth, Agriculture and Forestry; and finally, Labour and Industry.

Prior to the last election the portfolios were: Premier; Treasurer; Mines and Main Roads; Justice and Attorney-General; Education and Cultural Activities; Health; Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services; Development and Industrial Affairs; Primary Industries; Works and Housing (including Police); Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs; Lands and Forestry; Transport; and Local Government and Electricity.

At no stage during the last Parliament, even on the last day of sitting, did the Government or any Minister suggest that Ministers were overworked and that more Ministers were required. In his introduction, the Premier said that being a Minister was a very hard task and that it placed a tremendous strain on Ministers. I do not suggest that being a Minister is not a responsible position. Of course it is. However, we had in this Chamber two Ministers over 70 years of age who carried out their jobs quite effectively.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: They were not killed. I believe they are still alive. I am referring to Sir Alan Fletcher and Sir Douglas Tooth. My party and I did not agree with the administration of either of those gentlemen in every case. In fact, the A.L.P. had many fights with the previous Minister for Health. As I said, they were both over 70 years of age and not only did they carry on their jobs but they objected when it was suggested that they relinquish their portfolios to allow someone else to learn the ropes, as it were.

To suggest that any Minister finds his job too hard and arduous is rubbish. In the private sector, when men reach that age they either retire voluntarily, are passed over, or are promoted to some job with less responsibility. The fact is that there is no evidence that any Minister has been overworked or that his physical and mental capacities have deteriorated in carrying out the policies as dictated by the Government. I do not suggest that their policies were acceptable to the Opposition.

It is now proposed to increase the number of Cabinet members to 18. The portfolio allocations that have been published are: Premier; Deputy Premier and Treasurer; Mines and Energy (including Northern Development); Justice and Attorney-General; Community and Welfare Services together with Sport; Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs; Primary Industries; Police; Water Resources; Transport; Local Government and Main Roads; Tourism and Marine Services; Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service; Health; Education and Cultural Activities; Works and Housing; Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries; and Urban and Regional Affairs and Minister assisting the Premier with Planning, Development and Environment.

Some basic facts become evident. Some portfolios have been changed greatly over the years, others have been completely broken up and others have remained the same. There may have been some slight changes in the administration of subdepartments. This is important. Over the years more and more Government responsibility has been passed over, by legislation, to authorities that are virtually self-contained and make their own administrative decisions. Where Ministers are

involved, practice has shown that their involvement is only a formality. I have heard it argued in this Chamber when various boards or positions have been created that they were being created so that decision-making could be removed from party politics. They were entirely separated from Government decision except for the final carrying out of policy. The decisions were left with the commissions and boards.

Many Government activities are controlled by commissioners whose powers are quite extensive. I instance only a few. They are the Commissioner for Railways, the Commissioner for Transport, the Commissioner for Electricity Supply, the Commissioner of Main Roads, and the Commissioner of Police. No parliamentarian can interfere with their administration. For instance, the Minister for Police delegates his authority. He says, "My Government's policy on police is this." I am sure that he must take the advice of his commissioner and his commissioned officers. Actually, the person running the Police Department is the Commissioner of Police. He is responsible for the administration and running of the department. It is the Minister's responsibility to ensure that the Government's policy is carried out.

In other cases boards have been set up with very little ministerial control. Legislation provided that they would be removed from ministerial interference. Let us take a few examples. There are hospital boards, harbour boards, the Parole Board, the Films Board of Review, the Literature Board of Review, the Totalisator Administration Board, to mention only a few. Lately, in the last session, legislation was passed for the appointment of an ombudsman. These bodies were created by Governments of the day, irrespective of their political colour, to remove administration in these areas from direct governmental control. I have no fight with that principle at all, but surely over the years ministerial responsibility has been lessened rather than increased.

In recent years, tremendous advances have been made in electronic equipment, which simplifies and speeds up the operations of administration.

Mr. Moore: You said that before.

Mr. HOUSTON: Thank God the honourable member can hear, because he cannot speak. Computerisation is still only in its infancy.

In 1963, when Queensland had 11 Ministers, New South Wales had 16, or five more. Victoria had 14, or three more. Western Australia had 10, or one fewer. Tasmania had nine, or two fewer. South Australia had eight, which was three fewer. Even taking into account the 1963 amendment which increased the Queensland Cabinet to 13, New South Wales still had three more Ministers, and Victoria one more. With the increase now proposed, Queensland will have the same number of Ministers as New

South Wales, which has 18, one more than Victoria, which has 17; six more than Western Australia, which has 12; seven more than South Australia, which has 11; and eight more than Tasmania, which has 10.

I believe that no reasonable person would consider that Queensland should have more Ministers than Victoria, or as many as New South Wales, quite irrespective of the yardstick used. Queensland has approximately 2,000,000 people; that figure has not quite been reached. The last-known figures that I have for the other States, as at December 1973, are—

New South Wales	4,700,000
Victoria	3,600,000
South Australia	1,200,000
Western Australia	1,100,000

The only argument in Queensland's favour is that it is the second-largest State. But Western Australia, which is a much larger State, has only about half the number of Ministers proposed for Queensland.

Let us look at some of these matters in detail. Of the proposed 18 portfolios, seven are to have little change. Premier, Treasurer, and Health are to be separate portfolios. Justice and Attorney-General are to be together. Education and Cultural Activities are still to be together. Lands and Forestry are to remain together, and Transport is to remain on its own. Those seven are important facets of this State's administration, and there is to be no change in them at all. So far as the Government is concerned, they will continue as before.

Primary Industries has not been changed in name, but its activities have been reduced by the removal of the Fisheries portfolio. It was part of the election policies of both the Labor Party and the Government parties in the 1972 campaign to include Fisheries as part of the Primary Industries portfolio. After all, is not fishing a primary industry? It has been successfully administered as part of the Department of Primary Industries. Now, in an attempt to fill up the gaps, to make jobs for the boys and to justify this raid on the public purse, the Government is breaking up portfolios that should not be disturbed.

Mines and Main Roads and Local Government and Electricity have been rearranged to bring Mines and Energy together. On a portfolio of Northern Development, the Premier has Development and an assistant, which makes the whole thing ridiculous. Development and Industrial Affairs has been renamed. It is now to be known as Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs, but it is still Development and Industrial Affairs, no matter what it is called.

Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services, Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs, and Works and Housing and Police have only been rearranged to give six portfolios. The last one, surely, is in name only.

Those are the facts as they will be seen by anyone who cares to look for them. What justifies the Government's action? Surely nothing that I have said so far justifies an increase in the number of Ministers. The facts are that the reason for the increase of four is to give two to each party to retain the status quo, and to make sure that the National Party still has two more Ministers than the Liberal Party. But the real crux of the matter is that the Government is now going to put into the propaganda field four more paid servants on behalf of the National and Liberal Parties. In the short period since the election, we have seen that the Government's win has gone completely to its head. It won through circumstances that were not of its making. It took advantage of an idea that happened to develop in the minds of members of the public, and a week after the election the great majority of those people realised that they had been hoodwinked and wanted to reject honourable members opposite as the Government of the State.

After the election, the first thing the Premier did was say that he wanted more Cabinet Ministers. Then he put his own television show on the air. The honourable member for Murrumba referred to jobs for the boys and the cost of things. How much is the television show that disseminates National Party propaganda costing the people of Queensland? The Liberal Party should take care. It will find that it will suffer most from that political propaganda. Already the National Party is establishing branches in the cities.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Discussion on the National Party has nothing to do with the proposed Bill.

Mr. HOUSTON: I agree. Again, I could say that I am sure the honourable member for Chatsworth will agree that the National Party is a threat to the existence of the Liberal Party in this State.

However, let me go a little further. Another reason why some problems arose was that the leaders of the respective parties selected their own Cabinet Ministers, and there were only three vacancies, two of which were National Party vacancies.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MOORE (Windsor) (2.52 p.m.): I wish first to let honourable members in general know that I do not oppose the proposed legislation. However, I do oppose the method used to bring it about.

I make it clear that I am not in any way supporting the premises put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and supporting speakers on behalf of the Australian Labor Party. As a party, the A.L.P. would stoop to any measure to achieve its political ends. Before the last Federal election, the A.L.P.

was expounding the view, "If you don't like the law, break it." Now it is having second thoughts about that.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about responsibility in this Chamber. He has not shown any responsibility in the years that he has been here, and unless he changes his ways, I dare say that he will not display any in the future. Labor's record is a very poor one indeed. One has only to look at the Gair affair to see that the A.L.P. thought that by a smart move it could take advantage of the proportional voting system and have another member of the A.L.P. elected to the Senate, thus enabling it to control the Senate. It did not get away with that. The Premier, the Minister for Justice and other members of this Assembly, aided by one or two Senators, saw to it that it did not come about. Honourable members have all heard of the more recent Murphy affair, designed, of course, to do away with the States eventually.

I stand up in the Chamber today to voice publicly my comment on the way in which Cabinet appointments were made. The Government parties came into this Parliament with a record majority and with many new members. These new members, along with members who had been re-elected, were not given any chance of discussing the situation. The proposal was announced and then, in effect, it became a fait accompli.

What is the position? For a party or coalition to show that it is one cohesive unit—and we want to retain that—it is necessary for members then to sit pat, say nothing and accept what has been dished up to them. I do not think that is good enough. It is fair enough for members to be consulted. After all, who is to say what the position would have been if members of the Government party had been given the right to speak? They were not given that right, and that is not very fair.

Let me turn to the question of the workload of Ministers. If one looks at the brochures that are issued showing the number of Bills introduced by various Ministers and the number of Acts and departments administered by, for example, the Minister for Justice and the Minister for Health, it is obvious that the work-load is phenomenally heavy. No Cabinet Minister could cope with the work-load that certain Ministers have at the present time. In those circumstances the appointment of more Ministers could be justified. I am not haggling about the appointment of new Ministers but commenting on the situation that has arisen. One Minister is merely Minister for Police and another Minister is merely Minister for Water Resources. I am not saying this in criticism of the Ministers themselves. They would have no say in determining their responsibilities. But how fairly is the work-load being distributed when for some it is so low while others have the same work-load as ever?

I see the Leader of the Opposition grinning over there like a cat. He thinks I am coming into his camp. When he distributed his so-called shadow portfolios he put a heavy work-load on three or four members and gave the rest of them a sinecure. He need not smirk. He has nothing to say now.

As I see it, the Premier had no authority to make the announcement he made. Even though he is the Premier he is only a chairman among equals in the joint party room. He has to accept majority decisions like the rest of us. Before the Premier made his announcement joint party meetings had not been held. There was no great urgency about the matter, but now the Bill is before the Committee.

As the honourable member for Townsville remarks, a precedent was created on this occasion in that the president of the National Party and the president of the Liberal Party sat in on the meeting. I was not there and I do not know what part they played. Anything I know about it could only be hearsay. However, that was a dangerous precedent. It was a job for Parliament, not for the organisations. The organisations come into deciding whether we form a coalition. The organisations can come into the subject of boundaries. Each party organisation has many fields in which to play a part. It is concerned with the party's platform. Once the leader of the party has presented his policy speech its contents become a part of the party's policy. Policy matters in between elections are not the concern of the organisation. New policies are matters to be included in the next policy speech of the leader of the party. Of course, that is another story.

The cost of the new portfolios will not be really great. Obviously the Opposition speakers are talking with two voices. The present Federal Government has appointed about 120 different committees involving thousands of persons and costing millions of dollars. In those circumstances who are honourable members opposite to quibble at the piffling, piddling amount of money it is going to cost for the new portfolios? After all, in the main it will only mean the transfer of persons from various departments to the departments under the control of the new Ministers. I trust that it will not be an exercise in Parkinson's law. It has been well said that if a Minister is put in a hallway with a chair it will not be long before he will require a new building to house all his officers. I hope that that does not occur on this occasion. The work-load of the public servants is not great and it should not be hard to transfer them from one department to another. I hope staff will be picked who have a natural bent for the respective departments. It is no use transferring persons purely on a seniority basis. They should be transferred on the basis of ability. We have any number of very worthy public servants able to do a good job. Some

of them find themselves in the wrong niche. I hope that when the new departments are set up under the new Ministers, staff will be selected who have a natural bent to do the work of their respective departments and to assist their Ministers. A person who likes his job does it well.

Mr. Houston: What if the Minister has the wrong portfolio?

Mr. MOORE: I don't know how that can be overcome. I go along a little with that comment. However, while the Premier of the day has definite responsibilities, I certainly would not give him the right to choose his Cabinet. I believe that election is the best means of appointing Ministers. As members of a political party are expected to be loyal to their leader, I think that the leader should give greater consideration to the opinions of his back-benchers. Unfortunately, that philosophy tends to become dissipated under the present system.

Mr. Houston: You'd get up if that were the system, because you're a hard-working member.

Mr. MOORE: I do not want to hear any baloney like that. The honourable member is saying one thing and meaning another. He is not in the Chamber often enough to know whether or not I work hard.

I am also critical of the manner in which Cabinet Ministers are appointed. This is not a new thought; it has been in my mind for some years, even before I entered Parliament. Leaders of political parties should appoint the most competent private members to posts in Cabinet. Their likes and dislikes should not enter into it. Leaders should surround themselves with the very best lieutenants at their disposal. Even if the leader is of lesser calibre than some of his Ministers, his position is not in jeopardy because he is seen as a man who is able to weld his team together and to get the best from them. Unfortunately, this does not always happen these days. There is some degree of appointment of palace favourites. If I were leader I would not be in it.

The honourable member for Bulimba referred to the Premier's television programme, which is, in effect, a report to the State. I see nothing wrong with such a programme. I did not see the honourable member rear up on his legs at the Lord Mayor's television programmes, "City '71", "City '72", and so on right through to "City '75". The Lord Mayor is spending nearly \$126,000 a year, which is in excess of the figure given to the public, and this cost is borne by the ratepayers of Brisbane.

