

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 11 MARCH 1975

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 11 MARCH 1975

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

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assent reported by Mr. Speaker.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

CHANGES IN MINISTRY

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.2 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that, on 10 March 1975, His Excellency the Governor—

(a) accepted the resignations tendered by—

The Honourable Allen Maxwell Hodges, as Minister for Police and Minister for Works and Housing of Queensland;

The Honourable Neville Thomas Eric Hewitt, M.M., A.F.M., as Minister for Water Resources, Minister for Marine Services, and Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement of Queensland; and

The Honourable Thomas Guy Newbery, as Minister for Tourism and Minister for Education and Cultural Activities of Queensland,

as from 10 March 1975;

(b) appointed—

Valmond James Bird, Esquire,
Norman Edward Lee, Esquire,
Claude Alfred Wharton, Esquire,
William Daniel Lickiss, Esquire,

to be Members of the Executive Council;

(c) appointed—

The Honourable Allen Maxwell Hodges, to be Minister for Police of Queensland;

The Honourable Neville Thomas Eric Hewitt, M.M., A.F.M., to be Minister for Water Resources of Queensland;

The Honourable Thomas Guy Newbery, to be Minister for Tourism and Marine Services of Queensland;

The Honourable Valmond James Bird, to be Minister for Education and Cultural Activities of Queensland;

The Honourable Norman Edward Lee, to be Minister for Works and Housing of Queensland;

The Honourable Claude Alfred Wharton, to be Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement of Queensland;

The Honourable William Daniel Lickiss, to be Minister for Survey, Valuation, Urban and Regional Affairs of Queensland.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 10 March 1975 containing the relevant notifications.

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Water Act 1926–1973.

Regulations under—

Apprenticeship Act 1964–1974.

Traffic Act 1949–1974.

Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act 1969.

Harbours Act 1955–1972.

Queensland Marine Act 1958–1972.

Beach Protection Act 1968–1972.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MEDIBANK HEALTH SCHEME

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Minister for Health) (11.8 a.m.): I take this opportunity to make this ministerial statement to inform honourable members and the people of the State of Queensland of the Queensland Government's current position regarding the Commonwealth Government health insurance programme due to be introduced throughout Australia on 1 July 1975 following the passing of the necessary legislation by the joint sittings of the Commonwealth Parliament in 1974.

This national health scheme now known as Medibank is a slightly modified version of the Hayden health scheme prepared mainly by economists, Drs. Deeble and Scotton. It seems to me that there is still great confusion over the scheme despite debates and discussions through the 1969, 1972, and 1974 Federal elections and two expensive advertising programmes by the Federal Government.

Medibank deals mainly with two aspects of health-care delivery. Firstly, there is the medical practitioner component allowing people to attend private practitioners. If the private doctor charges the set fee for consultation or medical or other service, the Commonwealth will refund to the patient 85 per cent of the fee paid. If the doctor charges in excess of the common fee, then the patient, as the position stands at present, will be expected to pay the excess.

Secondly, there is the hospital component of Medibank. If a patient elects to enter a public ward, no charge is made by the hospital for that accommodation or treatment. If the patient desires intermediate or private ward accommodation, a charge will be made for that accommodation by the

hospital, and voluntary insurance will be available to cover these charges, if the patient wishes to insure himself.

I am deeply concerned that, in the present climate of conflict over the principles of the scheme between private medical practitioners, private insurance groups, medical benefit organisations and the Department of Social Security, those who are going to suffer throughout the coming months of increased conflict will be the people, who will be innocent victims of the chaos and disagreements.

I take this opportunity to call upon Mr. Hayden, the Department of Social Security, the medical profession and any other people involved to be flexible in their attitudes, responsible in their actions and tolerant in their reactions so that the patients of Queensland and throughout this nation will not be pawns in this politically controversial programme, which has caused so much division throughout the nation.

I now come to the section of the Medibank scheme that is the only area under consideration by the Queensland Government. At present the Commonwealth subsidises public beds at the rate of \$2 per day per occupied bed and \$5 per day for beds occupied by pensioners. These are paid without conditions.

Under the new scheme the Commonwealth has made certain proposals to the States to fund 50 per cent of net operating costs of public hospital operations. Active discussions have been undertaken between the Commonwealth and State Government officers, and Cabinet has been kept informed of all discussions. It is well known that the Queensland Government already provides free public ward accommodation at no charge to the patient and without a means test and therefore this State is already fulfilling a basic requirement of the Medibank proposal.

It has been stated publicly on many occasions that Queensland could receive substantial additional funds from the Commonwealth under any Medibank agreement, but this however will need to be carefully examined to ascertain the impact that the injection of additional Commonwealth moneys specifically into the hospital system of this State would have on the State's over-all entitlements under the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement grants due to be renegotiated soon. As well, the effect of additional hospital subsidies from the Commonwealth Grants Commission would need very close scrutiny.

It can be stated quite clearly that the Queensland Government's position regarding those proposals still requires a great deal of examination. I wish to state quite clearly that no form of agreement has yet been received from the Commonwealth.

As soon as conferences have concluded and financial positions are clarified, and draft agreements are examined, a full report will be made to Cabinet for consideration as to whether or not Queensland further negotiates

with the Commonwealth for the purpose of entering a formal agreement in respect of further funding of the State's hospital system.

I wish to assure all Queenslanders that, whatever the outcome of the Medibank negotiations, Queensland's unique free-hospital system will continue and will expand to provide the very best care possible for people who choose to utilise the public hospital scheme.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

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

(1) In view of the statement by Mr. Murray of the State Electricity Commission, as reported in *The Courier-Mail* of December 16, 1974, that Queensland's power-generating plant would be inadequate to meet the demand in five years' time and the statement by the Deputy Chairman of the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland on November 19, 1974, that they could not move any further until the Government gave approval of a site and, unless a decision was made in the immediate future, it would be inevitable that the continuity of supply of electricity would be endangered, and that at the best the delay would result in increased costs of electricity by reason of the need to retain in service obsolete power stations which should be scrapped and at the worst, rationing would have to be imposed until the new power station was brought into operation, what action has he taken to expedite the decision on the Tarong power station, the storage scheme at Rocksberg and the scheme proposed for Wivenhoe on the Brisbane River?

(2) Can he guarantee that no price increase or rationing of electricity will occur because of the shortcomings mentioned?

Answers:—

(1) "Now that Comalco has indicated its intention to build an aluminium smelter at Gladstone by exercising its power option, I have asked The State Electricity Commission which is the body in Queensland responsible for advising the Government on electricity supply matters, to review its proposals for future power stations. The Commission has advised that because of the time required to build an entirely new plant, such a plant could not be in service if required for operation in 1980. Alternative developments were therefore being investigated and a report and recommendations will be made when those investigations are completed. The possible projects referred to by the Honourable Member at Tarong, Rocksberg and Wivenhoe are also being re-examined in the light of more recent knowledge of load trends and cost changes. I have

asked for a report at the earliest date possible, but it must be realised that decisions on projects requiring hundreds of millions of dollars of capital expenditure involve some complex problems of engineering and finance which take time to resolve."

(2) "No."

VANDALISM

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

(1) Have vandals been entering the grounds of the Balmoral State High School in recent weeks, causing damage to vehicles and trees?

(2) Was one youth taken before the Children's Court on a charge relating to damaging three cars in succession, to a value of \$300, and then released into the care of his mother, with no provision made for restitution to the teachers concerned?

(3) Is he concerned at the inability of police to patrol public places, such as schoolgrounds, to prevent such vandalism?

(4) What steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure that the growing incidence of vandalism in our community is stamped out?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. There have been three separate complaints made to the Police Department since January 1, 1975, the first occurring on January 15-16, 1975, the second on February 14, 1975, and the third occasion being on February 26, 1975. In respect of the first offence, police inquiries to date have failed to establish the identity of the offenders. Two offenders (one child) were located whilst a third offender has not yet been located in respect of the second offence. The child was brought before the Children's Court on ten charges. On the first charge of wilfully damaging property he was placed under the supervision of the Director, Department of Children's Services. On the other nine charges he was admonished and discharged. No order was made as to restitution. Damage to the three vehicles totalled \$223. The other person located presently stands remanded on three charges of wilful and unlawful damage to vehicles. Police attention is continuing with a view to locating the third offender. In so far as the third offence is concerned, police inquiries have established the identity of two suspects. Should evidence be available to identify the suspects as the offenders, appropriate prosecution action will follow."

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

(3) "Police do patrol public places such as schools consistent with their other duties. However, as the Honourable

Member is aware there is also a responsibility on owners of property to safeguard their own property. The offences relating to damage to the vehicles were committed at a time when the school was open. Excellent co-operation exists between the Education Department and the Police Department and recent activities by the departments have resulted in a substantial lessening of vandalism at schools."

(4) "See Answer to (3). Active police attention will continue to be given to the subject."

DREDGE "ECHENEIS"

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

(1) In view of the proposed construction of the new port of Brisbane and the numerous breakdowns of the suction dredge "Echeneis", is a replacement planned?

(2) If so, what type of dredge will replace it and when is it planned by the department to begin construction of the craft?

(3) If there is no proposal to replace the "Echeneis", is it planned to have it overhauled and have major alterations made?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The dredger 'Echeneis' has been in the service of the Department of Harbours and Marine for 20 years and in that time has been involved, without any serious breakdowns, in maintenance dredging of the river channels and berths. It is not suitable for deep development dredging, as would be required at the Fisherman Islands, but will continue to maintain up-river berths and channels. New development work at the mouth of the river would require the use of the large dredger 'Sir Thomas Hiley' or its equivalent. The purchase of a new dredger is not justified, but contract dredging potential will be used where necessary."

(3) "A major overhaul is carried out each year to the 'Echeneis', and some modifications and improvements are provided when the need arises."

VISUAL TEACHING AIDS

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

(1) Has he seen the catalogue of low-priced visual-teaching aids which the Victorian Department of Education makes available to teachers in that State?

(2) Will he consider extending the same facility to teachers in Queensland schools?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "From information available, it would appear Queensland does considerably more than Victoria. In fact (a)

Many audio visual materials are supplied free of cost to schools as normal issue. For example in 1974, all primary schools received an issue of small group instructional material consisting of a slide projector, cassette player and cassettes, audio listening station and a projection screen. This issue was on the basis of one set of this equipment for each two teachers in each school in the State. (b) Schools may choose from a very comprehensive catalogue goods to certain values depending on the size of the school, e.g., \$300 for a class 1 primary school. These materials are very well priced because of bulk tendering and buying. (c) A media catalogue produced each year lists many items of equipment which primary and secondary schools may purchase at tendered prices. (d) A very wide range of materials such as film strips, slides and cassette programs are sold to schools at cost. I table examples of the catalogues available to Queensland teachers."

Papers.—Whereupon Mr. Bird laid upon the Table of the House the catalogues referred to.

GRANTS TO INDEPENDENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS

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

(1) What is the size of per capita grants from the State Government to independent secondary schools?

(2) What are the comparative figures in each of the other States?

(3) Do Queensland independent secondary schools receive a smaller per capita grant than schools in any other State excepting the two Labor-run States?

Answers:—

(1) "Per capita grants from the State Government to independent secondary schools from January 1, 1975 are \$132. In addition a text book allowance is paid to all secondary students, at the following rates:—grade 8, \$30; grades 9 and 10, \$20; grade 11, \$50; and grade 12, \$20. Furthermore, students compelled by reasons of remoteness to live away from home are eligible for remote area allowance ranging from \$200 to \$250 per annum and there is a (means tested) student allowance scheme affording relief to needy parents, such relief being at the rate of \$54 per annum per student living at home and \$222 per annum per student living away from home."

(2) "I table information summarising the provisions operating in the various States."

(3) "No."

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

COMPLAINTS ON SUMMONS AGAINST BONDED TEACHERS

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

(1) Is he acquainted with the complaint of his department which lies behind an unserved summons No. 25025 of 1974, taken out by the Public Service Board on behalf of his department?

(2) Is he aware that the defendant in that case is a person who has broken his bond to his department to take up service at a Queensland private school, in his own time and at his own expense has acquired a second degree, thus improving his ability to serve education, in his own time has coached Queensland schoolboy teams from both State and non-State schools in cricket and football, and has taken part in writing a matriculation-level textbook currently in extensive use in both State and non-State schools?

(3) Is it the practice of his department to examine the general contribution to education before proceeding on summonses in such cases?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2 and 3) "As is usual in such cases, the matter was referred to the Department of the Public Service Board. The board requested my department to arrange for legal proceedings to be instituted to recover moneys owed to the Queensland Government under a contract entered into by the teacher concerned. I am aware of the factors raised by the Honourable Member in his Question, but I am not prepared to interfere in the matter, which is essentially one between the Public Service Board and the other party to the contract."

JUVENILE AID BUREAU

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

(1) Has there been an overall reduction in the number of staff of the Juvenile Aid Bureau despite a call from the Commissioner of Police in his last annual report to Parliament for an increase in the staff dealing with juvenile crimes?

(2) Does the Police Department appoint officers to relieve those officers of the bureau who are absent from duty because of illness or annual leave?

(3) Is it the intention of the Commissioner to abolish the Juvenile Aid Bureau?

(4) In view of the substantial differences of approach and methods used by the Juvenile Aid Bureau and the Education Department Liaison Section, what method is used to determine which agency a juvenile is referred to?

Answers:—

(1) "The Juvenile Aid Bureau functions under the control of the Department of Children's Services. Police personnel are seconded for duty with the bureau. The number of secondments is subject to factors affecting the Police Force generally. For example, vacancies result from resignations, and secondments to fill these depend upon the availability of personnel to meet police requirements generally and suitability for duties at the bureau. The number of police actually seconded is below the nominal figure at present."

(2) "The provision of relieving officers in any area of the Police Department depends upon the availability of trained personnel and requirements for urgent police services at the relevant time. This policy applies equally to the provision of relief at the Juvenile Aid Bureau."

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

(4) "Referral depends upon the circumstances in each case. There is no impediment to direct referral either to the Police Department or the Department of Children's Services by any organisation or any member of the public."

ROADWORTHINESS CERTIFICATE; COMPLAINT BY MR. MARRIOTTI

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

(1) Has considerable publicity been given to the purchase of a second-hand vehicle by an Italian film-maker, Mr. Marriotti, and could legal proceedings ensue?

(2) Is he concerned, as a result of the publicity, that, whether the complaint is proven, justified or not, public opinion as to the efficacy of the roadworthiness scheme could have been influenced?

(3) What is the latest position in relation to one of the most practical pieces of legislation introduced in this House for many years?

Answers:—

(1) "Publicity was given to this matter in Monday's issue of *The Australian* newspaper, dated March 3, 1975. This matter is being fully investigated by the Chief Safety Engineer and appropriate action will be taken."

(2) "I stress again the success of the roadworthiness certificate scheme and the satisfaction it has given hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders."

(3) "Since October 2, 1972, when the scheme came into operation, 485,870 certificates have been issued by licensed inspection stations and only 896 complaints have been received. This is a percentage

of complaints of only .18 per cent. Following investigation of these complaints, 41 convictions have been obtained in respect to approved inspection stations and 16 convictions have resulted against licensed examiners employed at approved inspection stations. A further 15 breaches are pending court hearing. Approval of seven inspection stations and the licences of five examiners have been cancelled, suspended or surrendered."

DAM FAILURES

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

(1) Is he aware of an article which appeared in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of March 5 dealing with the threat to Wollongong from possible dam failures which could result from currently proposed access of coal-mining companies to catchment areas under four of the Sydney Metropolitan Water Board's dams?

(2) What safeguards are provided by existing legislation in this State against such a disaster, particularly in respect of the Brisbane catchment area?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "A situation such as this is covered by section 92 of the Coal Mining Act which, it is considered, can provide any necessary safeguards. A very strict control by way of width of drive and percentage of extraction is allowed under rivers, streams, watercourses and catchment areas. This usually provides for access from one side of a watercourse to the coal on the other side. At present there is no mining of coal in the Brisbane water catchment area."

MEATWORKERS STRIKE IN 1974

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

(1) Which abattoirs in Queensland were affected by the prolonged meatworkers' strike in 1974?

(2) What was the total number of killing days lost throughout the State as a result of this strike?

(3) What effect has this loss of abattoir output had in aggravating the slump in the beef-cattle market?

Answers:—

(1) "The strike affected abattoirs throughout the State."

(2) "It is impracticable to give the total number of killing days lost for the State as a whole. However, details of killing days lost by the public abattoirs in Queensland are: Bundaberg, 21; Ipswich, 19; Cannon Hill, 38; Toowoomba, 23; and Townsville, 39."