Against that sum the cost of the Premier's television programme pales into insignificance. Opposition members are not being fair dinkum. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; if it is good enough for the Lord Mayor to spend the ratepayers' money, it is good enough for the State Government to spend the people's money.

Before I resume my seat I express regret at the fact that the Premier and the Deputy Premier reached agreement on this matter without prior consultation with private Government members.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (3.4 p.m.): This Bill introduces a despondent note into our political history and this is a sad day for the political and parliamentary democracy of this State. As I have been reported in the news media as saying, the Premier is intoxicated by his electoral victory, and now for mere political propaganda purposes and patronage is prepared to plunder the public purse. He suffers from anxieties and traumas and has no hesitation in passing them on to the taxpayers of the State.

As Shakespeare wrote, "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." Certainly the crown is lying very uneasily upon the Premier's head at the moment. As a matter of fact, it is very difficult for the crown to fit the head. Since the coalition took office in 1957, the Ministry has increased from 11 to 14, and now it is proposed to increase the number to 18—almost a doubling of the Ministry.

This morning in very clear and concise terms the Premier said that the large increase in revenue has caused considerable hardship to fall on the shoulders of Cabinet Ministers. In no way did he take into account the huge inflationary spiralling since 1949, when a Federal counterpart of Government members remarked, while in opposition, that if he got control of the Federal Treasury benches he would put value back into the pound. We know what happened after that.

This morning the Premier used certain figures to bolster his argument. He said that the huge increase in Government revenue naturally placed a tremendous work-load on his Ministers' shoulders and it was necessary to increase the size of Cabinet to lessen the responsibility on each Minister. Opposition members have made many fine speeches opposing this measure violently. It is well that they should because this is a sad day for parliamentary democracy in Queensland. Quite rightly some Opposition members have referred to the number of Ministers in the various State Cabinets. If the Premier wishes to base his argument on revenue, it is well to note the true position. In New South Wales, in 1973-74, with 18 Cabinet Ministers, the total revenue was \$1,579,617,768; in Victoria, with 17 Cabinet Ministers, the total revenue was \$1,361,803,423; in South Australia, with 11 Cabinet Ministers, the total revenue was \$641,967,030; Western Australia with 12 Ministers had a total revenue of \$567,683,368; and Tasmania, with 10 Cabinet Ministers, had a total revenue of \$256,902,000. Queensland, with a foreshadowed Cabinet Ministry of 18 had a total revenue of \$853,675,607.

For the benefit of the Premier and other Government members—and I am sure that many Government members are ashamed of the Premier and those who were so vocal in the party room in getting him to take this course—I point out that in New South Wales the revenue, on a per-capita basis for Cabinet Ministers, was equal to \$87,756,537.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. HANSON: It will be very interesting to see how the honourable member for Townsville South votes on this occasion and whether he will still merit the title of "Tory Tom" or join with us to vote when we divide the Assembly. It will be interesting to see how fair dinkum he is because I will be telling the people of North Queensland if he does an about-turn on us.

In Victoria it will be found that the distribution is \$80,000,000 per Cabinet Minister, while if the Queensland revenue were dissected in proportion to the number of Cabinet Ministers it would be only \$47,000,000 a head. From that can be seen how easy will be their tasks. So much for the Premier and his submission about the State's revenues and the huge responsibilities that have devolved upon his Cabinet Ministers through those increased revenues.

In the early days of this Parliament uneasiness in the operation of the coalition is apparent. Within a few days of the election the party leaders were at variance, each looking suspiciously at the other, jealously observing his performance. When the Premier flew to London to consult lawyers and junior members of the Wilson Cabinet about constitutional matters, the Treasurer could not get the Australian Government Treasurer (Jim Cairns) to Queensland quickly enough. "For goodness sake", he said, "let's have some money." He said to Dr. Cairns, in effect, "While the cat's away, let the mice play a little. I want to get some propaganda in the media. I want to do something for the State." On this occasion we do not blame him, because many employees of Government departments were faced with the threat of the sack.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will return to the principles of the measure.

Mr. HANSON: Within the present Cabinet, unfortunately, Ministers are at variance. Over the week-end one Cabinet Minister transgressed, attempting to usurp the authority of a fellow Minister by making observations about the control of the Police Department. Obviously he does not have sufficient work within his own department. That is my assessment of the situation. He should concentrate on his own departmental affairs. If Ministers are to have so little work in their own portfolios that they have time

to make observations on departments controlled by their colleagues, it is only natural that the public will fail to see why the Ministry should be increased.

As this Bill was being introduced, four honourable members awaited the call. We all know how unhappy, even gloomy, people waiting in a doctor's surgery or a dentist's reception room look at times. However, today those four men, with blank stares, are completely unconcerned at the telling submissions emanating from the Opposition showing the Government up in its true light. Of course, those four men are not worried one iota about the plunder of the public purse.

As has been said, it is unfortunate that mere political expediency has led to this legislation. The names of two members of the Liberal Party who are presently on the crossbenches have echoed in the corridors of Parliament House for many moons as one day receiving the accolade and being promoted to Cabinet rank. However, there was only one vacancy. There was always intense competition between those two members for any vacancy.

Outside Parliament House the honourable member for Yeronga would most courteously open the car door for the Treasurer. At many social functions he put the milk in the Premier's coffee. In the Parliament he was given many "Dorothy Dix" questions for the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, and people said, "His performance is certainly good." It looks to be a clear case of: he who humbles himself shall be exalted.

The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha did not humble himself in the same fashion. He turned in another direction and received the nod from the Premier. Subsequently he will be the Minister assisting the Premier. It is a source of worry to me how the alleged astuteness of the Premier could have gone so much astray in selecting, not from his own party, the gentleman to receive that particular Cabinet rank.

I do not know why he overlooked the honourable member for Callide, who has distinguished himself admirably since entering the Parliament. I am certain he would be the first person to agree with me.

I have considerable admiration for one Minister presently in the Chamber for the wonderful work he has undertaken and his assiduous dedication to the part of his portfolio dealing with Aboriginal Affairs. He has worked extremely hard, and I do not take any credit from him. However, I fail to see how the future incumbent of that portfolio can say he will be a satisfactory Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement simply because he employs Aborigines on his orange grove at Gayndah. Incidentally, he grows very good oranges.

I know there are considerable heartburnings in the coalition. Members of the Opposition study the parliamentary performance of Government members and I fail

to see why the honourable member for Toowong has been overlooked and not elevated to Cabinet rank. He has researched considerably and, while to me his politics are on the nose, he has shown considerable ability in researching and making wonderful submissions in this Chamber in his party's interests. We all know the story.

We have four gentlemen who could possibly be likened to Shakespearean actors waiting in the wings, thinking of the very apt words—

"Is this a dagger which I see before me, The handle toward my hand? Come, let me clutch thee."

The Deputy Premier and Treasurer certainly knows something about that.

I intend to do exactly what the Premier and the Deputy Premier and Treasurer did when, in 1948-49, the Labor Government increased the size of the Ministry from 10 to 11. After decades, the Cabinet was increased by one. On the motion, "That the Bill be now read a second time", they voted, "No". I shall vote against this proposal. They should hang their heads in shame for proposing to increase the size of the Cabinet by four members. They are the ones commanding the ship and they are doing this. For their own political expediency and the short-term friendship that no doubt will exist they are quite willing to sink or to plunder the public purse.

Prior to 1957 no such office as Cabinet Secretary existed. It does now. In Labor days a responsible Minister recorded the minutes. This Government created the position of Cabinet Secretary to lighten the burden of Cabinet. That should not be forgotten. It would be interesting to see how much the present Cabinet depends on the Public Service, who, under this Government, do almost all of the preparation of Cabinet submissions. Do the present Ministers criticise and look microscopically at all matters that come before Cabinet? I very much doubt it. I know that some Ministers work exceedingly hard; just a while ago I gave a spray to one of them. I do not want to go through all the Cabinet, because that would be drifting away from the motion before the Committee. But there is one Minister who jumps into another Minister's responsibilities. If he does that, he cannot have enough work of his own to do, and it is about time he applied himself to his own duties.

Many Bills that now come before this Assembly are amending Bills. There is very little new legislation. Amending legislation is a consolidation of the law to make things easier for departments.

I think that the federalists among Government members would be most outraged by the Bill, and certainly many people will be outraged if they vote for this piece of legislation because, by doing so, they would by no means be upholding State rights. The centralists,

of course, would be crowing over them because they would realise that the federalists would be squirming at the Government's indiscretion in setting about this public plunder in the interests of political expediency.

I join with my colleagues in very strongly opposing the measure before the Committee.

Mr. GUNN (Somerset) (3.22 p.m.): I do not intend to delay the Committee unduly, as I think that sufficient time has already been wasted on this matter. Most of what was said by the honourable member for Port Curtis was light-hearted, and, whilst it made quite good listening, it did not contain many facts.

The fact of the matter is that for a long time members have complained bitterly about their inability to see Ministers on matters concerning various departments. I am one of them, and I have always complained when I have not been able to see a Minister. This has happened, of course, because portfolios have embraced far too many departments.

Mr. Houston: They gave you the brush off. Why don't you wake up?

Mr. GUNN: I have never been brushed off by Ministers. They have all treated me quite well. There are, however, various departments that have not been given the importance that they warrant. The honourable member for Bulimba said that Fisheries should not be removed from Primary Industries. I beg to differ on that point. If, as he claims, Fisheries should rightly be part of Primary Industries, Forestry and Mines should also be included in Primary Industries.

Mr. Houston: Why did you put Fisheries in Primary Industries?

Mr. GUNN: I say that it should never have been put there. It should be attached to another portfolio, probably one of not such great importance.

Mr. Houston: Fishermen will love that.

Mr. GUNN: The Primary Industries portfolio covers quite a number of industries, such as wheat-growing and cattle and sheep-raising, which are of great importance. Unfortunately the Opposition's Federal colleagues in Canberra do not seem to think so. Since the Whitlam Government came to office, primary producers have had the roughest trot that they have ever had in the history of this nation. Nearly all of them are now broke. I could speak for hours on all the things that the Whitlam Government has done that have been against primary producers. The damage that it has done will take years to correct. The former Leader of the Opposition should know that. He went round espousing the wonderful things that an A.L.P. Government would do for primary producers, and we now, of course, have seen the devastation that the A.L.P. Government has caused throughout Australia, particularly in Queensland.

Police, of course, should be a Ministry on its own, as should Works and Housing. I believe that the additional Ministers will be great assets to this Assembly. I have no doubt that the men chosen will apply themselves to their duties. They have all proved themselves as members of this Assembly and, knowing them as I do, I am sure that they will do a wonderful job.

The principal advantage of the proposal is that it will give back-benchers and representatives of committees and shire councils who wish to see Ministers at short notice an opportunity to do so and to discuss their various problems.

Let me look for a moment at the Federal Government and see what it has done. As mentioned by the honourable member for Murrumba, Grassby and Brendan Hansen, and umpteen dozen others, have been put into positions that should be administered by the Ministers themselves.

Mr. Houston: They get directions from the Ministers.

Mr. GUNN: We know how much direction they get. Grassby continually makes statements that I am sure embarrass his Minister. It is obvious that he does not get any direction. Surely the honourable member for Bulimba, if he were Prime Minister—God help us if he were!—would not allow anything like that to happen. I think much more of him than I do of the present Prime Minister.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. GUNN: I am interested in Grassby and Brendan Hansen.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am interested in the Bill before the Committee.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Mr. Hewitt. I was side-tracked. The point I am endeavouring to make is that that is the example set by his colleagues in Canberra.

Mr. Houston: No, it is not.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has applauded them. It is one of the reasons why he is not Leader of the Opposition today. Since the honourable member for Lytton became Leader of the Opposition, he has done a back flip. The honourable member for Bulimba refused to do that. Cairns has done it; many others have done it. That is one thing that the honourable member, as a member of the A.L.P., failed to do. He thought he was doing the right thing; in effect, he was doing the wrong thing. He did not do a back flip, and that is why he is where he is today.

People are more politically conscious now, and one sees committees being formed all over the country. It is difficult to find a television programme that does not have some political content, and people, being politically conscious, watch the workings of Parliament very closely. In my electorate in

particular, I have been asked on many occasions, "Why don't you have Assistant Ministers? Why don't you have more Ministers?"

Mr. Houston: Well, why don't you have Assistant Ministers?

Mr. GUNN: I do not believe in the appointment of Assistant Ministers. Other people in this Chamber are entitled to their opinion, but I do not believe in such appointments. I believe that Assistant Ministers would act contrary to the wishes of their own Ministers. Who will be the senior man? I suppose the Minister himself will be the senior. If he has an assistant, who will make statements? Contradictory statements could be made, and a great deal of trouble could arise from that.

In my opinion, Ministers have had too big a work-load in the past. We have seen very conscientious Ministers—I will not name them—break down.

Mr. Houston: Who are they?

Mr. GUNN: I am not going to name them. If the honourable member had been paying attention in the Chamber, he would know. If he had not had trips to New Zealand and many other places, he would know more about what occurred here. Every other honourable member knows. I am not going to spend two minutes of my time explaining to the honourable member. If he had been doing his job properly, he would know.

Mr. Houston: You have only 10 minutes, you know.

Mr. GUNN: I was going to take only 10 minutes, but I shall take a few more minutes because the honourable member has been interjecting and I wish to place a few matters before the Committee.

The Bill will mean quite a lot to backbenchers in this Chamber, and it will take a good deal of work off the shoulders of the present Ministers.

Mr. Houston: It is a good story.

Mr. GUNN: Of course it is a good story. The proposed Bill is a good Bill, but I would not expect the honourable member to acknowledge that.

Mr. Houston: It is of no interest to Queensland.