(3) "I am informed the general opinion is, that the lost throughput on account of the 1974 strike had little or no effect on the beef cattle market, the slump therein being due to other factors."

EXPORT OF KANGAROO PRODUCTS

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

(1) Was a submission for the management and conservation of kangaroos forwarded to the Commonwealth Government in Canberra and, if so, on what date was it despatched?

(2) Has any reply been received and, if so, when will the export of kangaroo products recommence, as kangaroos and wallabies have reached pest proportions in many areas of Queensland and the sale of these products could again be a valuable source of revenue for many people?

Answers:—

(1) "The Queensland submission for the management and conservation of kangaroos within the State was submitted to the Federal Minister for the Environment and Conservation on September 24, 1974."

(2) "The Federal Minister's private secretary acknowledged receipt of the submission by letter dated September 30, 1974. Nothing further was received from Canberra until February 25 this year when I received a letter from Dr. Cass. In this letter Dr. Cass said that with the introduction of a tagging/quota system the Queensland programme for red and grey kangaroos was now acceptable to him. Upon attention to two matters, he would recommend to the Minister for Customs and Excise that the ban be lifted for kangaroo products taken under the Queensland conservation programme. One matter involves the format and presentation of the programme in printed form and the other involves the evaluation of sanctuaries and reserves. My officers are giving this top priority and the additional information will be supplied to Dr. Cass very shortly. I am fairly confident in all the circumstances that within the next couple of weeks we will be advised that skins or products from skins taken according to the programme, that is, taken after March 1, will be granted export permits."

OBJECTIONS TO BRISBANE TOWN PLAN

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

(1) Is he aware that the Brisbane City Council is making it difficult for persons and groups to obtain the official form of objection to the new Town Plan and is securing names, addresses and signatures from all obtaining the forms?

(2) As this constitutes a form of pressure which contravenes the basic requirements for the fullest citizen participation in town planning, will he use his authority to terminate this detestable practice?

Answers:—

(1) "The *City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1974* provides, amongst other things that, before the Brisbane City Council submits the proposed new Town Plan for the City of Brisbane to the Governor in Council, the town clerk has to notify every person who has lodged an objection to the new plan of the purport of the representations which the council proposes to make to the Governor in Council in respect of his objection and of his right to make further representations in the matter to the Minister. I am informed that, because of the statutory requirement to notify objectors in this manner and in the light of previous experience where it has been found difficult to correctly ascertain the names and addresses of objectors, the council is endeavouring so far as possible to ensure that each objection clearly sets forth the relevant particulars. According to my information it is for this reason that the council is offering to persons who desire to lodge objections facilities for inserting, on the spot, the information considered necessary to ensure a speedy and efficient processing of the objection. These facilities include a form for the lodgement of objections."

(2) "I would stress that the Act does not specify a prescribed form for the lodgement of objections to the proposed new Town Plan. It provides that objections must be submitted within the prescribed time, be in writing addressed to the town clerk and state the grounds of objection and the facts and circumstances relied on by the objector in support of those grounds. Subject to compliance with these requirements, the form and content of objections is a matter within the discretion of the objector. If he decides to do so, he can make his objection on the form offered by the council but there is no obligation on him to do so."

BRISBANE FLOOD MITIGATION WORKS

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

What works have been submitted by the Brisbane City Council for his approval, under the *City of Brisbane flood-mitigation works?*

Answer:—

"The following applications have been made by Brisbane City Council under the *City of Brisbane (Flood Mitigation Works Approval) Act 1952-1974* for the approval of the Governor in Council to the carrying

out of flood mitigation works:—(a) On September 26, 1974, application was made for approval to raise the height of the Enoggera Dam and to dredge Enoggera and Breakfast Creeks downstream of the Normanby Bridge. An Order in Council was made on February 20, 1975, authorising the council to construct the new Enoggera Dam and appurtenant works in accordance with working documents enumerated in the Order in Council. Consideration will be given to the making of an Order in Council in regard to the dredging of Enoggera and Breakfast Creeks as applied for by the council when working documents for such works are submitted by the council and have been processed in accordance with the provisions of the Act. (b) On February 3, 1975, a brief preliminary report was submitted by the council on proposals for flood mitigation works in Kedron Brook and Sandy Creek and approval was sought for the carrying out of such works. The council advised that detailed plans of the works were being prepared and would be submitted when completed. The material supplied by the council has been referred to the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission for a report as required by the provisions of the Act. On February 26, 1975, the council supplied the Director of Local Government with preliminary drawings for flood mitigation works in the Kedron Brook catchment. The council's letter stated that the drawings were incomplete and that final drawings would be sent as early as possible. The question of granting approval for the carrying out of these works will receive prompt attention when all necessary information is to hand from the council and has been processed in accordance with the Act."

IMPORTS OF PASSIONFRUIT PULP

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

(1) Is he aware that passionfruit pulp is being imported into Australia?

(2) Is he aware that 136 growers in the Electorates of Redlands, Cooroora and Landsborough are likely to be forced out of business because of the Commonwealth Government allowing the imports?

(3) Is he aware that in the last six months of 1974, 286,447 litres of passionfruit pulp were imported from Sri Lanka, Brazil, Fiji and New Guinea and that the local annual production is 285,929 litres worth approximately \$861,536 to local growers?

(4) What action will he take to protect the livelihood of growers?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes, but nearly all the imports of passionfruit are as juice and not as pulp. This distinction is important as juice is approximately 75 per cent. of pulp."

(2) "Yes, these growers could be adversely affected if imports of passionfruit juice were to continue their recent upward trend."

(3) "Imports in the last six months of 1974 were running at an annual rate of nearly 600 000 litres of juice. This is nearly double the imports in 1973-74 and nearly six times the average rate in the previous five years. Processors have contracted to purchase the equivalent of 920 000 litres of locally-produced juice in 1975, valued at \$868,000."

(4) "I understand that the industry is making representations to the Federal Government. If they submit a request to my Government then I would be happy to make representations on their behalf."

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES TO FOOTBALL CLUBS AND WELFARE ORGANISATIONS

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

(1) Has he noted a report in the *Telegraph* of March 4, wherein it was stated that the Wynnum-Manly Football Club will spend \$100,000 this season on paid players and are Government funds directly or indirectly involved?

(2) What has been the total Government subsidy to football clubs since the subsidy scheme was instituted some two years ago and what were the annual amounts contributed to respective codes?

(3) Can he state, with reasonable certainty, the source of the massive funds given to football clubs and the source whereby these clubs fund the huge transfer fees required for imported players?

(4) What were the Government subsidies given to the Sub-Normal Children's Fund, the Spastic Welfare League, the Multiple Handicapped Association, etc., for the last three years?

Answers:—

(1) "I have read the report in the *Telegraph* of March 4, 1975 and Government funds are not directly or indirectly involved. As a matter of interest, no application for subsidy for either junior coaching or development of playing facilities has been received from the Wynnum-Manly Rugby League Football Club since the scheme for assistance and encouragement to sport was commenced."

(2) "Total subsidies and grants paid to football clubs and associations since the inception of the Sporting Subsidy Scheme up to and including March 7, 1975 amount to \$240,925.84. The subsidies paid to the various clubs and associations in the four football codes in the relevant financial years are as under—

	1972-1973 Financial Year	1973-1974 Financial Year	1974-1975 Financial Year (to 7-3-75)
	\$	\$	\$
Australian Rules ..	13,069.79	16,049.80	12,300.82
Rugby League ..	4,806.34	25,117.46	59,528.75
Rugby Union ..	2,556.05	6,637.31	6,207.43
Soccer ..	5,38.00	29,518.16	59,904.93"

(3) "No. I have no knowledge of such matters."

(4) "Subsidies for the Sub-Normal Children's Fund, Spastic League, Multiple Handicapped, etc., are not matters which are under my administrative control. However I do know that an amount well in excess of a million dollars was paid by the Health Department alone to the three organisations over the three-year period."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

TELECASTS BY POLITICAL LEADERS

Mr. MELLOY: I ask the Premier: In view of his statement that he will allow the Opposition Leader (Mr. Burns) the same television rights as the Federal Opposition Leader receives from the Australian Government, is he aware that almost every time the Federal Opposition Leader has applied to the Australian Government for television time, it has been granted? Will he now take the same sympathetic attitude towards the Opposition in that State?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member does not seem to know the rules of the game. Application for television time is not made to the Prime Minister; it is made to the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Its members are the ones who knock back Mr. Snedden.