Mr. GUNN: It is of great interest to Queensland. It will give us easier access to Ministers. Ministers will be able to exercise greater control over their departments.

The honourable member for Bulimba mentioned commissions and authorities. I do not believe in them. To a certain extent we must have experts in various fields, but we are the elected Government and we should govern accordingly. I do not believe in delegating power to too many authorities or commissions.

Mr. Houston: Your Government has created more authorities than any other previous Government.

Mr. GUNN: Rubbish! I do not want to digress from the Bill, but I have to answer the honourable member for Bulimba. After Whitlam came into power, about 110 committees, authorities and suchlike were set up in the first six months.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. GUNN: I know very well that they do not like hearing about this. The point is that they have got them on their backs, and that is all there is to it.

I commend the Bill to the Committee in the firm belief that what is proposed is going to be a great asset. In spite of the fact that there is some opposition to the Bill—anaemic as it may be—from the other side of the Chamber, I am confident that what it proposes will be a great asset to the Assembly.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (3.32 p.m.): At the outset I make it quite clear that I hold nothing personal against those members who have been appointed to the Cabinet or who have been named by some newspapers as Ministers elect. I feel that such is a completely incorrect statement. We all know what happened to the present Speaker of the House. A few years ago he learned that a decision of this Parliament had to be made before he could occupy that particular office. On that occasion Parliament decided not to elect him to that office at that time. Until such time as the Bill is passed by Parliament, in actual fact no person or newspaper has the right to name anyone as a Minister elect. I back the point made in this regard earlier today by the honourable member for Townsville.

I was extremely disappointed when the Premier introduced the Bill today, but my disappointment was no greater than my amazement when the newspapers announced that Cabinet was to be increased by four. Although Government and Opposition members were acquainted with the fact that the Ministry was to be increased, despite all the speculation that was going on I do not believe that any honourable member honestly and sincerely would have been of the opinion on 18 or 19 December 1974 that the Ministry was going to be increased to 18. I challenge any honourable member to say honestly that he believed that that is what it would be. We all know that as a result of the compromise reached in the political discussion on that occasion, and the other points brought forward today, the decision was made to increase Cabinet to 18.

When the Premier introduced the Bill he said that his main reason for wanting to increase the size of Cabinet was the increased capital expenditure in the State since Cabinet was last increased in 1969. What would happen if we were to follow that

kind of logic? I do not go along with it. Most of us have had our salaries almost doubled over that period. If we followed that sort of logic, surely we should say that, because our salaries are now double what they were in 1969, we should take unto ourselves a second wife in order to help us spend it all. That was the type of logic used by the Premier in introducing the Bill.

We have heard much discussion about efforts that are being made in this Chamber and other places by certain people to denigrate Parliamentary procedure. Reference has been made to the need for an increased Ministry to overcome this. I cannot see how this will help in any way whatever. We only need read in "Hansard" what happened last Thursday morning to see an example of derogation of parliamentary procedure. When the honourable member for Landsborough attempted to give notice of a motion, one of the normal procedures allowed by Standing Orders, the Premier rose to his feet and merely said he was not prepared to accept notice of such a motion, and sat down. Surely such a decision should have been made by the Parliament as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will understand that the Committee is not debating parliamentary procedures.

Mr. CASEY: I accept your ruling, Mr. Hewitt, but you will agree that earlier in this debate much has been made of the denigration of Parliament. I have quoted that incident merely as an example of the derogation that has occurred in this Parliament since it was reconvened last week.

Earlier speakers have drawn comparisons between the present State Cabinet and those of former years as well as those in other States and the Commonwealth. The Committee has before it a motion that will allow for an increase in State Cabinet to 18 members. I remind honourable members that in the years when the Commonwealth Parliament had to carry its heaviest burden, that is, in the years from 1942 to 1945, the Federal Cabinet comprised only 18 members. Those 18 Ministers took not just the State of Queensland but the whole of the nation through its worst and most troublesome times. The population was then between 7,500,000 and 8,000,000, a figure far in excess of the population of Queensland.

As leader of the Commonwealth Cabinet was the Prime Minister, Mr. Chifley. I do not think any honourable member would deny that he was one of the greatest Prime Ministers Australia has had. Besides being Prime Minister he took it upon himself to carry out the duties of Federal Treasurer, and he did so with great efficiency. Of course at that time the Federal Ministry was concerned mainly with defence, but it also had before it the important function of national reconstruction after the war years. I repeat: at that time the Federal Cabinet consisted of only 18 Ministers.

In the present issue the important questions are, "What is the work-load that is imposed on the Cabinet Ministers? What creates the work-load they carry?" Here, too, I must be critical of the Premier for not having given greater detail of these aspects in his introduction. He did not explain the reasons for the establishment of the new departments; he did not tell us why the Ministry of Urban and Regional Affairs is necessary; he did not tell us why it is necessary to tack onto the portfolio of Mines and Energy that of Northern Development; nor did he tell us what the portfolio of Northern Development entails. All he told us was that many of the new portfolios were being created to match those in the Commonwealth Government.

Let us single out the portfolio of Northern Development. The two main aspects with which the Federal Minister for Northern Development concerns himself are the development of water resources in Northern Australia—not just North Queensland—and the sugar industry, which is almost solely confined to Queensland. In the Queensland Cabinet structure the Minister for Primary Industries has control of our greatest agricultural asset, the sugar industry, and the Minister who will be in charge of the new portfolio of Water Resources will be responsible for the implementation of water schemes. Will there be any overlapping? What is going to happen? What does the Premier envisage by creating a portfolio and department of Northern Development? What will be the respective areas of responsibility? How far will the control of the new departments extend into legislation already controlled by existing departments? The Premier should have told us these things when introducing this Bill. Unfortunately, to some extent, he engaged in the usual nonsense that we quite often hear.

It is only natural to think that the toughest portfolios would be handled by the most experienced Ministers, so it is amazing that from the Premier's announcement we learn that the three Ministers who will have the hardest jobs to do will be three of the new appointees. I have in mind the Ministries of Health, Education, and Works and Housing. One has only to look at the departmental Estimates presented each year to find that these three Ministers have the greatest Budget allocations and control the largest work-forces. I know that the honourable member for Mirani (the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Education and Cultural Activities) is looking forward happily to the day when he can off-load the Education portfolio because it is a big work-load in addition to that of his other portfolio. In fact, it is a tremendous work-load for a new Minister to undertake. It should be carried by an experienced Minister.

Mr. Jensen: Would you say that the Ministers who were left were not capable of administering those portfolios?

Mr. CASEY: I will come to that a little later. I will say that most of the former Ministers will be very happy to off-load some of the extra work they were doing. It will mean that they will have less to do. The new Minister for Water Resources will have only one department to control, that is, the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply. It is true that some facets of local government are being transferred to him. The water works that were undertaken under the supervision of the Local Government Department are to be transferred to his portfolio—and rightly so. Rather than be fragmented, all water resources of Queensland should be controlled by the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply.

We will get more fragmentation as we proceed. In the old Cabinet, the present Minister for Water Resources looked after Irrigation and Water Supply, the Department of Harbours and Marine, and the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. Why should he not be happy with a lighter work-load? If we want to determine the actual work-load of the various Ministers, we can do so quite easily by examining the Estimates for the year and noting the expenditure by the various departments. The volumes of "Hansard" can also be examined to see the number of Bills placed before the House by Ministers in former years. Some Ministers are very rarely seen or heard from one year's end to the other, other than at question time. Some Ministers have presented very few Bills while holding their portfolios. This is another way to determine the work-load.

It has been said here today, and in other places, that Parliament is the most important place in the nation. Let us make it so rather than do what we are doing under this Bill, that is, placing more executive power in the hands of a small group in this State.

The appointment of junior Ministers was referred to. I do not agree with that proposal. If Parliament wants to help Ministers to shoulder their work-load, it can do it by establishing a system of parliamentary committees. By that I do not mean party committees, despite the weakened number of the Opposition. Parliamentary committees could sort out at a very good level many of the problems arising under legislation. In this way a lot of talking could be eliminated at the introductory stage. I know that you, Mr. Hewitt, strongly favour this proposal, as do many other Government members.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not favour discussion of that matter under the Bill before the Committee. I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: I am making the point that power rests with Parliament. While power rests in Parliament, Parliament should

retain it. It should not hand it over to an executive body. In creating additional ministerial portfolios, that is what we are doing. I mention the portfolio of Police, for instance. If this legislation is enacted, Police will be the sole responsibility of one Minister. A few years ago "Police" was not even mentioned in Cabinet portfolios. It was a responsibility that was tacked on to a portfolio—for many, many years to the Premier. In previous Governments "Police" came under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs.

The first job of the Police Minister will be to correct his own mistakes and the foolishness of what he has done with the various police districts throughout the State. An awful abomination has been made of the task police divisions. As I said at question time the other day, they have been the result of some of the worst administrative decisions that have ever been made. In Mackay, for instance, the police have been split up so that in the urban area of North Mackay, with a population of 9,000 or 10,000, the people have to obtain police protection from a point 25 miles to the south. If under this legislation Police is to be a separate portfolio, perhaps that is something to be dreaded.

We will find a conflict of portfolios, where Police will be an entirely separate portfolio and Prisons another. With do-gooders and others in the community we will have the anomalous position of one Minister putting offenders in gaol and another Minister doing his best to let them out.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Do you think that the Minister for Police is a sinecure, because he is looking after 3,500 public servants?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member for Archerfield wants to interject, he should return to his usual place in the Chamber.

Mr. CASEY: The Minister for Police is a Minister of senior Cabinet ranking. In the proposed new set-up he will off-load the important departments of Works and Housing. Anybody who does not believe that housing is one of the biggest problems we have in this State today has something wrong with him. The Department of Works carries with it a tremendous proportion of departmental expenditure. I suppose most other members would share my experience of having more correspondence with the Department of Works than with any other department; yet the senior Minister will take unto himself the very small job of Police—that lovely little cushy corner of executive disposition—while one of the new, junior Ministers will be responsible for the major portfolio of Works and Housing. It is unfair to our new Ministers that they should be thrown straight into such hectic jobs.

In all sincerity I say that in past Parliaments, if a work-load grew on any Minister, it was his own fault. In my years in Parliament I have noticed that there has been an

increasing tendency in the Government for Ministers to carry the work-load of their own back-benchers. I would counsel those who have now been placed in the Cabinet—and any of those who will become members of the projected Cabinet—to beware lest they should have too great a work-load cast upon them by their own back-benchers.

It is for that reason that I now suggest, as I have before, that a system of parliamentary committees be established. That would be far more beneficial to Parliament and to Ministers, because it would place a little more responsibility on members of Parliament. The system of parliamentary committees would provide members of Parliament with a little more say in the framing of legislation and in the development of legislation.

I believe that the Bill is ill-timed and incorrect. I do not propose to support it.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (3.49 p.m.): I rise to make a contribution to this debate because I advocated the extension of portfolios in the Queensland Cabinet and because of the poppycock I have heard this afternoon of comparing us with other States, notably Victoria and New South Wales. In area, Victoria represents 3.8 per cent of the Australian Commonwealth, while Queensland represents 22.5 per cent and New South Wales 11.8 per cent. New South Wales and Victoria together represent only two-thirds of the area of Queensland. Are the people of Mt. Isa, Cairns, and other far-flung areas in Queensland not entitled to the same privileges, representation by and access to Cabinet Ministers as the people in the metropolis in the south-eastern corner of Queensland?

The whole purpose is to give a more positive form of government. Since I entered Parliament, I have seen members go downhill physically. I refer particularly to Mr. H. A. McKechnie. He was simply burdened with too much work. It is time we took a good look at ourselves. For instance, the Minister for Local Government should be able to spend more time in local government areas. However, as he is also Minister for Main Roads, he has a dual duty and it is a fairly onerous one, too. Previously, Mines and Main Roads were joined but 15 years ago mining was insignificant whereas today, thank God, it is one of our greatest industries.

Mr. Casey: Do you think that potential Cabinet Ministers should qualify medically?

Mr. HARTWIG: I do not know about "medically". I will leave that to members of the Opposition. I am concerned about representation.

I believe that a system of appointing junior Ministers should be introduced. It is not good enough that a back-bencher should have to step out of the ranks and take over a Ministry. As I said, Queensland covers a vast area and if we are to show positive government we should have men prepared to

step into portfolios. We believe in private enterprise and we are virtually asking the gardener to take over the management by appointing to Cabinet a man from the back-benches. I believe that he should be groomed to occupy that position. A man must know his director and his department. I think that this would show to the people of Queensland some positive form of government.

I commend the Bill and I certainly will support it.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (3.53 p.m.): We have listened today to probably the worst splurge of sickening hypocrisy that has ever been splashed on the floor of this Chamber. In the first place let me deal with the speech of the honourable member for Port Curtis. It has been described as being somewhat facetious and a little good-humoured. He clearly demonstrated to the Committee that he should be the leader of the A.L.P. in this Chamber. His speech was completely unrehearsed. Not one word of it was read. It was extempore. He made the Leader of the Opposition look like a rag-picker.

The arguments of some Government members, or should I say some of the things they mentioned, are based on two grounds. The first is that two wrongs make a right; that because the Federal Government has gone completely haywire and is spending the taxpayers' money with the reckless abandon of a drunken sailor and is appointing its mates, its mates' mates and its mates' girlfriends and everybody else to very well-paid positions, this Parliament should do the same by exploding the ministerial ranks. I do not agree with that at all. I have never believed that two wrongs make a right.

The next argument they put forward was directed to the personal calibre of some back-bench members who might be appointed to the Ministry. I have been in the Queensland Parliament for some considerable time. During that period the A.L.P. was in power for 13 years and the National and Liberal Parties from 1957, and I have seen some frightful rumpers appointed to the Ministry, believe you me! But some seemed to make good. I suppose they had to learn as they went along, at the taxpayers' expense. What I have learned is that it is impossible to say who would be a successful Minister by judging him on his performance as a back-bencher. Sometimes a good back-bencher will make a deplorable Minister, and vice versa. So that argument does not cut any ice with me.

The real fact of the putrid political game is that there are not enough plums on the tree to go round all members of the Government parties. There never have been. Those who sit under the tree waiting in vain for plums to fall into their hands naturally become a little sour at those who are up in the tree munching on large, juicy plums. In the Government parties today

there are 69 members, and, even with the passage of this Bill, there will be only 20 plums—18 Ministers, the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. The office of Chairman of Committees is, of course, a rather dry and shrivelled plum, but nevertheless it is a plum. Forty-nine members of the Government parties therefore have to go without any semblance of plums at all. Human nature being what it is, naturally they all say to themselves, "I'm just as good as any of those who have plums, even shrivelled plums. I wonder why I haven't got one?" There is then a hotbed of dis-sentiment and discontent among the rank and file of party members.

I shall tell the Committee a perfectly true story of what followed speeches made last Tuesday when the House elected its Speaker. Incidentally, I pay a tribute to you, Mr. Hewitt, because in my long period in this Chamber very few men have so applied themselves with tremendous energy, and much burning of the midnight oil, to gaining the command of the English language that you have. I suppose you would stand almost unexcelled as an expert in philology and etymology. That is to your credit.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is with the greatest of reluctance that I point out that the honourable member's remarks are not pertinent to the Bill.

Mr. AIKENS: They may not be pertinent to the Bill, Mr. Hewitt, but they are analogous and I hope to be able to make my point. That of itself still did not qualify you for a ministerial position.

When we speak of men who are good back-benchers and would make good Ministers, let me say that a fellow came to me after the speeches on Tuesday, the conclusion of which saw the election of the honourable member for Redcliffe as Speaker, and said, "Did you hear Frawley say that Wright was a Baptist, and that he went to various churches and changed his religion at every church he attended?" I said, "No, I didn't hear it, and, if I did, I wouldn't believe it, because, although I am prepared to believe almost anything about Mr. Wright's political exploits, I do not believe that he is an apostate." This fellow said, "Frawley didn't say that; he said he was a Baptist."

Mr. Wright: Who was that fellow?

Mr. AIKENS: I will have a talk with the honourable member for Rockhampton later and see if we can reach some agreement on the matter.

Let us face up to facts. I tell the Committee that I have quite a number of leaks right into the top echelon of the A.L.P., and, if the A.L.P. had been successful at the last election, as its members really thought they would be (such is the way people can delude themselves, and there is almost as much delusion in politics as in religion), they were going to have 20

Ministers. Yet we find them here wringing their hands, beating their breasts, and saying, "We cannot have 18 Ministers. That is far too many."

When the Leader of the Opposition put forward the proposition the other day that the 11 A.L.P. members would form a coalition with the 30 members of the Liberal Party and someone said, "What are you going to do about a Speaker?", he said, "Tom Aikens will take the Speakership." As you know, Mr. Hewitt, I abhor and abominate any suggestion of vulgarity, any suggestion of the argot of the gutter, when speaking in this Chamber. I think we should all strive to keep the plane of debate in this Chamber as high as we can. But I think I lapsed on that particular occasion when a top-ranking executive member of the A.L.P. came to me and put that proposition to me, because I said, "As far as I am concerned, Jack, you can put the Speakership where the work-house foreman was told to put the Christmas pudding." Perhaps that is what would have happened.

Let us be frank about it, Mr. Hewitt. The question we have to decide for ourselves is this: are 18 Ministers necessary for the successful government of Queensland? The people will say, "What sort of a Parliament have we? What sort of a Government have we? All chiefs and no Indians!" Quite frankly—and I am saying this with all the sincerity at my command and on the basis of my years of experience of the operation of this Assembly—I do not think 18 Ministers are necessary to run this Parliament and this State, in view of all the aids, additional secretarial assistance, and so on, now available.

However, I wish to refer to something that I think will affect every member representing an electorate outside Brisbane, and I hope that some mention of it is made in the media because I think something should be done about it. A system is creeping into the Ministry in Queensland that is repugnant to me and repugnant to every dinky-die rank-and-file member of this Parliament who represents a country electorate, that is, an electorate outside the Brisbane metropolitan area.

Many Ministers are now getting into the habit, when they have to take legal action against any person who breaches a regulation or law administered by their department, of issuing a summons against the offender. I have no objection to a summons being issued if it is considered that that is necessary; but Ministers are getting into the habit—and this is what is repugnant to me—of issuing all Queensland Government summonses out of the Magistrates Court in Brisbane. That means that if a person away up in Weipa or Cloncurry, or Townsville or Cooktown, or even half way down the Queensland coast at Rockhampton, receives a summons for a breach he has committed and that summons is taken out

in the Magistrates Court in Brisbane, it places that unfortunate person in the unenviable position of saying, "Well, I might be fined a few dollars if I do not go down; but the expense and inconvenience of going to Brisbane to fight the case will be greater than the cost to me if I do not go."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will come back to the motion before the Committee.

Mr. AIKENS: I have made that point, Mr. Hewitt, and I hope that the Premier, who is now in the Chamber, will do something about it. I think it is monstrous that, when the Government takes out an ordinary Magistrates Court summons against any alleged offender in any part of the State, that summons is taken out in the Brisbane Magistrates Court. As I said, it is monstrous, and I think it is unforgivable on the part of a Government that talks of decentralisation. I know the practice is sneaking in; perhaps Ministers do not know about it. I will say this for both the former Minister for Main Roads and the present Minister for Main Roads: they have always been very happy to listen to representations that I have made to them in order to have a summons cancelled or to have the matter settled out of court.

There is an eternal argument—I have heard arguments on one side and arguments on the other—as to which is the better way of selecting Cabinet Ministers—selection by the leader of the party, or selection by a caucus ballot. I have seen both methods in operation. I suppose you have, too, Mr. Hewitt, although I do not wish to embarrass you. There are grave deficiencies in both methods. However, of the two, I should say that selection of a Minister by the leader of the party is preferable to the election of a Minister by members of his own party in a caucus meeting. I have seen so much skulduggery, so much bribery, so much coat-tailing, so many putrid things in the election of a Minister by the rank-and-file members of his party that, although there are many arguments against it, I prefer the system of the leader of the party selecting Ministers.

We talk about the people not knowing what goes on in this Parliament. People do not know how Ministers are selected. In fact the people would not know a Minister if they saw one. I came in from Eagle Farm this morning in a taxi. The driver, a rather intelligent sort of chap, started to talk about the Premier, as most people do. He said, "What's he like?" I said, "What do you mean, 'What's he like?'" He said, "What's he look like? I've seen him on television and I have seen his photograph in the Press. First of all they tell me he's been there a long while, and yet he looks only a kid." I said, "He's remarkably young in appearance. He has the appearance of a man of about 30 or 35. He has lived a clean life. He has led a very hard working life. I can assure

you he is as young as he looks." He said, "I'd like to see him." I said, "You wouldn't lose anything by seeing him. He's well worth a look at."

If we are going to be dinky-die with the people of Queensland, it is time we started televising proceedings, particularly now that colour television is the vogue. Every now and again, quite surprisedly and quite unexpectedly, the proceedings of this Parliament should be televised so that the public can see us here in action just as we are, without any of the flim-flam or rehearsals to spoil the effect. Let the operators of the television cameras sneak in whenever they feel inclined so that the people of Queensland can be shown just how this Parliament works and so that they can see whether or not the Premier, his Ministers and members are carrying out their job.

I do not think that 18 Ministers are necessary, but because of the sickening and slobbering hypocrisy of the A.L.P. on the matter, which was particularly exemplified by the honourable member for Port Curtis of all people, I am not going to vote against the Bill. I will walk out of the Chamber rather than vote for the Bill. But for the sickening and slobbering hypocrisy of the A.L.P., I would vote against the Bill, but I would rather do something unpleasant to myself than vote with the A.L.P. against the Bill. I do not believe that 18 Ministers are necessary. I will not support the Bill, but I will not vote with the A.L.P. against the Bill. I am sickened by the hypocrisy it has displayed. Nobody knows better than the honourable member for Port Curtis, who should be the Leader of the Opposition—and he demonstrated it today by his stirring oration, making Tom Burns look like a rag-picker—that, if the A.L.P. had been elected to power on 7 December last, it was going to have 20 Ministers. Yet A.L.P. members ask me to vote with them on this measure!

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (4.9 p.m.): On 20 August 1969 the Premier moved a motion very similar to the one before the Committee, the principal purpose of which was to raise the ministerial numbers from 13 to 14. He produced quite reasonable arguments for the proposal at that time. The Opposition was then led by the honourable member for Bulimba. He made some quite pertinent observations about the growth of Cabinet over a number of years. His figures have been touched on one way or another today, but I would remind the Committee of them. On that occasion he said—

"In the 43 years from 1920 to 1963 the Ministry increased by two, from 9 to 11. In the six years since 1963 the Ministry has already increased by two, and there is now to be another increase which will make three in the short period of six years. There were two in 43 years, yet this Government has seen fit to appoint an additional three in six years."

He went on to make comparisons with other Australian Parliaments in the ratios of

members to Ministers and the population represented. In cold figures it would seem that Queensland is quite heavily weighted with Ministers. However, Queensland has its own set of problems with its spread of population, size, decentralisation and diversity of industry, so comparisons with other States are of little relevance.

If we are to act responsibly on this present proposal, we should get back to the figures quoted by the honourable member for Bulimba, which showed an increase of two Ministers in 43 years, an increase of three in the next six years, and now an increase of four in the following six years. This is getting close to doubling the size of the Ministry in 12 years. I suppose the same arguments would be just as logical in six or 12 years time as they are today, so if, on those arguments, we follow this progression we will have a pretty big Ministry. It is quite incredible, really. Obviously something went wrong. Something goes on in the Cabinet room. They are breeding like flies in there and we need a little bit of zero population growth or some other control. This sudden rise is regrettable.

A Government Member: A bit of radiation.

Mr. MURRAY: Let me say to all my colleagues on the back benches—the old frustrated and the new starry-eyed—“Take heart, because it won't be long before we are all in the Ministry.” The only “indians” will be in that little bunch that is grouped on the Opposition front benches.

Mr. Porter: This is Parkinson's law.

Mr. MURRAY: It certainly is. I fully supported the 1969 proposal to increase the size of Cabinet from 13 to 14. Thirteen was never a number that I was very happy about. It is not that the number 13 has been unlucky for me. I stayed alive in the 13th Battalion for six years, I was married on the 13th day of a month, and many happy things have happened to me on 13's. I have, however, only six children! Nevertheless, the figure of 13 always seemed to remind me of a great group of 13 persons who had such a profound influence on the course of history and civilisation.

I was rather pleased that the Premier saw fit at that time to increase the size of Cabinet from 13 to 14, because while the number remained at 13 I was never quite sure that we might not find amongst them one who would settle for 30 pieces of silver. However, we are away from that number; we had moved to 14, and I understood the present proposal to be that the number be increased to 16, but instead it is to be 18, consisting of 10 National Party and eight Liberal Ministers. This is regrettable. As I suggested before, something went wrong. I do not doubt for a moment what the Premier's intention was. It was canvassed that the number would be 16. But suddenly we find it is to be 18.

We know from the reports that the parliamentary and organisational leaders of the coalition parties were locked in conference for several days of bargaining while the State waited with hushed and bated breath for the outcome. When it came it was received with a good deal of shock, amazement and cynicism.

The only conclusion we could come to from the little information that was available was that the Treasurer was completely adamant that he wanted the members for Ipswich, Yeronga and Mt. Coot-tha appointed to Cabinet and, to cope with what seemed to be an inflexible demand, the Premier was forced to increase his party's representation in Cabinet, with the result that we are to have 10 National Party and eight Liberal Ministers.

The Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party chooses his own Ministers. He makes his choice freely, without pressure or suggestion at any meeting of the party. But it was not always so. In the first place, he was elected by his parliamentary colleagues in 1957, as were all of the Morris, Munro and Hiley teams. The Treasurer inherited this system of election by the parliamentary party. In more recent times of serving Ministers, we find that the Minister for Justice (Mr. Knox) and the Minister for Community and Welfare Services (Mr. Herbert) were also elected under that system. The change to selection by the leader came with the appointment of the Minister for Industrial Development (Mr. Campbell), and was subsequently carried on for the appointment of the Minister for Transport (Mr. K. W. Hooper).

I have never wavered in my belief that a leader should always select his own staff; that he should have the unchallenged right of hire and fire. I believe that should apply in the parliamentary party system as it should in the service system or anywhere else outside. I played a leading part in effecting the change from election to selection, and I stand by it. The success of the selection method depends very heavily on the qualities of a leader as a leader. If he has that somewhat rare and natural instinct and ability to lead, and is prepared to use it, not only can he command respect and loyalty but he will get it. And, of course, he will give it. He can put around him the strong and the able, and even the independent, because he can command and they will know it.

If the Parliamentary Liberal Party was still using the election method, I have grave doubts—it is a matter of opinion—whether any of those whom the Treasurer has chosen would, in fact, make the Ministry. But that is a matter of opinion only. As the honourable member for Townsville South properly pointed out, we never know until a man pulls on the guernsey of ministry how he will perform—or until he pulls on the guernsey of leadership. We may have a pretty fair idea, but we are never quite sure.

Sometimes we expect far too much of our Ministers. Often we have a good Minister and expect him to make a good leader—but that is not always the case. Without being facetious, I think everyone agrees that Mr. Bill McMahon was a first-class Minister. He handled a number of portfolios in the Federal Government with a great deal of application and did extremely well. But as a leader—obviously no. I think we expect too much.