FAMILY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Dr. CRAWFORD: I preface a question to the Minister for Health by saying that, in regard to the future of the Family Planning Association in Queensland, I assume from his answer to the question I asked last week that the new clinic at the Women's Hospital will not be under the control of the Family Planning Association and, therefore, that the Health Department is not prepared to make space available for that association in Government buildings. Is that so?

Dr. EDWARDS: The answer I gave last week was quite clear. The Family Planning Clinic at the Women's Hospital has been set up for a number of specific reasons, the

major one being to provide an opportunity for students to be taught the principles of family planning and to enable post-graduate students to receive instruction in family-planning techniques.

A different situation has existed in other centres throughout the State, and the Government has been well aware of the problems the Family Planning Association is facing. Space will not be made available in Government hospitals to meet the situation, but room may be provided in community health centres, as these are developed throughout the State, where there will be space, rent free, for the Family Planning Association and the Catholic Welfare Planning Association, so that advice on family planning can be obtained by people who seek assistance through these associations, both of which are well respected throughout the State and the nation. The purpose of family planning is well recognised in Queensland, but the Government subscribes to the belief that both philosophies of family planning must be adhered to and respected in every way.

DUTY POLICEWOMEN, PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG: In asking the Minister for Police this question without notice I refer him to an article in "The Australian" of 5 March which reported that a Victorian policewoman has joined the security staff at Parliament House in Victoria and that she is the first woman police officer employed in the security of an English-speaking Parliament. In the interests of historical accuracy, will the Minister please inform the Victorian Government and the Victorian Police Department that the well-being of Queensland politicians has been very well protected for some time now by women police?

Mr. HODGES: As we all realise people who live in Victoria regard anybody who lives north of the Murray as a foreigner. They do not know what goes on in the rest of Australia. For the edification of people in the South, I point out that Queensland leads the way again. We have so many firsts in police administration in Queensland it is just not funny. Female police officers have been looking after the security of our Parliament House for the past two years or more. They have been doing an excellent job and, unlike their counterparts in Victoria, they are so well trained and efficient that they do not require the assistance of male officers.

BEEF SALE TO RUSSIA; FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LOAN TO AUSTRALIAN MEAT BOARD

Mr. HARTWIG: I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to a recent decision of the Federal Labor Government to lend the Australian Meat Board \$3 million to finance the beef deal with Russia? Does this in fact mean that the beef producer in Australia is subsidising a deal under which he will not even recover his own costs while ensuring the supply of cheap beef to a foreign

country? Has this been arranged to give Mr. Whitlam some kudos and a justification for his recent visit to the Soviet Union? Will the Premier give this Parliament an assurance that the Queensland Government will never be involved in a similar deal purely for political gain?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Like other members I have heard and read the report that Senator Wriedt has arranged a \$3 million loan to assist the Australian Meat Board to pay for the slaughtering and dressing of cattle and the subsequent loading of the beef onto Russian ships. To me, that is absolutely scandalous. As the Senator said, the loan is for the purpose of providing employment for abattoir workers and saving the Commonwealth Government unemployment relief. The cost of keeping those men in work is being passed on as a cost to the primary producer.

The price that the primary producer is receiving for the beef—9c a lb.—is ridiculous. I have already clearly indicated my own thinking on this matter. I believe that no primary producer should be expected to supply meat for any transaction under which he will lose money. I am appalled to think that there are men in the industry saying, "At least we are getting the cattle out of the road, if nothing else." It is unbelievable that the Commonwealth Government has sponsored and furthered a project of this nature under which the cattlemen have to pay for the loading, transportation and slaughtering of these beasts.

There is no need for Dr. Patterson to run round the nation speaking in terms of co-operation with the States to help the beef industry. Almost daily in the House of Representatives, Queensland Federal members point out the urgent need for long-term low-interest money. He knows the situation and so does the Commonwealth Government. They can do as we have done, that is, provide money at the very low interest rate of 2½ per cent.

Mr. Wright: They can't borrow it, and you know it.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Honourable members opposite are trying to draw red herrings across the trail to protect their mates in Canberra. If they want to align themselves with their mates in Canberra, I will soon line them up with them in this State. If they support Canberra's attitude of doing nothing for primary producers, they are protecting their mates and trying to shield them from their apathy. I stress that they are doing nothing. They ought to become active and do something constructive.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the House proceeded with Government business.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIRST AND SECOND ALLOTTED DAYS

Debate resumed from 27 February (see p. 41) on Mrs. Kippin's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (12.2 p.m.): I welcome this opportunity to pledge the loyalty of the Opposition to Her Majesty, Queen of the United Kingdom, Head of the British Commonwealth and Her Majesty, Queen of Australia, including Queensland.

We congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election and we look forward to a co-operative, constructive Parliament in which all political parties, together with you, will be able to modernise some of the still antiquated, still restrictive forms observed in this Chamber.

Similar congratulations are offered to the honourable member for Chatsworth on his election as Chairman of Committees, and to the panel of Temporary Chairmen.

This is International Women's Year and, while regretting their choice of political parties, I welcome the two new lady members to this Parliament and compliment them on their maiden speeches. Likewise, I am sorry at the temporary absence from this Chamber of Mrs. Vi Jordan, who flew the female banner alone here for so long, as well as many other former members who distinguished themselves in the last, and in some cases, previous Parliaments.

On a personal side, I thank the people of Lytton for reaffirming their faith in me as their member at the 7 December election and I pledge my continued dedication to their representation and interests.

The 7 December elections, in which the National Party won only 28 per cent of votes, did not give the Premier a mandate for continuing senseless obstruction of and non-co-operation with the elected Australian Government. Nor did it allow him the right to delay the implementation of his election promises. Surely, before increasing its own Ministry, any responsible Government would have introduced the Treasurer's election promise of 14 November to subsidise parents of students travelling on council buses before 8.30 a.m. so that children could still receive concessional fares. I understand that today one Government member asked a question seeking information on this promise made by the Government.

Surely, before increasing its own Ministry, any responsible Government would have enforced its Premier's election promise in November to eliminate road taxes. I have not heard a question so far on that subject from Government back-benchers.

We of the Opposition will support genuine legislation designed to benefit thousands of Queenslanders wherever they live, whatever their age and whatever their occupations. But

we will oppose—and continue to oppose with every means available—selfish, self-effacing, patronising Bills framed, presented, and granted false priority to feather the nests of a chosen few.

As I said on 7 December, the National Party, which campaigned through its Premier for outright obstruction of Canberra, received only 28 per cent of the votes. The A.L.P., which promised responsible co-operation, received 36 per cent and the Liberal Party, with a similar policy, won 30 per cent; in other words, 66 per cent of Queenslanders wanted better national co-operation, yet the Premier claims that his splendid 28 per cent arms him with a mandate to do the exact opposite.

Why can't this Government eliminate road taxes and provide concessional bus fares for students, as it promised? Why couldn't it immediately introduce these things rather than Bills to increase the size of the Cabinet and the number of Supreme Court judges? Why can't the Government show responsibility in its attitude to, and dealings with, the elected Government in Canberra, in accordance with the expressed desire of 66 per cent of Queenslanders, instead of pointless confrontation sought by, at most, 28 per cent? These are the questions that, only three months after the election, I want answered. They are questions that, only three months after the election, thousands and thousands of very worried and very confused Queenslanders want answered.

This Government is the master of political reversal; the master of political contradiction; the master of political sleight of hand. Let us take, for example, the Australian Government's Regional Employment Development scheme. There has been no more vocal critic of this scheme than the Premier. We are told that the Government does not support it. The Premier was even critical when a photograph appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of six Federal members, including some Liberals, sitting with the Lord Mayor of Brisbane working out how to use the grant of \$17,000,000 in the city of Brisbane. The next day the Premier attacked the Liberals who showed an interest in our unemployed.

The Liberal member for Griffith, who is one of the friends of the honourable member for Windsor, sent me a telegram the other day in which he asked me to recommend a list of projects in the Lytton electorate to enable him to submit them for consideration under the R.E.D. scheme. That was done by Don Cameron, a Liberal member whom Government members support. The Liberal member for Petrie has been running around Deception Bay in the last few weeks trying to organise public meetings to take credit for the money that the Federal Government is giving for a community centre in that area.

Mr. Frawley: That is untrue.