The Premier has demonstrated qualities of leadership on many occasions. I am glad that he is in the Chamber to hear my remarks. Quite recently we have seen very great and wide public endorsement and recognition of these qualities. The Treasurer, I believe, has always been a hard-working, able Minister—prompt and decisive. But as a leader, he just has not got it. Nor should we automatically expect him to have it. He has been the leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party for many years—since Sir Thomas Hiley retired. There has never been a challenge to his leadership, although I personally have commented publicly, as I do now, on his ability as a leader. We have, I think, waited long and patiently for time to demonstrate that he would grow into leadership. He has not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable gentleman is now moving away from the Bill. While he was talking about the method by which Ministers were selected, I thought that his remarks came within the scope of proper discussion, but now that he is talking about leadership of parties he is moving away from Ministers of State.

Mr. MURRAY: I have very little to add in conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Nevertheless, I have made a ruling, and I should like the honourable member to respect it.

Mr. MURRAY: As you realise, Mr. Hewitt, I have not seen the Bill. I believe it is now time that he be asked to move over, to stand aside, and make room for the heir apparent who, I am tempted to say, I believe would fill the leadership void and work with the compatibility so desirable at coalition level, at the same time raising to a recognisable degree the integrity . . .

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable gentleman will return to the Bill.

Mr. MURRAY: To enable me to finish, I move the following amendment to the motion—

“Add the words—

‘and for other purposes.’”

I regret that I have to do that, Mr. Hewitt, but I have only a few more prepared notes that I desire to touch on.

As I said, I believe that if the move I have suggested was taken we could then raise the Liberal Party’s identity, integrity and credibility to a recognisable level.

I very much regret that the number of the Ministry is to be 18 rather than 16. Speaking of the Liberal Party, more Ministers will not improve our image and prestige—nor would they necessarily improve the prestige and image of any party. It is performance that parties need. What we require is more able and capable Ministers rather than more Ministers, with the parliamentary party working under its leader as a team.

Amendment (Mr. Murray) negatived.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (4.21 p.m.): I have listened carefully to the debate today mainly to hear the reasons for the increase in the Cabinet. I think most honourable members have listened to this long debate to discover exactly why the Cabinet is to be increased from 14 to 18. A number of speakers from the Government side have elaborated on the original point put forward by the Premier, which was that the work-load of Ministers was very, very heavy. That seems to be the only reason that they have been able to bring forward.

We have heard opposition from some Government members, and the honourable member for Townsville put his views. It is a great pity, however, that he suddenly lost the courage he obviously had on 23 December 1974, when this report appeared in “The Courier-Mail”—

“Liberal Party back-bencher, Dr. Scott-Young, will cross the floor when Parliament votes to increase the size of State Cabinet.”

That reminds me of a previous situation, when the new Minister for Health promised he would cross the floor but suddenly lost the courage or the intestinal fortitude to carry through with it. However, perhaps the honourable member for Townsville will tell us another story another day.

I have listened very carefully for the reason for the increase. However, the only one seems to be that given by the Premier—the huge work-load on his Ministers. Other reasons have been suggested. “Cronyism” was one. The proposal has been criticised as being unnecessary and a game of numbers. It has been suggested that the only way the Premier could gain control in the Cabinet by having a majority of two was in fact to have 18. He must have had that majority; otherwise he could have ended up with eight all. Also, he must have had Ministers like the member for Mt. Coot-tha.

We have also heard the criticism that this will be a very costly exercise, but there has been no rebuttal from the Government side. It has been suggested that the cost will be anywhere from \$200,000 to \$500,000. The ministerial salaries amount to nothing like that; but when the changes within the departments are costed, the figure becomes huge.

I listened to the honourable member for Murrumba and thought, "He is a very vocal person. Surely he will tell us the reason for the increase." However, as usual we were bombarded with the personal attack on A.L.P. people in the Federal sphere. I stand by those Government members who said the other day that they do not want to be a "Frawley" after spending three or six years in Parliament. I can understand why it is now being said that hysterical attitudes and hysterical behaviour in this Chamber are referred to as "doing a Frawley". One would have thought that, in view of the seriousness of the debate, he would at least have given us one reason why there should be this increase.

I suggest that the only reason given—the work-load of Ministers—is not a valid one, because in fact some Ministers are greatly underworked. We accept that there are two aspects to the ministerial performance or function—firstly, legislative within this Parliament and, secondly, administrative over departments.

It is very interesting to use statistics and go back to 1971 to see what the legislative roles of the various Ministers have been. In 1971 the Premier dealt with six Bills, the Treasurer with five, and the Minister for Mines and Main Roads one. What a huge task he had in 1971! The Minister for Justice dealt with eight; the Minister for Education dealt with one; the Minister for Primary Industries with one; the Minister for Health with four; the Minister for Tourism with four; the Minister for Lands with two; the Minister for Works and Housing with five; the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs with three; and the Minister for Local Government with seven. And here is the interesting part. Neither the Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs nor the Minister for Transport dealt with one during the whole of 1971.

The relevant figures for 1972 to 1974 are—

Portfolio	Number of Bills			
	1972-73	1973-74	1974	Total
Premier	4	8	5	17
Treasurer .. .	4	11	6	21
Mines and Main Roads	2	4	2	8
Justice	30	36	8	74
Education .. .	2	7	..	9
Health	3	3	3	9
Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services	3	..	1	4
Development and Industrial Affairs	6	8	..	14
Primary Industries	9	5	5	19
Works and Housing	6	3	3	12
Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs	2	2	1	5
Lands and Forestry	1	5	3	9
Transport	1	1	..	2
Local Government and Electricity	3	21	4	19

In those three years the Minister for Justice worked very hard. He introduced 74 Bills. I do not know how the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs spent his time, and it could hardly be said the Minister for Transport was overworked! In those three years the Premier introduced 17 Bills, the Treasurer 21, the Minister for Primary Industries 19, and the Minister for Local Government and Electricity 19. But what about the rest of them? What were they doing?

Sir Gordon Chalk: What about the Budget?

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept that the Treasurer has his task. I am not decrying that. As a matter of fact I include him among the hard workers, despite what a previous speaker said.

But what about the rest? What have they been doing? We have been told by the Premier that the reason for introducing the Bill is the work-load on Ministers, requiring the huge increase from 14 to 18 Ministers. Ignoring the five or six hard workers—the others have been having a holiday.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: All that has happened has been to take Consumer Affairs from him, but his will still be a work-load.

It is also an interesting exercise to go through the administrative roles of Ministers. I have not the time to do so now but I suggest that members take a few moments to look through the State Directory. In the back of that booklet they will find listed the responsibilities, areas of control and Acts administered by the various Ministers. Then they would come back and agree with the sentiments of the Opposition that many Ministers are in fact greatly underworked.

Many Ministers have limited administrative roles. I might add that they have limited administrative expertise. Many of them are known to be totally dependent upon their departmental heads. We have seen them in action when legislation is being discussed. Some of them cannot answer a question without sending a note to a departmental officer who sits in the lobby. When the note is handed back, they rise and give the answer. This has gone on and on.

Many Ministers have not taken the interest to find out what their departments are about. We speak of departmental control and the need for departmental supervision. We also speak of ministerial responsibility. I think it is a joke in this Chamber and will continue to be until Ministers apply themselves to their tasks.

Ministers are in fact only figureheads. They parrot what their public relations officers say. A well-known National Party

member in Rockhampton said to me that the Acting Minister for Education had never said so much before he suddenly became the Minister for Education. And we know that somebody else writes everything he says. I have a lot of time personally for the Minister in question. But this goes to prove the point that many Ministers depend totally on the people behind them. Some even get their departmental heads to publicly fire the shots. I noticed this in education the other day. When there was talk about fire danger in schools, it was departmental heads who answered queries and criticisms. It is departmental heads who go on television programmes to argue against those who criticise. It is departmental heads who answer questions in this Parliament, and they or their officers who write speeches delivered here.

In fact, what do Ministers do? What is their task? They certainly receive salaries for carrying out their duties, but I believe that they play a very small part indeed in the administrative functioning of the State. I have always been fearful of the growth of bureaucracy, and I have always looked to Ministers to be at least the instruments of Parliament to control the growth of bureaucracy, and to supervise delegated authority, subordinate legislation, Orders in Council, and in fact the total powers that Parliament gives to departments. Despite what has been said by other Opposition members, if I thought that an increase in the size of Cabinet would bring about control over bureaucracy, I would support this move. But I do not believe that it will. I do not believe that increasing the size of Cabinet from 14 to 18 will change anything for the better.

I believe that, next to the Premier, bureaucracy is the greatest threat to this State, and Ministers have a responsibility given to them by Parliament to safeguard the State from the forces of bureaucracy. The appointment of additional Ministers will not overcome this problem. The new Ministers will simply fall into the same old groove of total dependence upon departmental heads. While we have criticised the Treasurer, I wonder how many other Ministers can match his ability answering questions off the cuff. Most Ministers have their cronies on the back benches put up "Dorothy Dixers" to them, which they proceed to answer from long screeds. At least the Treasurer does not have to do that; but Ministers like him are few and far between. Very few Ministers can match the Treasurer in knowledge of their departments and their portfolios, and I pat him on the back for that. He is very much alone in Cabinet in knowing his departmental role.

I suggest that we need to control bureaucracy and to supervise all the decisions that are being made within it. I agree with the honourable member for Mackay that this will be achieved only if Parliament accepts the idea of select committees. I suggest that

under the new system of 18 Ministers, many of the new Ministers will have a holiday. Let us go through the list of administrative Acts for which the Ministers will be responsible. Consider the Minister who will look after Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries. What will he really do? I believe that he will have one long holiday. I am not casting aspersions on the person who will be selected for this portfolio, but I do think he will have a great holiday.

The Police portfolio has been well canvassed. What in fact will this Minister do? The Commissioner runs the whole force.

An Honourable Member: Continue to muck it up.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, continue to muck it up. To show how much he will not have to do—he has now been made Leader of the House.

What will be the task of the Minister for Works and Housing? How will he earn the money to be paid to him? Tourism and Marine Services will be a laugh. Will this Minister's task be to go around the islands to see what tourist resorts we have? That is what it comes down to. And what of Water Resources? I understand that the Minister who has this portfolio now was a very hard-working Minister in his previous portfolio, but I think he is very lucky to get this one.

It is very apparent that this increase has not been made necessary because of what we have seen Ministers doing previously. We know that many of them have not worked. I suggest that honourable members go back over their speeches to see how many times they have stood up in this Chamber. They will find that with some Ministers the occasions have been very few.

A comparison with other States supports the view, to use the words of Dean Martin, that there are "too many chiefs and not enough Indians." Let me instance one State. I have heard arguments advanced by Government members that Queensland is different, that it is huge and diversified. Let us compare Queensland with Western Australia. The only great difference is in population. The Parliament of Western Australia has 81 members and 12 Ministers, while the Queensland Parliament, with 82 members, is to have 18 Ministers. Are we saying that Sir Charles Court's boys are more competent than Joh Bjelke-Petersen's boys? Are we saying that Queensland Ministers are in fact incompetent?

I believe that this comparison can be taken even further. Let us look at what happened in the past—because we use precedents in this State. In 1896 we had 73 members in this Chamber, with eight Ministers. Now, with 82 members, we are to have 18 Ministers. In 1896 the Ministry made up almost 11 per cent of the Parliament; it will now be double that—22 per

cent. The honourable member for Clayfield spoke about the last 23 years. I think it is worth going right back to 1896.

Let us look at the statistics. If we do, we realise that they do not lend credence to the need for the increase that the Committee has before it in the proposed legislation. There are no real grounds for it; the only ground is cronyism. I have been told that the original intention was in fact to appoint only two additional Ministers. That was all that it was to be—two Ministers—but there was political pressure within the Parliament from the Government parties and there was outside pressure, and the Premier was faced with a dilemma. The only solution he had was to appoint four additional Ministers.

I suggest that this is going to be detrimental to the members of this Assembly, and particularly because of the way portfolios have been allocated. I hold the honourable member for Burdekin in high respect, but I suggest that he is now only a junior Minister and should not have been given the Education portfolio. No doubt he has an interest in the problems of education, but Education has always been a very important portfolio in this Assembly and it has been seriously downgraded. Consumer Affairs has been downgraded. At a time when people need protection and when the whole State needs positive laws in the area of consumerism, we have it downgraded by being taken from the Minister for Justice and put into Industrial Development.

I suggest, Mr. Hewitt, that the legislation proves a number of things. First, it proves that the Premier will do almost anything to retain power. Next, it proves that the Government cares little what it spends provided it gets its own way. As I said earlier, this proposal could cost somewhere between \$200,000 and \$500,000. I suggest also that there are no principles involved as to looking after the State. The honourable member for Callide based his argument on the claim that the proposal will give greater representation to the people of Queensland. Let us examine that. Of the 18 Ministers, 11 come from the south-east corner of the State; four come from Central Queensland, between Bundaberg and Mackay; two come from the South-west, and one from the Near North (the honourable member for Burdekin). There is no-one from the Central-west, no-one from the Far North and no-one from the North-west. So how are we covering the State? How will this give the people of the State the representation that they deserve?

There is a humorous aspect of this matter which will probably make the headlines—and I was told about it only recently. The Premier knew, of course, that the Opposition did not have the numbers to worry him. All that bothered him was how he was going to cover up the increase in the Cabinet

table. It has been all round the lobbies that first the Cabinet table was to be increased by 6 ft. and then the Premier, suddenly finding that this might be embarrassing, decided that it should be increased by only 3 ft. How is that for being great stewards of the State's funds! If there is a young journalist in the Press gallery who wants an interesting exercise, he might try to find out where the money is coming from. How is the increase in size of the Cabinet table being paid for? I am told that it will not show up in any financial report.

It is obvious that there are no sound reasons for this proposal. One moment the Premier speaks of his desire to take over the Treasury, but, although that has been done in every other Australian State, he certainly is not doing it here. So we cannot trust him. If we think back to what happened in October and November, we see that none of the things he mentioned then have come to pass in the changes today—not in the numbers or in the dispersing of the portfolios themselves.

I admit that the opposition we give will not mean very much. But I suggest to new members that they might consider that they are supporting something that is unnecessary, something that is going to be very costly, something that falls into line with cronyism or what might be called jobs for the boys.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (4.39 p.m.): We have had the Opposition making enormous mountains out of little molehills—I could probably say with accuracy bigger molehills out of little molehills—and attempting to exploit a situation in a very petty way for political advantage.

This is one of the unhappy situations that Government back-benchers face from time to time. Many of us may not like the enlargement of the Cabinet that is proposed in the Bill; but when we set this against the very massive issues in which we are involved against the A.L.P. socialists, then we have to ask ourselves, "Is this an issue on which we should align ourselves with the A.L.P. and give it strength, succour and encouragement that it may then employ against us in other areas that are infinitely more important to us?"

So in my view it is quite proper for my colleague the honourable member for Townsville, myself and others to indicate that we are opposed to some aspects of the Bill, but we are not going to vote with the Opposition against it. We are not going to help the Opposition to make hay at our expense.

Any comment on the Government's attitude here comes very poorly from the Opposition, no member of which has ever had the courage to act as an individual on any issue that has come before the Parliament in all the years that I have been here. Honourable members opposite are totally, permanently and irrevocably bound by their party machine.

In the debate here and in the presentation of the Bill one can sympathise with the Premier because it may well be that, to some degree, he is in a similar situation to back-benchers. In other words, he has to accept responsibility for something which may not necessarily be entirely of his own making. Who knows? We don't. This is a decision he may have accepted as one required to provide a stable coalition. Certainly the coalition must be kept stable at this time of great economic and political stress and strain.

One is concerned that the number is 18. It indeed is a big number. There was talk before the election that after the poll the Cabinet might be increased to 16. I think most of us would have been very happy and quite content to see the Cabinet enlarged to 16. I agree with many speakers on both sides that an enlargement beyond 16 is unwise, because most people in the electorate see this as unwarranted. It takes a great deal of explaining to persuade them that there is a very useful purpose behind it. Unfortunately, for many people it has that atmosphere about it of a convenient arrangement for political expediency. I believe that this tends to weaken the Government's prospects of standing successfully against the Federal parade of bureaucratic build-up and the overweening extravagance we have been talking about for a long time. For me the enlargement from 14 to 18 in one fell swoop is regrettable.

Of course, numbers alone are not the aspect that really should concern this Chamber. Particularly on this side of the Chamber I think the way in which it was done is the sorriest aspect, and my colleague the honourable member for Townsville properly mentioned this. The arrangement was announced in the Press. There was no consultation with members of the Government, and there was not even advice to them. To add insult to injury the putative Ministers were in fact named. They were named before the proposal to enlarge the Cabinet to 18 was even put to the Government parties, before the Governor had been consulted and before the securing of Parliament's consent to it. I do not think this does us any good at all. It is a tendency to treat Parliament with quite an undue amount of scorn. I very much regret it.

It meant, of course, that when the proposition came to the party rooms it was difficult for members to revolt against it. It meant that members were presented with a proposition which a large bulk of people supported because they had a vested interest in the proposition as it stood, namely, existing Cabinet Ministers and proposed new Cabinet Ministers. A large number of new members are unsure of the political scene and, of course, quite properly do not want to rock the boat at this very early stage. So it is extremely difficult to do anything about such a proposition inside party rooms.

The great worry I have is that we have a very extraordinary Parliament here, and

the great problem that this Parliament will have to face as its term slowly goes by will be its gross imbalance. The electorate has provided the Parliament with 69 Government members and 11 Opposition members. It means that we on this side have to take enormous care to ensure that we do not generate our own problems. The best way to ensure this is to have a good, sensible Cabinet—not necessarily a large Cabinet—that recognises the proper role of the back-bencher and treats the rank and file as people of intelligence and with consideration. Setting a pattern right at the opening of treating the back-bencher as something of a necessary nuisance is not a happy start. I do not believe it is useful for a Cabinet, the executive branch of government, to give the impression that its own parliamentary members do not amount to very much at all. It is not a good start for what I say will undoubtedly be an extraordinary Parliament and, without very careful handling, one that might turn out to be a very difficult Parliament.

The electorate cannot be blamed if they see this situation as expediency arising out of fairly crude party-political bargaining. If anything was demonstrated by the State election last year as well as by all elections in recent years, it was that the electorate as a whole are fed up to the back teeth with parties trying to do things for narrow party-political advantage. They expect a lot better than that from us.

I very deeply regret the significance of this Bill, in that the enlargement of Cabinet coming to Parliament now means that there was a stage when the Executive pre-empted the Government parties' and Parliament's approval of the proposals and that people were named for posts that did not exist in order to end hopes and aspirations of others. Following that—and this is what I believe will persuade most people that it was an expedient arrangement—there was this peculiar arrangement of portfolios, to which my colleague the honourable member for Windsor and other honourable members have referred. It seems to me that before very long we will need to have another wholesale rearrangement of portfolios to give them some real and equitable sense. All this is bad for Parliament and bad for the Government. As I said at the outset, no-one can be sure where the real blame for this lies.

I do hope that we can learn from our mistakes. And it was surely a mistake to do it in the way it was done. It is a mistake for which we will pay in lost prestige and perhaps in unnecessary friction as time goes on. I hope that, having made the mistake, we will learn from it and never tread an expedient path of this kind again.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (4.48 p.m.): This is the second occasion during this session on which I have risen to make a speech under what might be described as somewhat

surprising circumstances. Firstly, during the debate on the election of Mr. Speaker, an offer was made to me as Leader of the Liberal Party to link up, as it were, with the Labor Party, and on that occasion I spoke impromptu. Today I had no intention of entering this debate, so whatever I say is said by way of an impromptu speech and with all the sincerity that I possess. It is backed by the knowledge that I have gained over the 28 years that I have been in this Chamber.

I believe that as a member of Parliament my personal integrity has never been questioned. I also believe I have carried out my responsibilities to my electors in a manner completely acceptable to them. This has been demonstrated by the fact that I have been returned to this Chamber on 11 occasions, once unopposed. Those whom I represent have seen fit to return me and, I believe, have not questioned my integrity.

The Bill before the Committee is designed to increase the number of Cabinet Ministers to 18. I know that there are people who feel that the increase in number is not warranted. Each honourable member is entitled to express himself on whether he is in favour, or not, of the increase. I believe it is an honourable member's right to demonstrate in this Chamber where he stands on the matter. I also believe that there is a responsibility on any person who carries the banner of a political party—any person who seeks nomination and is nominated, selected and ultimately elected to represent that party—to at least try to support the views of the party. But within his conscience he has the right to do otherwise.

When we come to the issues of the leadership of a party and decisions made by members of the party, I believe that the integrity of the person concerned should lead him to make his charges within the ambit of the party room. This afternoon, unfortunately, the debate on this Bill in this Chamber has given one member of the Liberal Party an opportunity to wrap within the realm of the Bill a condemnation of my integrity and my leadership. I believe that I can keep my remarks in reply within the ambit of the Bill.

As to my leadership, the honourable member for Clayfield, to whom I refer, knows very well that after each State election I have been elected unanimously unopposed, as the Leader of the Liberal Party. The honourable member had an opportunity after the election, at a time when discussion was going on about the number of members to be elected to the Ministry, to place his views before his colleagues. He had the opportunity to challenge the leadership of the party. Did he? He never opened his mouth. This matter of the extra four Ministers came up in the joint party room. I challenge the honourable member: he did not open his mouth in relation to it. But he chose this public stadium firstly to highlight this issue and then to make an attack on his leader.

This afternoon I have no intention of pursuing what might be termed the quarrel that he has attempted to raise. But I say quite publicly, so that it will be known to the Press, that at 10 a.m. tomorrow, at the party meeting of the Liberal Party members, I shall give him an opportunity to test whether or not I have the confidence of all members of the Liberal Party. That is the only answer I can give in relation to this particular issue.

It was said that, in the discussions which took place about the increase in the number of Ministers, I, as the Leader of the Liberal Party, would not agree to anything other than having the three members who have been named by the honourable member; that I would not agree to anything other than having those three honourable members included in the Ministry. The Premier, his deputy and my deputy know very well that no such words were spoken and that no such argument was put forward.

It is no secret that the executive of the Liberal Party, realising that the party had secured more than 30 per cent of the votes at the election and that our partner, the National Party, had obtained less, had discussions with me—and rightly so—at which it was indicated that it was the belief of the party in Queensland that, as the Premier and I had stated in our policy speech that the Cabinet would be extended—and both of us believed at that time that it would be extended to 16—I should endeavour to obtain eight seats in the new Cabinet. If there was a discussion on that matter, that is what the electors of Queensland and the supporters of both parties would have expected.

Discussions took place. Finally, after looking at all the factors, the Premier and I agreed on an increase in the Cabinet to 18. I stand wholeheartedly behind him in the number that was agreed upon. However, to say that I had some preconceived idea about the three members that I wished to put into the team is entirely wrong. It is true, naturally, that a leader has a responsibility to obtain some idea of the ability and, above all, the loyalty of those whom he wants to put into Cabinet.

I challenge the integrity of those who condemn me under the circumstances in which I have been condemned this afternoon. All I wish to clear up is the fact that the decision to increase the Cabinet to 18 was taken by the Premier, myself and our deputies, was endorsed by the Cabinet and was endorsed within the joint party room unchallenged. Yet we have the damnable approach made within the Chamber this afternoon by one who, I say now, is a rare attender at many of our party meetings, who has absented himself on many, many occasions and who has indicated his non-desirability to work on committees.

These are the comments one is called upon to make on an occasion such as this. I have made my points, Mr. Hewitt—firstly, that I support the proposal before the

Chamber and, secondly, that the honourable member for Clayfield will have his opportunity tomorrow morning.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (4.59 p.m.): I do not intend to go into the controversial aspects of the amendments to the Act. However, I should like to deal with other relevant matters. It was interesting to hear some comments from the Opposition by way of interjection about "guts". I should hate to sit here and hold my breath waiting for those within the ranks of the doctrinaire socialist party that they represent to stand up and speak out with any sort of freedom or individuality.

I will not waste time by referring to them in this debate, as I want to comment on one provision of the Officials in Parliament Act. I refer to section 5. The original legislation was passed by the Colonial Parliament in the last century. Section 5 commences with the words—

"Any person holding any office or place of profit under the Crown . . ."

It also contains the words—

"... incapable of being elected, or of sitting or voting, as a member of the Legislative Assembly;"

It also states that if he attempts to do so, his election shall be null and void.

It is a great pity that while we are amending this legislation, we do not take the opportunity to amend that section. With the increased number of people employed within the Public Service of this State, it would be a good thing if, prior to their standing for Parliament, they were not placed in the delicate position of having to resign from their previous employment and refuse to receive pay cheques in order to ensure that they did not hold "any office or place of profit under the Crown" as at the date of their election. This falls rather heavily on those citizens who work for the Government in the Public Service, the Police Force, the teaching profession, the Railways Department, or wherever it may be. They have to engage in quite a tricky bit of footwork upon entering this place. I believe it has caused some hardship to some members and their families.

There is the uncertainty that prevails between the date of their resignation and the date of their election, particularly in the case of a prolonged count of votes, which could take some weeks owing to the allocation of preferences. In the interests of those persons who may come here under those circumstances, I should have liked that section to be amended on this occasion.

At the other end of the time span there are those people who move on from this place into an office of profit under the Crown. We all remember Percival Raymund Smith, who was the honourable member for Windsor. He was appointed to the Law Reform Commission and still occupies a place there. On that occasion, because of the uncertainty of the position, a legal opinion had to be sought. This happened also when

a man much beloved in this place (the late Sir Peter Delamothé) was appointed Agent-General in London. He was also placed in this situation. There was uncertainty about his legal status. A simple amendment to this section would have helped out.

This legislation, which was introduced in 1896 by the Colonial Parliament of Queensland, has been amended many times. On some of the occasions on which amendments were made, this particular aspect was dealt with, but it has not been dealt with in a clear, simple way so that the average man in the street could feel secure in standing for election to this Parliament. This Parliament should be a place representative of the community. It should comprise people from all sections of the community—including academics, tradesmen and public servants.

The Act originally set down the number of Ministers of the Crown as eight. In 1963 the number was increased from 11 to 13. In 1969 it was increased from 13 to 14. Today we are increasing it from 14 to 18.

It is amusing to look at some of the titles of some of the previous Ministers. Many of us well remember that the Minister for Education of today was known as the Minister for Public Instruction and, before that, as the Secretary for Public Instruction. The Treasurer was then the Chief Secretary. Many of the old colonial terms have been changed as the years have passed.

The Officials in Parliament Act has preserved at all times that special relationship between Parliament, the Government, Cabinet and the Queen, which is acknowledged in this State by the Queen's representation by the Governor. The children who come to this House to watch its proceedings from the gallery are always very interested to observe the pomp and ceremony of messages from His Excellency being presented to Mr. Speaker following the opening of the House on some mornings. The Government parties respect this special position of the Governor, and the relationship between the Parliament and the Crown. The friends of Opposition members in the Federal Parliament do not have the same regard for these traditions. We were surely all disgusted by some of the intricate manoeuvres carried out at Federal level by the Australian Labor Party to bend the system in order to give special advantage to themselves. We all remember the Gair affair, and how a bunch of Q.C.'s were on that occasion unable to match the common-sense approach of the Premier of this State.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should return to the matter before the Committee.