Mr. BURNS: Just wait and see. In spite of the acceptance of the R.E.D. scheme by his Liberal partners, the Premier still remains hypocritical, and still takes a "dog in the manger" attitude. I say that he is hypocritical because, despite his denouncements, at least four of his own State departments, namely, Forestry, Main Roads, Railways and Works, have applied for aid, and in some cases they have already received it. Yet he told the House in response to a question that I asked, "We don't agree with this allocation." Departments that he controls have made application to the Federal Government for aid under the R.E.D. scheme, whilst the Premier says in the Press that he is against it.

In fact, as the Opposition revealed during question time just over a week ago, \$19,000 has been allocated under the R.E.D. scheme towards work on two primary schools and a child welfare centre in his own electorate of Barambah. The Premier's reaction is that he welcomes the money, but opposes the scheme under which it is granted. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot have his cake and, at the same time, bite the hand of the chef who makes it.

Let me now refer to the Premier's newly produced monthly television programme. It is paid for by the Queensland people, but he will not tell them how much it is costing. He has refused to answer questions asked on this matter in the House, and he has refused in public to say how much it costs. His way of diverting attention from his television programmes was to attack the A.L.P.'s privately owned radio station for paying, with A.L.P. money, for an A.L.P. broadcast made by me, and to claim that the A.L.P. should make free time available for him. The A.L.P. pays for me to put out A.L.P. propaganda; the people of Queensland are paying television stations and newspapers for the National Party propaganda put out by the Premier.

Harking back to the R.E.D. scheme, I have received a news release which reads—

"Queensland is running second only to New South Wales as the biggest beneficiary under the Regional Employment Development (R.E.D.) Scheme.

"This is revealed in figures released today by the Australian Minister for Labour, Mr. Clyde Cameron.

"Up to March 5, Queensland had received about \$11.5 million from R.E.D. funds. This would finance about 407 projects with a total value of about \$14.4 million.

"Employment would be provided for some 4,600 people, nearly 4,000 of whom had been unemployed previously."

And the Premier is against the scheme!

Let me return briefly to the matter of broadcasts. What about the Minister for Mines and Energy, who makes weekly broadcasts, I understand at no cost, from a Mackay radio station, and another station in that area, every Sunday night? Have we ever

heard the Premier demand equal time for anyone else? Does this only apply when he wants something for himself? It applies in this case to only the National Party, never to the Labor Party.

This complaining and whingeing Premier does not tell the people that during the recent election campaign he and the Minister for Local Government breached the law by making broadcasts over a private radio network licensed as a private business concern for the Corporation of the Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. They did it, and it was in defiance of the Act. The Premier talks about implementing the Act in relation to his television programmes. He cannot have it both ways; it has to be one way or the other.

Last September we had what the Treasurer described as the best Budget of any State in Australia. By December the Premier was crying that, in spite of this wonderful—this visionary—Budget, the Government would be forced to stand down hundreds of public servants unless urgent funds were received from Canberra. That marvellous Budget, in other words, required financial transfusion from the Australian Government within three months of its presentation.

This usually vocal Premier was strangely silent when, earlier this year, the Federal Government rescued the State Government from its own budgetary inadequacies by allocating it \$47,000,000—more than it had actually sought. As I said, the Premier cannot have it both ways.

Remember the pious words of the 1969 and 1972 election campaigns in defence of the miserable 5c a ton Queensland was getting in royalties for its coal.

We were told by Minister after Minister that this could not be increased and that the real mineral profits came in rail freights. Of course, simple statistics show that, when we are supposedly reaping such countless wealth from coal freights, the losses of the Railway Department are growing each year.

We found also that last year, under prompting from the Minerals and Energy Minister in the Australian Government, these immovable royalties could suddenly, almost without warning, be lifted from 5c to \$1 a ton. The fact is that, because of the negligence of National-Liberal Governments, because of their past obedience—sickly obedience—to their foreign masters and indifference to the interests of this State, Queensland, over the years, has lost millions and millions of dollars that were available and should have been contributed.

Mr. Aikens: Russ Hinze is in the Chamber now. Tell him he is a law-breaker.

Mr. BURNS: He is a law-breaker. He cannot have it both ways.

The Premier was the barrier to the Australian Government's Land Commission—the scheme to provide cheaper land for home-seeking families. The Lands Minister in the

last Parliament voiced support, but was quickly rapped over the knuckles and deported to the Agent-General's Office in London for his political audacity.

The Premier will not have the Australian National Line for intrastate shipping trade in Queensland. By some strange pattern of reasoning, he declares it will damage the State's railways. Yet now, according to his election promises, he plans to eliminate road taxes—an action which even the most economically naive member opposite must concede will have at least some effect on rail transport.

Last year, in one of the northern broadcasts to which I referred earlier, the Minister for Mines warned of the export dangers of trading blackmail tactics against Japan. What he said was also reported in the Press. He said it was against the long term interests of the State.

Now the Premier is threatening a coal blackout with Japan unless that country takes Queensland beef, and the Minister for Mines—that opponent of standover tactics—is mumbling his consent. I repeat, "You can't have it both ways, Mr. Minister."

When the Prime Minister visited Europe last year and applied subtle diplomatic pressure to increase Australian trade in the Common Market countries, the Premier of Queensland condemned the trip; but now, for propaganda purposes, he has resorted to his own pressure tactics against the State's best overseas customer.

He accuses the Australian Government on unemployment but rejects Federal money that is available to provide jobs. Last year honourable members saw the incredible, unbelievable spectacle of the Government of Queensland not only refusing but also denouncing an offer of Federal money to build a new hospital at Mt. Gravatt—a new hospital that its own health planners deemed necessary as far back as 1969.

I could proceed indefinitely. The Premier is the Houdini of Australian politics. He creates crises and then attempts silent escape. He creates imaginary propaganda wars that achieve only harm for the State he claims a mandate to represent.

At one stage he even threatened secession from Australia but at the same time demanded his right to criticise almost everything that emanated from the Australian national capital.

When the former Liberal Prime Minister, Mr. McMahon, in 1972 gave him less aid than he asked for, he returned to Brisbane applauding a new deal for Queensland. But in 1975, when the Whitlam A.L.P. Government gave him more help than he sought—more than even he expected—he was conveniently silent.

He does not want the Australian national anthem—in fact, refuses to play it; does not want the Australian High Court; and does not want the Australian National Line in Queensland ports.

The Premier wants it all ways. He wants the privileges of being an Australian without the responsibilities. He has become known as the national nark; the national knocker; the national contortionist.

Take his present theme—his plea, his demands, to Canberra to cease tinned meat imports, as a protection to the beef industry—a beef industry, I might add, for which he and his Government showed scant concern until recent weeks.

I have here correspondence from the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's State Council, and I shall read to honourable members a letter that the council wrote to Mr. E. O. Burns, the Chairman of the Queensland Fish Board, on 10 February 1975. It said—

"It has been noted that certain imported seafoods, including Alaskan Snow Crab, Californian Edible Squid, Breaded Oysters, etc., are being sold by the Queensland Fish Board direct to the public at Brisbane market and other points.

"The Queensland Commercial Fishermen's State Council was dismayed to learn (when our two fishermen's representatives currently sitting on the Queensland Fish Board were asked) that neither of them had been consulted in relation to this matter; nor had the decision to sell imported seafoods direct by the Queensland Fish Board been made by the members of the Board."

As fishermen—as primary producers—they made the following recommendation:—

"That the decision to sell imported seafoods direct to the public in competition to local produce is not in the interests of Queensland fishermen."

This is being done under the auspices of the National Party, the people who profess to support the primary industry section of the State. They had a letter back from the board, and the board said—

"Small quantities of imported seafood lines such as those you mention have been handled by the Board for many years . . . All we are doing is taking the profit from resale away from private enterprise. Surely this is a good thing!"

The Fish Board is being operated by the so-called free-enterprise parties. It has been set up under a Government that has been critical about cans of beef and cans of passion-fruit juice coming into the State. Under this board, which is controlled by a National Party Minister, Alaskan Snow crab and Californian edible squid are being imported for sale through the board and

its retail outlets. Yet honourable members opposite say that they are interested in our primary producers. They make their complaints on behalf of one industry, attacking the Federal Government, while this sort of thing is happening under their own noses. It is happening under their own Government, and they cannot deny it. The letters are there. Why do honourable members opposite complain about what another Government is doing when they are doing nothing about the same problems affecting our local fishermen?

During the life of this Parliament there will be a redistribution. When this arises I call on the members of the Liberal Party, particularly the new members—if they retain an inch of spine, an ounce of courage—to join with the A.L.P. Opposition to ensure it is a fair redistribution.