Mr. LANE: Yes, Mr. Hewitt. The Officials in Parliament Act protects those who have power in this State, and I am merely seeking to draw a comparison between the present position and what would be the position if this Act did not prevail. I am also pointing

out how there has been an attempt at Federal level by the A.L.P. to circumvent the basis of the Federal Parliament. Previous speakers have referred to things that are not specifically mentioned in the sections of the Act but strike a contrast with the philosophical approach of the Government and the way in which it will go about altering the structure of this Parliament.

The phrase "jobs for the boys" is well known, particularly when used in relation to the Labor Party in Government in Canberra. There is another aspect of its devious activities that should be more fully known. I refer to "jobs for the comrades"—for friends of the Communist Party. There have been many such appointments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! On a previous occasion a member tried to develop such a line of reasoning and I ruled him out of order. Likewise I rule the honourable member out of order and ask him to return to the Bill before the Committee.

Mr. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt, for your guidance. I was about to speak of Jack Munday, Norm Gallagher—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will not speak about them. He will not try to flout my authority.

Mr. LANE: Certainly not, Mr. Hewitt. I know that if I did you would call me to order quickly. I see the hideous grin on the face of the honourable member for Port Curtis whilst he attempts to justify his position of weakness in the ranks of the Opposition. One wonders what would happen to the Officials in Parliament Act if Opposition members sat on the Government benches.

Mr. Murray: Tell us about Jack Munday.

Mr. LANE: Well, Jack Munday—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LANE: Jack Munday will never be elected to a Parliament because his party does not command sufficient public support.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for the last time to return to the matter before the Committee.

Mr. LANE: I make one final plea in respect of section 5 of the Officials in Parliament Act and hope that when next it comes before Parliament to increase the size of Cabinet, or for some other important reason, consideration is given to removing one of its provisions so that the average man in the street, the man employed in the Public Service, feels free to stand for Parliament without having hanging over his head the thought that if he occupied the two positions his election would be declared null and void, and that he would be precluded from sitting or voting in this place.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Energy) (5.11 p.m.): I rise to speak on this issue because my name

has been associated with the suggestion that four Ministers were responsible for selecting the four new Cabinet Ministers.

It is true that the leader of the National Party and the leader of the Liberal Party and their two deputies made a decision that Cabinet would be increased by four members. The actual selection of the four members to be so elevated was, and still is, the responsibility of the leaders of the respective parties—the National Party and the Liberal Party.

However, there are, to my mind, very good reasons why Cabinet should be increased from 14 to 18 members. First, the Premier and the Deputy Premier both told the people of Queensland in their policy speeches that if the Government was returned to power there would be an increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers, mainly because of the increased work-load that has developed for Ministers in the Queensland Parliament as a result of the attitude of the Federal A.L.P. Government in Canberra. From personal experience, I know that my work-load has increased many times since the A.L.P. gained the Treasury benches in Canberra.

In the Department of Mines, we used to be able to negotiate a mining lease or a mining project with an enterprising company desirous of carrying out developmental work in the mining industry in Queensland. Now we cannot sit down with confidence and undertake such negotiations because overriding control has been exercised by the Government in Canberra. That makes the job of the Department of Mines doubly hard. Of course, it is only one department. The Main Roads Department is in a similar position. The centralist Government in Canberra is endeavouring to take control of the construction and financing of road works not only in this State but also throughout Australia. Therefore, the work-load of the Minister for Main Roads, whoever he may be, is far heavier than it was a few years ago.

The position is similar in all the ministerial portfolios in every State of the Commonwealth, and I envisage that, when an opportunity arises, other Australian States will increase the numbers in their Cabinets.

I have sat in Cabinet and seen the health of Ministers deteriorate under the strain of the work-load to which they have been subjected because of the interference of the Federal Government in the administrative affairs of the Queensland Cabinet. If one looks at the additional load that has been placed on Ministers, one sees issues such as environmental problems, pollution and urban affairs that were not experienced 10 years ago. All these issues have developed over the last four or five years, and they have all added to the responsibility of Ministers.

It is all very well for some members to compare the work of Ministers in Queensland with the work of Ministers in other States. New South Wales is far smaller in area and

it has 18 Ministers. Queensland is the most decentralised State in the Commonwealth of Australia. Who among the rank-and-file members of this Parliament does not desire a Minister to visit his electorate? It has been the desire of the Queensland Cabinet to go into the country, meet people and give them adequate and proper representation, so they can say, "Here is a Minister of the Crown coming to visit us and discuss our problems with us in our own towns and cities in the far-flung areas of Queensland."

In my term of 10 years as a Minister, I have visited towns in Queensland that had never in their history seen a Minister until I went there. The same can be said of the Premier, the Treasurer and every other Minister in the coalition Government. They have all visited towns that had never before been visited by a Minister. It was with this in mind that I agreed that Cabinet should be increased by four members, so that Ministers could go farther afield and represent the people more adequately.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition harangued the Committee to the effect that inflationary trends would develop from the appointment of four new Ministers to the Queensland Cabinet. What a ridiculous statement from a man who has never stopped whingeing since he became Leader of the Opposition! He wants a private secretary; he wants a Press secretary; he wants a motor-car, and he wants increased transport facilities, all of which would mean increased costs. He wants increased accommodation in Parliament House for members of his party. All of these things might be needed—I am not decrying that—but he is the man who now says that the appointment of four members to the Ministry will boost inflationary trends, whereas since he became Leader of the Opposition he has never stopped crying for additional funds. He cannot have it both ways. He is even saying that the Government should furnish him with an aeroplane so that he can flit around the State and visit the 11 electorates his party represents. All his demands entirely negate his suggestion that what is proposed will create inflation in Queensland.

Two or three honourable members have mentioned the phrase "jobs for the boys". All members of the A.L.P. should hang their heads in shame at the mention of those words because of what we have seen going on in Canberra since the last Federal election. The Federal A.L.P. lost so many seats at the last Federal election that it had to supply jobs for the boys. We have had no need to supply jobs for the boys in Queensland. We had plenty of new members on our side coming into this Chamber. There were no defeated members of the National Party or Liberal Party for whom we had to find jobs, but we adequately provided jobs for defeated members of the

A.L.P. who were formerly public servants. They went back into employment under this Government.

Mr. Wright: Like you did with Bill Wood.

Mr. CAMM: Bill Wood is back in work.

Mr. Wright: You sent him to Rockhampton from Cairns.

Mr. CAMM: What a terrible think to do to a school-teacher! He wants to select his own job. Is that the sort of Government the honourable member wants to develop? He has got his job according to his qualifications and ability to do the work and the jobs available in his sphere of activity. If the honourable member does not like having him in Rockhampton because he is frightened he might beat him at the next plebiscite, he can write a letter to the Education Department saying that he wants him shifted out of Rockhampton.

We heard criticism of the fact that during the discussions among the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party and me prior to the announcement of the proposed increase in Cabinet there were two party presidents with us. Those two party presidents were with us because we were discussing a coalition Government. We were discussing terms for a coalition of the two political parties. When it came to deciding by how many Cabinet would be increased it was entirely a decision of the four parliamentary members.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about domination from outside. At least when any decision was made in respect even of coalition the parliamentary members dominated that meeting, unlike what we saw with the Federal A.L.P. not so many years ago, when the leader and the deputy leader stood on the veranda while 13 faceless men made the decision and then told them what the policy of the A.L.P. was going to be when it became the Government. No parliamentary member made that decision. Mr. Whitlam himself coined the phrase "the 13 faceless men" who made the decision. I remember it well. It was at the time of the bi-election for Dawson when that decision was made. The Leader of the Opposition should look first at his own house when he talks about outside domination.

I was very pleased, and no doubt should be rather thrilled, that the Leader of the Opposition gave credit to four men for the increase in the Queensland Cabinet. He should know only too well that our decision was only a recommendation to be made to individual parties and to the joint parties, and then a Bill had to receive endorsement by Parliament. The people in this Chamber will make the decision whether Cabinet will be increased by four. We do not take any credit for it. All we take credit for is the introduction of a measure to enable the work-load of Cabinet to be spread more

evenly and to provide greater and more adequate representation for the people of Queensland.

I was surprised at the honourable member for Rockhampton. Normally I would have given him more credit. He measures a Minister's responsibility and work by the number of Bills that he presents to this Parliament. He also measures a Minister's responsibility and work-load by the number of speeches he makes in this Chamber. No-one who listens to the rantings of the honourable member for Rockhampton could be blamed for thinking that he must be the hardest-working member on the Opposition benches. Yet if we read and analyse his speeches we can see that he says practically nothing. All he does is rise to his feet and, in a long diatribe, criticise whoever presented the legislation to which he is speaking and any Government member he wants to vent his spleen on.

A Minister's responsibility goes far beyond the preparation of legislation. A Minister's work cannot be measured by the number of times he rises to his feet and speaks.

Mr. Wright: Tell me what you do?

Mr. CAMM: It is hoped that this debate will be concluded before dinner time. If the honourable member would care to spend a week-end in Brisbane I will tell him just some of the things I do. If he would like to start off with me at quarter past 6 in the morning and follow me through the day till 10 or 11 o'clock at night he will see the amount of work I do. But I have no doubt that he could not stand the pace. His attitude and behaviour in this Chamber clearly indicate that he would crack very rapidly under the work-load that Ministers have had to endure over the past 10 years.

To show how little the honourable member for Rockhampton knows of Ministers' responsibilities—he drew a comparison between Western Australia and Queensland and claimed that other than in population there is no difference between the two States. This man, who I should imagine would have some knowledge of geography, claims there is no difference between Queensland and Western Australia other than the number of people who live in the two States. Hasn't he ever looked at a map of Queensland? Isn't he aware of the decentralised development that has taken place here? Hasn't he noticed that the development in Western Australia is confined to the south-western corner and to a small area on the north-west coast? Can't he appreciate the travelling that has to be undertaken by a Cabinet Minister in Queensland to carry out the duties of his ministerial portfolio? Isn't he aware that my portfolio covers the area stretching from Brisbane up to Weipa and Mt. Isa, to the gem fields outside Quilpie and to the coal-fields in Central Queensland? My portfolio covers the whole of the State, as does that of the Minister for Education,

for example. Schools are provided all over Queensland. The same thing can be said of the Minister in charge of Main Roads. I challenge the honourable member for Rockhampton to cite a portfolio in another State that covers the whole of that State. If the member for Rockhampton wants a lesson in geography, I shall include it in our discussion when he comes to me to learn what a Minister's responsibilities and work-load are.

The honourable member also talked about a relegation of certain departments to junior Ministers. To my knowledge, with the exception of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, there is no seniority in the Ministry; all other Ministers have equal votes.

Mr. Wright: You sit on the front benches in order of seniority.

Mr. CAMM: We sit in order of appointment not in order of seniority of the portfolios that we hold. Because I hold one portfolio, it does not follow that it is more important than that held by a recently appointed Minister. All departments are regarded as equal, as are all Ministers' responsibilities. The voting capacity of all Ministers is the same. Although the Premier and the Deputy Premier hold senior positions in Cabinet, they do not exercise any greater voting right than that held by the other Ministers. There is no thought of degrading or belittling a portfolio simply because it is allocated to a junior Minister.

Finally, I wholeheartedly support this measure. It has been discussed by the joint parties on the Government side of the Chamber and has received their endorsement for presentation to Parliament. It provides for an increase in Cabinet from 14 to 18 Ministers.

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

AYES, 58

Ahern	Lamond
Bertoni	Lamont
Bird	Lane
Bjelke-Petersen	Lee
Byrne	Lester
Camm	Lickiss
Campbell	Lindsay
Chalk	Lockwood
Chinchen	Lowes
Deeral	McKechnie
Doumany	Miller
Elliott	Murray
Frawley	Neal
Gibbs	Newbery
Glasson	Porter
Goleby	Powell
Greenwood	Row
Gunn	Simpson
Gygar	Small
Hales	Tenni
Hartwig	Tomkins
Herbert	Turner
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Warner
Hinze	Wharton
Hodges	Young
Hooper, K. W.	
Hooper, M. D.	
Katter	<i>Tellers:</i>
Kaus	Moore
Kippin	Muller
Knox	

NOES, 9

Burns
Casey
Dean
Hanson
Houston
Jensen

Wright

Tellers:
Hooper, K. J.
Yewdale

PAIRS:

Alison
CoryJones
Marginson

Resolved in the affirmative.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, read a first time.

SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Justice) (5.38 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced relating to the number of Judges of the Supreme Court and, in connection therewith, to amend the Supreme Court Act of 1921.”

At present the Supreme Court Acts limit the maximum number of judges of the Supreme Court to 14. The object of this Bill is to amend the Supreme Court Acts to provide that the statutory maximum number of judges of the Supreme Court be increased from 14 to 16.

I wish to point out that this amendment will merely provide legislative authority for the appointment of two additional judges and will not automatically bring about an increase in the number of judges to 16.

During the course of this year it is proposed to appoint one additional judge to the Supreme Court and this Bill will provide the legislative authority for this appointment and also allow for the appointment of a further additional judge at some time in the future should the circumstances so require. This will obviate the necessity, which could otherwise arise, for the appointment of an acting judge.

Honourable members will realise that the appointment of an acting judge is seldom completely satisfactory either to the appointee or to the administration of justice. There are difficulties associated with the selection of acting appointees. Persons who are suitable for appointment as a judge may not be prepared to accept an acting appointment.

The last increase in the number of Supreme Court judges was in 1967, when the number was increased to 14. The volume of court work has increased considerably in recent times. The judges have been unable to cope with this increase, with the result that the number of actions awaiting trial has steadily grown. To illustrate this point, I would mention that in August 1972 there

were 186 civil actions awaiting trial. In September 1974, this figure had grown to 375.

It is most important that the work of the Supreme Court should not be allowed to lag, and result in considerable delays before important matters can be brought to trial. The provisions of this Bill will provide the necessary legislative authority for action to be taken at the appropriate time to meet any requirements for the effective administration of justice.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (5.41 p.m.): It has been asked repeatedly, since the intention of increasing the number of judges of the Supreme Court was made known, if such an increase is warranted. I asked last Thursday for information that would back up the Minister's claim, but unfortunately, as honourable members heard this morning, he was unable to obtain the information I required. If he was unable to get this information for me, one wonders therefore—

Mr. Knox: I gave it this morning.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is not complete. In fact, the Minister said—

“Time has not allowed the information to be obtained from the various district registries . . .”

Mr. Knox: But I gave the effect of it.

Mr. WRIGHT: As best you could; I accept that. The point is that one would have thought that with a Bill of this nature to be introduced, the Minister would have had at his fingertips information that clearly provided grounds for such an increase. I was somewhat amazed that this information was not readily available.

Mr. Knox: The numbers that are not there are very minor.

Mr. WRIGHT: But the information is still not complete, and one wonders on what basis the Minister claims that the increase is warranted. It is known to honourable members that there are already 17 District Court judges in Queensland, and 14 Supreme Court judges. The aim of the Bill is to increase that number to 16.

Reference was made earlier in this Chamber to the validity of using statistics when making comparisons with other States. I think it is valid to see what other States are doing. If one looks at the position in Victoria, one finds that it has a population of 3,600,000 and 19 Supreme Court judges. South Australia, which has 1,200,000 people, has nine Supreme Court judges. The population of Queensland, at 1,900,000, is not very much greater than that of South Australia, yet 16 Supreme Court judges are now envisaged.

If an increase in the number of judges would remove the problems existing in the judicial system, I think Opposition members would give it their support. But I think we

have to look very carefully at the problems that do exist. The other day I read an article by Mr. Justice Else-Mitchell entitled, "The Judicial System—The Myth of Perfection and the Need for Unity." He said—

"But apart from its qualities of independence and impartiality, it is an open question how far over the centuries the judicial system gave a proper measure of satisfaction to all human and community needs with reasonable expedition and without excessive cost and undue technicality."

Not only does the court have to be independent and impartial; it has a responsibility to deal with matters without the complexity that we have in this State, and to deal with them without huge costs and long delays.

I am sure that all honourable members, regardless of the time that they have been in this Assembly, have had constituents come to them and tell of the huge costs involved in trying to obtain legal redress, and the great delays that there are in trying to have matters resolved in the court system. If some of these problems can be overcome by increasing the number of judges, I would say that the Bill should be supported.

I admit that efforts have been made to overcome these difficulties. In the lower jurisdiction, the Small Claims Tribunal has been established, and notice has been given of intention to set up a Small Debts Court. But I wonder if delays have been overcome by the measures already taken. I do not think that the delays in the District Court were overcome by legislation put through this Chamber recently to increase the number of judges to 17, or by the fact that special rights were given, as is being done in this legislation, to increase the number when necessary. I suggest that the problems of costs and delays remain. If 16 judges of the Supreme Court will overcome these problems, the proposed increase will have the complete support of the Opposition.

I am a little concerned—and this concern has also been expressed to me by members of the legal profession in this State—about this question: Would it not be better to remove the parochialism of the judicial system in Australia? There are six completely separate groups; therefore we tend to draw only from the bar of our particular States. I have figures here showing that the 33 judges in Queensland are in fact drawn from 100 barristers, and that in New South Wales the 80 judges are drawn from 450 barristers. So, although it is admitted that an increase in the number of judges may be necessary, it may be time to look at the whole judicial system on a national basis. It may be worthwhile to break down the State system that we have, and Mr. Justice Else-Mitchell certainly puts forward that view, too.

Other positive changes are needed, and I believe that there should be some type of permanent Court of Appeal. If we are

going to begin looking at the Supreme Court and the judicial system, let us admit that it has not been successful, that we have not overcome the delays and the huge costs, and that we have not in-built in the system the expertise that should be there.

I suggest that we should probably copy the ideas that have already been put into operation in the United Kingdom, where the Beeching Commission has investigated the total sphere of the judicial system and brought down a series of recommendations based on divisions. If the idea of divisions were adopted and we removed general judges and brought down a system of specialists, I think we may overcome delays and improve the standard of the legal system in this State.

In my opinion, there should be a permanent Court of Appeal. It could simply be composed of three judges—the Chief Justice could be a member *ex officio*—and one of the judges could be the president.

Mr. Aikens: Do you believe in a separate Court of Criminal Appeal?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes. I intend speaking about that.

Mr. Aikens: I am glad that you see my point.

Mr. WRIGHT: If the honourable member is going to speak about it, I will leave it to him.

I think that would be the first step in making the functioning of the judicial system more applicable to the needs of the community. There are a few "legal eagles" in the Chamber—I am pleased about that, because their expertise is needed here; it is something that former Parliaments have lacked—and I should like to hear their views. Mine are mainly from a layman's point of view, but still they are sincere.

Not only should there be a permanent Court of Appeal; there should also be a family division to deal specifically with family law. There could then be a commercial division to deal specifically with commercial causes. I have it on good authority that the Commercial Causes Act already allows that, so there is nothing to prevent it from happening, but the provision has never been implemented. At the moment, people with commercial causes are moving away from the traditional courts into arbitration, and possibly a separate commercial division is needed.

To take it further, one would then move into a common law division to deal with all civil cases—and it should be strictly a common law division—and finally into a criminal division.

Surely one should adopt the view that people in the community are entitled to expertise and swiftness in obtaining justice. I believe that this could best be done in Queensland by bringing down a division system. There may be many criticisms of it,

but I think we need to begin. Let us investigate the possibilities, because I suggest that people are not getting swiftness and expertise at present.

I am told that many judges who sit in the Supreme Court have had little experience in criminal courts for many years before they are taken from the bar and placed on the bench. It is obvious, therefore, that we should appoint a man who has delved deeply into criminal law to deal with criminal cases. I suggest, therefore, that the legal profession should specialise.

Later in the session I intend to speak about the need for reorganisation in the lower courts. However, let us now consider the desirability of investigating the implementation of divisions within the legal system. I believe that there is much to be gained from such an exercise.

Finally, I indicate that the Opposition does not intend to oppose the Bill, because it believes that a greater number of judges could overcome delays. I suggest to the Minister through you, Mr. Hewitt, that he seriously consider the reorganisation of the judicial system in the State of Queensland.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (5.50 p.m.): I think the time is overdue for a full public inquiry into the whole of the judicial system in Queensland. The judicial system in Queensland today—I suppose it is not very much different from the judicial system in any other State—is a putrid anachronism. It is something we inherited from Great Britain, with all its putridities, and we have not done a damn thing to clean it up or to make it an instrument of justice as it is supposed to be.

If I heard the rather diffident remarks of the Minister, this Bill will provide that, if the Crown wants to, it can appoint another Supreme Court judge straight away with provision for another Supreme Court judge to be appointed later on. It means, of course, that both of them will be appointed within a week after the passage of the Bill. A part of the job of the public inquiry would be to see whether these judges are necessary. I do not think they are.

Mr. Wright: How many of them really work?

Mr. AIKENS: How many work? Never mind about "really" work.

It is a matter of finding out whether our Supreme Court judges at the present time work (really work) or even make a semblance of working. Let us be quite honest about this. I am not going to recapitulate all I have said. I know that the Minister for Justice, having associated quite frequently and for quite some time with members of the legal profession and the judiciary, feels that we have no right to criticise the judiciary. When we talk about snobbery let us not forget that there are more snobs to the square yard in Australia than there would be to the square mile in any other

country in the world. But our snobbery is not directed to the titled aristocracy, landed gentry or royalty; our snobbery is directed to the professions, particularly the legal profession. We are told, "You can't say that, because he is a barrister." "You can't say that, because he is a solicitor." Of course, when it comes to a judge, my goodness, one cannot even look at him. A person must bow his head; he must thump his forehead on the footpath three times as he goes past. He can be a hopeless no-hoper and waster. He can be an alcoholic, as many of our Supreme Court judges have been. He can be a crook and a grafter, as many of our Supreme Court judges have been.

Mr. KNOX: I rise to a point of order. I must protest that the remarks made by the honourable member are completely untrue. I wish to record that in relation to the judiciary of this State, past and present.

Mr. AIKENS: How does the Minister know they are untrue? He is not game to hold a public inquiry to find out if they are untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: I am putting it on the Minister to prove whether they are true or untrue. I know that he is just not prepared to do it.

How much of our court procedure is a time-wasting farce? Let us be honest about it. Any man who wants to face up to facts and who wants to be reasonably honest will know what a time-wasting farce a Supreme Court hearing is, whether it is in the civil jurisdiction or the criminal jurisdiction. Most of that is caused by the legal profession itself. If a person goes to a solicitor he will be talked into briefing a barrister. That is the first thing a solicitor does. Sometimes a solicitor will tell a client that it will cost him \$400 to brief a barrister, but he will pay the barrister only \$300 and kick the other \$100 into his pocket in addition to the fee he will be paid as a solicitor. That is a little thing called dichotomy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will realise that this is a Bill to amend the Supreme Court Act. That does not allow a full debate on the legal profession as such. The honourable member will relate his comments to the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. AIKENS: I am attempting, with considerable opposition, to prove that a lot of the Supreme Court's time is wasted. Consequently, the barrister will say, "My fee on brief is so-and-so with \$200 a day refreshers." Can anyone deny that? Is there anyone in this Chamber who can deny that that is how a brief is marked? Is it any wonder then that it is in the interests of the barrister, supported by the ex-barrister on the bench, to drag out a case for as

long as possible? A refresher of \$200 a day, sometimes \$600 a day for a Q.C., goes into the barrister's pocket. It cannot be denied; it is common knowledge. Why let us go on with this casuistry, this hypocrisy, this dissimulation and this sophistry? Let us face up to facts.

Almost every week we see proof of the fact that trial by jury, our most vaunted British possession of justice, is a sickening farce. There is no such thing as trial by jury unless a judge allows the case to go to the jury. Time after time in cases that go to the Criminal Court the defence counsel stands up and asks the judge that the jury be chased out of the precincts of the court and everyone else be chased out into the mulga while he makes certain legal submissions to His Honour. Those legal submissions go on for days. Nobody knows what submissions are made by the defence counsel. Nobody knows what replies, if any, are made by the crown prosecutor. Nobody knows if the judge is wise enough or awake enough—sometimes I suppose he will have a little doze—to know what the submissions are about. After several days of wasted time the judge more often than not will say, "I do not think there is sufficient evidence for this case to go to the jury and I order the crown prosecutor to enter a nolle prosequi." The judge doesn't think! Nobody else is taken into consideration. When the nolle prosequi is entered the accused—more often than not he is a criminal—goes free and gives the judge a wave. He probably waits across the street to buy him a beer. That is the end of it. But a period of three or four days, and sometimes longer than that, is wasted and nobody knows how it is wasted. Can anyone read the transcript of those submissions that are made to the justice of the Supreme Court after the jury and everyone else have been sent outside? Will the Minister for Justice produce some of them here so that we, the elected legislators of the people, can judge for ourselves whether that time has been wasted or whether it has been utilised in the interests of justice?

I was in this Chamber when this Government introduced and put onto the Statute Book the District Courts Act, which appointed District Court judges. They were described, very appropriately, as legal brumbies and glorified magistrates. Those terms are enshrined in "Hansard" for anyone to read. The District Court judges were supposed to take a tremendous amount of work off the shoulders of the Supreme Court judges. These legal brumbies are having the time of their lives. I think that initially their salaries were lower than ours, but now they leave us for dead. By comparison we are in the pauper class. Some shocking things have happened in the District Courts, but I will not try to talk about them, Mr. Hewitt, because you know what a stickler I am for the rules and procedures of this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: And because of that the honourable member will know that he cannot talk about the District Courts while debating the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. AIKENS: I think I can say that the District Courts were set up ostensibly to take the weight off the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is still blooming like the green bay tree.

If we are going to have Supreme Courts that are worthy of their name, and if we are going to have justice instead of measly, mouldy, crooked law in our courts, let us say to the Supreme Court justices, "We are going to clean up your courts for you. You won't clean them up, so we will."

A former Minister for Justice, who later became Agent-General, and unfortunately died in England, gave me some very interesting documents that he received from England and that made it quite plain to the legal profession and judiciary in England that if they did not clean up the courts they would be cleaned up for them. I think something was done about cleaning up the English courts. The honourable member for Rockhampton would know where to get these documents.

If we are to be honest, decent representatives of the people, one thing we must do in the Supreme Court is to see that the man who prosecutes for the Crown is indeed a prosecutor for the people and that he is given the same rights, privileges and open go as a defence counsel. I adjure anyone who has not witnessed a Supreme Court criminal trial to do so. I predict that any such person would be absolutely astonished to see the crown prosecutor virtually bound, gagged, handcuffed and leg-ironed, standing with pompous dignity, confining himself to the bare facts of the case. He cannot even ask for a conviction. He cannot even criticise the other side unless it first introduces criticism. After the crown prosecutor has done his little bit, the defence counsel then stands up. Did any honourable member hear Mr. Justice Stanley when he was a barrister at the bar? Has any honourable member heard Dan Casey, Des Sturgess or some of the other barristers at the bar as defence counsel? There is much talk about members of this Parliament getting away with murder, but they are mere babes in arms compared with some defence counsel in the things they say and get away with. Members of the judiciary allow them to do it because they themselves, on many occasions, were defence counsel when practising at the bar.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is it the honourable member's wish to preserve his right

Mr. AIKENS: I am going to talk as long as I can on this rotten, putrid aspect.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am asking the honourable gentleman if he wants to preserve his right to complete his speech at a later hour?

Mr. AIKENS: I shall be happy to do so.
(Leave to continue speech tomorrow granted.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 6.4 p.m.