In a debate with me on the television programme "A Current Affair" on 3 March, the Treasurer and Liberal leader said he believed in a fair distribution with boundaries set by a District or Supreme Court judge and representatives from both sides. When the next redistribution is proposed I ask him—I ask his Liberal Party—to honour those words, to fight for a fair distribution, to fight for a distribution rather than surrender—rather than capitulate without struggle—to their National Party overseers.

If the National Party has its way, it will be an unfair redistribution, a gerrymander in which the object will be preservation of undeserved power rather than a restoration of democracy in this State. It will, if this party prevails, be a distribution masterminded by those two architects of outside political intrigue and dominance, Bob Sparkes and Mike Evans.

The elected members of the Liberal and National Parties in this House will do as they are told. They will be presented with a document for rubber-stamp endorsement and asked to agree in Parliament to proposals conceived outside it.

If the National Party has its way, it will be a redistribution designed to preserve an unwanted gerrymander for the retention of unwanted control and dominance in the hands of electorally unwanted political leaders.

Is this the type of democracy the Liberal Party supports? Is this the type of freedom that Sir Robert Menzies founded the Liberal movement to protect?

When the redistribution comes before the House, I challenge members of the Liberal Party to stand on the side of Queensland; to stand and be counted as Queenslanders—not as puppets of a power-preserving Premier and his minority, power-greedy political party.

If honourable members opposite think that everybody in Queensland supports the system under which boundaries are rigged, let me read a few newspaper extracts. An editorial in "The Courier-Mail" stated—

"The present system certainly gives the Country Party disproportionate representation in Parliament. Improved transport has made it much easier for members to move about sprawling rural electorates."

A Gallup Poll taken of a cross-section of Australian people revealed that the majority were in favour of equal electorates. People living in country areas themselves answered: "All electorates the same—53 per cent; fewer people in country areas—27 per cent; no opinion—20 per cent." Fifty per cent of people living in capital cities said that all electorates should have the same numbers.

"The Courier-Mail" reported—

"The Country Party Federal Leader (Mr. Anthony) agreed yesterday with a suggestion that State Governments had jockeyed the electoral laws. Speaking on an open-line radio programme, he said it had been done in all States over the last 50 years, and added, 'I don't approve of it.'"

That comment was made by the Country Party Federal Leader, Mr. Anthony. Who in this Government denounced and attacked him when he made this statement?

Even the Methodist Church has had some words to say about the Queensland Government's redistribution. In fact, nearly everyone has condemned it.

As the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads (Mr. Hinze) is in the Chamber, and is likely to duck out if things get hotter, I shall read some of his comments on redistribution. He has been reported as follows:—

"You say that we are not democratically elected. I'm telling you we are. You can talk about rigged boundaries . . . I said to Joh, if you want somebody to gerrymander the boundaries, brother let me do it. We'll stay there forever.

"I've no compunction about it. You'd have to be mad if you didn't. They all do it."

Asked whether he saw anything wrong with gerrymandering Mr. Hinze replied—

"No, not as long as you can stay in Government. If you don't gerrymander boundaries, somebody'll get under your neck and do it for you."

Those words were uttered by the democratic member for South Coast.

As I have said, the Methodist Church passed some comments on the redistribution. A study conducted by the Methodist Church's Christian Citizenship Committee and published in the "Methodist Times" described Queensland's record on electoral rights as "the least enviable of all Australian States." The committee's report said that the precious political heritage that one man's vote should be equal

to any other man's vote had been taken away by a succession of State Governments of all political shades.

In quoting "glaring inequalities in the Queensland electoral system," the report said that in the 1972 State election the Liberal Party received more votes than the National Party but won five fewer seats and the Labor Party won more than double the votes cast for the National Party, yet won only seven more seats. This church report conceded that there are minority groups in the community that need assistance, but said that to give such groups an advantage at the ballot box was undemocratic and inevitably led to greater injustices.

The report went on to say—

"History proves that whenever benefits of this nature have been granted by Governments, in almost every case it assists the governing party to stay in power."

The study called for reform to "take control and manipulation of a precious democratic right away from opportunistic politicians". It also recommended a mandatory redistribution every seven years.

If the honourable member for Redcliffe were in the Chamber, he would agree, I am sure, that the Redcliffe branch of the Young Liberals suggested that a Labor voting area had been moved prior to the 1972 election from Redcliffe to Murrumba as the result of representations made by a sitting National Party member who knew the exact boundaries before they were released. An editorial in the "Redcliffe Herald" made the following comment:—

"This is a prime example of the expertise with which politicians can manipulate things to suit themselves with total disregard for the people who vote them into office."

The Gold Coast City Council objected to the redistribution, as did the Liberal-dominated Gap Protest Committee. Furthermore, the Toowong branch of the Young Liberals condemned the Liberal Party's association with the 1972 redistribution. State Young Liberal officers in a document titled "Towards a New Freedom", which, incidentally, saw no reason why the present system of States should remain, proposed major alterations to the redistribution.

An editorial in the Maryborough "Chronicle", a newspaper published in the area represented by the honourable member for Maryborough, a Liberal member, had this to say—

"Even Young Liberals have been moved to protest at the gerrymander of Queensland electorates effected by the last redistribution of boundaries.

"That the rigging of electorates has taken place for many years under both Labor and Country Party-Liberal Governments does not justify its use to retain power. It merely makes a mockery of our much vaunted claim to be democratic,

so much so that elections in South Vietnam appear to be reasonable by comparison."

That is what "The Chronicle" had to say about redistribution.

It went on to say—

"It is the misuse of power to ensure the dominance of the Country Party in Queensland that has led the Young Liberals to call for a continuing electoral commission headed by a Supreme Court judge to fix boundaries on the one vote one value basis east of the Great Divide and with reasonable weightage in favour of electorates west of that line."

Mr. Katter interjected.

Mr. BURNS: The article also said—

"Queenslanders have memories of the rejection of a vital clause in a Redistribution Bill last year when some Liberals crossed the floor of the House to prevent a blatant gerrymander."

Mr. Katter interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Flinders will restrain himself.

Mr. BURNS: The Liberal State Conference also discussed motions on redistribution proposing major changes, but discussion on redistribution at Liberal conventions is mostly public window-dressing, as the Liberals do not really want electoral reform. In the past Liberal politicians have shown that they are more concerned with retaining their limited, second-rate or second-string power, than with risking the return of a Labor Government by keeping to a set of decent principles.

The Liberal electoral redistribution proposals on the conference agenda suggested—

"That this convention:—

(a) expresses its strong disappointment at the redistribution effected this year;

(b) believes that the already mal-apportioned state of the electorates more than justifies a redistribution during the life of the current Parliament;"

That was referring to the last Parliament. The agenda item continued—

"(c) therefore calls upon the State Government to implement a redistribution—

(i) on the basis of one vote one value east of the Great Dividing Range;

(ii) with reasonable weightage in favour of electorates west of that range;

(iii) with a continuing electoral commission headed by a Supreme Court judge freely determining boundaries on a regular basis; and

(iv) with all submissions and hearings before the commission to be public;

"(d) urges that the same machinery be used for the preparation of State and Federal electoral rolls."

On behalf of the Labor Party I make the point that the Government has its own system of rolls because that is the easiest way to rig the system. If the Government had to support the Federal electoral-roll system it would find it much harder to rig the boundaries to suit itself.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. BURNS: That is right. The "dead uns" have been coming on the roll since the day the honourable member was elected to Parliament. There are more "dead uns" on his electoral roll than on Eagle Farm race-course on a Saturday afternoon. Possibly one day the Liberal Party will get a little backbone and cease acting like a filleted flat-head in this Parliament and its members might even start standing up to be counted. If they do, the will of the people may be reflected in the ballot box results.

Mr. Aikens: I'm beginning to think you're trying to drive a wedge between the National Party and the Liberal Party.

Mr. BURNS: You might be right. It is about time the Liberals tried to stand on their own feet. The young Liberals who have come into this Parliament will have to ask the older members of the Liberal Party whether they stand by what they have been saying in the electorate and in this Parliament.

Mr. Lester interjected.

Mr. BURNS: A member with a very squeaky little voice has been screaming about country people. I shall turn my attention to him for a moment to see what I can do to educate him.

Mr. Lester interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURNS: It should be emphasised that for some 40 years Queensland Governments were elected on the basis of one vote one value and that Premiers from all parties, and from rural electorates, have agreed with this principle. This policy was initiated when travel and communication were very difficult—before the days of the aeroplane and TV. Country people were more isolated then than they are today.

The 1910 Electoral Districts Act was brought down by a Liberal Premier, William Kidston of Rockhampton. It provided for 72 single-member electorates, each having as nearly as possible the same number of voters. In 1910, with inadequate forms of transport and communication, the electorates throughout Queensland were equal. In 1922 the State electoral boundaries were redistributed under the 1910 Act, with 72 electorates, each having as nearly as possible the same number of voters. At that time the Premier was E. G. Theodore of the Labor Party, who represented the North Queensland seat of Chillagoe.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn all honourable members that I will not allow persistent interjections.

Mr. BURNS: The 1931 Electoral District Act was brought down under the Conservative Premier, A. E. Moore, who represented the Darling Downs seat of Aubigny. He reduced the number of seats from 72 to 62, each to have, as nearly as possible, the same number of voters. It should be noted that this was done by a Conservative Premier.

In 1934 the State's electorates were redistributed under the 1931 Act, maintaining 62 seats, each having, as nearly as possible, the same number of voters. This was done under W. Forgan Smith, the Labor Premier of the time, representing the North Queensland electorate of Mackay.

The 1949 Electoral Districts Act contained the first departure from equality of representation. It was introduced by a Labor Premier, E. M. Hanlon, representing the Brisbane seat of Ithaca. The long-standing principle of each electorate having as nearly as possible the same number of voters was replaced by two principles for the drawing of electoral boundaries, namely, distance from Brisbane and sparseness of population. The State was divided into four zones—metropolitan, south-eastern, northern and western.

The 1958 Electoral Districts Act—the first such Act introduced by the present Government parties—was introduced during the first year in office of Country Party Premier, G. F. R. Nicklin, representing the south-eastern Queensland seat of Landsborough—again a country member. Mr. Nicklin, as he then was, applied neither the principle of one vote one value nor the joint principles of distance from Brisbane and sparseness of population. Electorates bordering on Brisbane were given the same low quota as those in the Far West, while distant electorates like Cairns were given more electors than those close to Brisbane.

The State was divided into three zones, each with a different quota. By 1969 the number of voters in Queensland electorates had grown more unbalanced and the political leaders at the 1969 State election agreed that a redistribution was necessary. In fact, the imbalance had reached the stage where 19 electorates had 16,000 voters and over while 11 electorates had 8,000 or fewer. No-one could really support the proposition that some seats should have twice as many electors as others.

That brings me to the redistribution proposals debated in this House in 1971, four years ago. The Labor Party advocated returning as nearly as practicable to the idea of one vote one value; but, as Western Queensland electors had for the past 20 years had special consideration, we proposed in 1971 to agree to continuing it. The Labor scheme would have been for 69 electorates on the coast from Mossman to

Goondiwindi, each electorate having approximately 12,600 voters. In the West there would have been nine electorates, each with approximately 8,500 voters. The Liberal Party proposals at that time were very similar in principle to the Hanlon Labor redistribution of 1949.

It was about the Country Party proposals that the furore arose in this House. The Electoral Districts Bill which the Premier drew up very hastily in March 1971 was an extremely clumsy piece of legislation. It incorporated neither the democratic principle of one vote one value nor the principles of distance from Brisbane and sparseness of population as reasons for deviating from the principle of one vote one value. According to the Attorney-General at that time, the late Dr. Delamothe, no member actually knew the contents of the Bill until it had passed the introductory stage in Parliament and had been published. The only rationale behind the Bill seemed to be to keep the Liberal-Country Party coalition in power and to ensure that the Country Party remained the senior party in the anti-Labor coalition.

Let us look at the geographical distribution, which is what the squeaky-voiced fellow from the West has been talking about.

Mr. Lester: He's not squeaky-voiced.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition that he should address honourable members by their correct names.

Mr. BURNS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. They have been acting like larrikins, and their actions tend to bring one down finally to their standard.

Mr. Lester: That's not right, and you know it's not right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURNS: Let us look at the geographical distribution of seats under the various proposals put forward by the political parties in 1971. These three divisions were, I suggest, south of Bundaberg, including the Darling Downs; north of Bundaberg along the coast; and west of the Range. Under the 1958 Electoral Districts Act, introduced by the then Premier (Mr. Nicklin) there were 52 seats south of Bundaberg, 17 north along the coast and nine in the West. The proposal of the Labor Party in 1971 was that there be 52 seats south of Bundaberg, 17 north along the coast (exactly the same), and nine in the West.

Mr. Aikens: That was the time some of the ginger group crossed the floor and voted with the Opposition.

Mr. BURNS: That is right. We might get them back on this occasion. If they get up enough courage, they might cross the floor on this occasion.

Under the 1971 Liberal proposal there would have been 50 seats south of Bundaberg, 17 north along the coast and 11 in the West. (The western region under the Liberal proposal included part of the coastal section in the Labor proposal, which is the reason for the larger number of western seats.) Under the Bill drawn up by this Premier there would have been 58 seats south of Bundaberg (eight more than the Liberals wanted and six more than Labor asked for), 15 north along the coast and five west of the Range. So the party of those people who have been screaming all day about "west of the Range" would have reduced the number of seats proposed by both Liberal and Labor for west of the Range by at least four under the Premier's proposal, which was defeated by the Labor Party and the ginger group, as the member for Townsville South has just said.

In March 1971 the Liberals crossed the floor of the House and voted with the A.L.P. to defeat the National Party's Electoral Districts Act.

After a lot of political in-fighting—not in this Parliament but in the party rooms outside and in Primaries Building and other places—a sordid compromise was reached between the Liberals and the Country Party, and in July 1971 a redistribution was brought before the Parliament and was passed.

Mr. Lester: Country people need a vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURNS: Under the Electoral Districts Act of 1971 the State was divided into four zones, with the Mackay and Mt. Isa areas specifically prescribed by the Act. After a redistribution based on outdated electoral figures, on Wednesday 22 December 1971 the new boundaries were announced: As a result, the Liberals were in danger in five or six seats, the Country Party seats were safe and Labor had slight hopes of some gains. As the election was to be held in May, political parties moved to select their candidates, but the Country Party had its way and on 1 March, when the final electoral maps were produced, there was a further alteration in 34 of the 82 new seats, plus five name changes. They virtually had another redistribution!

This strange secret step forward forced "The Bulletin" of 11 March 1972 to refer to—

"... what can only be described as classic gerrymandering."

No reasons were given by the commission or the Government for those later alterations. Under the Act no-one can learn what suggestions were made to the commissioners. The redistribution was effected and became operative without any discussion on the final proposals. The Australian Labor Party had proposed that there would be equal seats right down the eastern side of the range and a loading for country voters west of the range.

Mr. Lester interjected.

Mr. Katter interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the honourable members for Flinders and Belyando. I ask them to contain themselves and to desist from making persistent interjections.

Mr. BURNS: The State Parliament was not in session when either the commissioners' first report or their final report was received. All that Parliament was asked to do was to pass an Act setting out the principles, if they can be called that. Federal Parliament has the right to debate the new boundaries and disallow them. I suggest that we in Queensland should have a similar power.

In a strongly worded editorial, "The Courier-Mail" made the following points:—

"Following the final report of the redistribution commissioners Queensland now has a distribution of electorates capable of giving it a reasonably representative Parliament.

"The final changes are claimed by the Australian Labor Party to affect its election chances adversely in the Brisbane area. This is true.

"...
"But it is wrong that final boundaries have been decided after nominations for seats were known."

I am sure that no-one who reads "The Courier-Mail" regularly would call it a friend of Labor, yet this staunch supporter of the conservative powers in this State could not stomach the 1971-72 redistribution.

We have compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting. I want to know why the people are not allowed to participate at the most important level, that is, the setting up of the boundaries. Legal men tell me that most evidence in court is subject to challenge. Why not a redistribution? Federal Parliament debates the proposals; why shouldn't we?

The present electoral boundaries discriminate within the districts and among neighbours. How can any westerner support boundaries under an electoral system that provides for 16,001 voters in Mt. Isa and only 8,505 in next-door Flinders? How can any voter on the Darling Downs accept having almost 16,000 electors in one seat in Toowoomba and fewer than 9,000 in the nearby western downs seat of Roma? How can a northerner tolerate having 15,400 voters for the electorate of Cairns and only 10,300 on the roll in adjacent Mulgrave?

The present distribution makes a mockery of democracy, a mockery of equality in even its faintest form—a mockery because of the unjust quotas upon which it is based.

Mr. Lester interjected.

Mr. Katter interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will not warn those two honourable members again. If they do not behave themselves, I shall deal with them under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BURNS: Already we have signs that certain people are obsessed with power and obsessed with the idea of governing in secret and smothering the open forum of this Parliament. We already have evidence of outside interference in legislation by non-elected machine manipulators of the Liberal and National Parties. We already have proof of disunity and discontent within the parliamentary Liberal Party.

It is our responsibility over the next three years to keep this Parliament working and to ensure that it remains constructive and does not become a fanatical forum for men who show a frightening tendency towards the extreme. I urge the Liberal Party to join with us in this pursuit and in the struggle against outside dominance of this Parliament. I urge those Liberals who still remember Sir Robert Menzies, whose flag they waved for years, to show some of the spirit he intended when he launched their movement.

They have their opportunity in the three years ahead. If they dismiss it and bow to their suppressors, never again can they claim to yearn to govern; never again can they claim to desire to implement policies or principles and never again can they claim that they want a Liberal Premier. Let Queenslanders watch to see whether they have the courage to grasp that opportunity.

The Australian tradition is one of equality. While we continue to strive for equal educational opportunities, equality before the law and equality in the distribution of wealth, we must still hold to the first tenet of equality—the equality of votes. Whether a man is rich or poor, whether he is a clerk, a farmer, a doctor or a labourer, he has an inalienable right to an equal voice in government. Whether he lives at Wynnum, Spring Hill, Sandgate or Inala, he has the same right to equal representation in this Parliament. The notion that one man should have more than one vote or that his vote should be worth more than that of his neighbour is centuries out of date. It has no place in modern Queensland or modern Australia.

Mr. KATTER: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has been telling us that everyone should have a vote of equal value. With due respect—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr. KATTER: The point of order that I take is that the Leader of the Opposition is saying that everyone should have a vote of equal value. Let me submit—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no valid point of order. The time allotted to the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Orders has expired.

Mr. TURNER (Warrego) (12.41 p.m.): In taking part in the Address-in-Reply debate, I first wish to convey my personal loyalty, and the loyalty of the constituents of Warrego, to her most gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. To His Excellency the Governor of Queensland, Sir Colin Hannah, I offer my congratulations on the capable and dignified manner in which he performs his important duties. The dignity and decorum of the opening ceremony was a tribute to Sir Colin Hannah's personal ability.

To the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the honourable member for Mourilyan (Mrs. Vicki Kippin), and the seconder of the motion, the honourable member for Salisbury (Mrs. Rosemary Kyburz), I offer my congratulations on the capable manner in which they delivered their maiden speeches in this Assembly. I feel that in International Women's Year it was fitting that the honour and privilege of moving and seconding this motion should go to our two lovely lady members.

I pay my respects to, and thank very sincerely, the Premier of Queensland, the Premier of New South Wales, and all other State and Federal Government members who assisted me so much during the recent State election campaign. My thanks would not be complete without reference to the people who elected me—the majority of the electors of Warrego—and to the National Party organisation, under the hard-working directorship of Vic Calcino. To all these good people I wish to express my appreciation of, and thanks for, their assistance and support.

I assure the Warrego electors as a whole of my untiring efforts to serve them, and Queensland, to the best of my skill and ability. I realise that there are larger electorates than Warrego. However, I feel that some people are unaware of the size of the inland electorates, and the magnitude of the problems in them. The Warrego electorate extends from the New South Wales border in the south to above Barcaldine in the north, a distance of over 400 miles. From Mitchell in the east, it extends 200 miles to the west. There are approximately 400 miles of railway in the electorate of Warrego, and six shire councils, of which the Murweh Shire Council alone services a distance of 4,324 kilometres of road.

In the Warrego electorate would probably be the best strip of sheep and cattle country in Australia in the 20-inch and under rainfall area, with artesian water and the best area of mulga country in Australia. If anyone could estimate the amount of money taken out of this area by Governments since it was first settled, and the amount returned to it by Governments over this period, people would understand why in some respects we feel neglected at times.

In this debate I wish to raise a number of matters that I consider are important to the people of Warrego whom I have the

privilege to represent in this Parliament. In the electorate of Warrego there are at this time two industries that are the life-line of the whole electorate. They are the wool and beef industries, and they are in a desperate position today, with wool returns unprofitable and cattle returns well below the cost of production. Unfortunately, in this area it is not possible to diversify into grain, sugar, dairying, minerals or major secondary industries. If the industries already in existence are to remain viable and to act as the basis of continued employment and rate collections, they must be given some concessions to provide people with an incentive and to permit them to show some initiative. If free enterprise and incentive are destroyed, the alternative is something which I feel the majority of Queenslanders could well do without.

There is one industry in inland areas which over the years has brought a tremendous amount of money to country towns. I refer to the kangaroo pet-food industry. I have no quarrel with the contention that the continued survival of the kangaroo is of paramount importance. However, I submit that the controlled harvesting of kangaroos will provide an added source of revenue in an area which has a tremendous amount of unemployment.

The annual harvesting in Queensland of 600,000 kangaroos, which biologists say can safely be done, could create over 1,200 jobs, mostly in Western Queensland, if the interstate and export bans are removed. Total returns to western areas would be in excess of \$2,500,000 annually.

The industry can be controlled because all shooters are licensed and it is covered by the provisions of the Fauna Conservation Act. If it was considered that red and blue kangaroos were being thinned out excessively, a ban on the taking of these species could be imposed.

Local authorities in my electorate will find it almost impossible to collect rates in the future unless there is an immediate upturn in returns to producers, which appears unlikely at this stage. Local governments in the electorate of Warrego are the greatest employers of labour. They have been caught in the inflationary spiral, with increased wages, higher interest rates, and greatly increased fuel costs as a result of the loss of the fuel subsidy, and now face the prospect of vast retrenchments if finance is not forthcoming from both the State and Federal Governments.

Although it is true that the Federal Government has increased the amount of money for national highways, it is tragic that the money available for inland arterial roads has been reduced, and many thousands of additional miles of road have been added to this classification. Many thousands of miles of road in the inland arterial classification need completing, but I think that the shocking road between Cunnamulla and Wyandra

should be completed with the utmost urgency. Why the road is not designated a national highway is beyond me. It is situated on heavy black-soil country and is absolutely impassable after 50 points of rain. If it were completed, a tremendous number of southern tourists would drive through Western Queensland. However, with this well-known horror stretch, many travellers with caravans will not use the road and, consequently, much business is lost to all the inland towns along the route.

The Cunnamulla-Wyandra road could also be needed in defence of the nation. What a ludicrous situation it would be if 50 points of rain prevented the Army from proceeding North. The trade between the States, the shifting of livestock in time of drought and the haulage of heavy loads from the southern States to Mt. Isa and Darwin need no further explanation.

From a local point of view, Cunnamulla is a very sport-conscious town. Most of the competition in golf, cricket and football is against Charleville. Just a shower of rain prevents sportsmen from making the 200 kilometre trip to Charleville, and, if rain falls while they are in Charleville, they have no chance of returning home. Twelve months ago the cost for a two-carriage football excursion train was \$600. That will give honourable members some idea of the need to complete this section, so that local people can travel on a bitumen road to sport and to the capital city of the State.

Although many roads in my electorate that come within the same road classification urgently need finance—the Quilpie-Charleville road, the Blackall-Jericho road, the Tambo-Springsure road, and many more—in my opinion, the completion of the Cunnamulla-Wyandra road should be undertaken at the earliest possible time. Cunnamulla people believe—quite justifiably, I think—that they merit some special consideration in the light of the contribution that the area has made, and will continue to make, to the over-all prosperity of Australia.

Education is a very important factor in the world today, and I believe that the State Government can feel justly proud of its record in this field, with the construction of many schools, pre-school centres, etc. However, education presents a very worrying problem to many people living in inland areas, mainly because of rising costs and fees.

I think that I should mention the sterling work done by the I.C.P.A., which has but a single objective—the equality of educational opportunity as between isolated and non-isolated children. As a means of assisting isolated children to be educated, the association is seeking the State Government's support to increase and extend the remote-area allowance to cover grades 1 to 5. It also aims to get an increase in the travelling allowance so that people who are disadvantaged by living long distances from

schools can receive more compensation for the use of their cars in taking children many miles to school each week.

I should hope that, if the necessary finance is available, some consideration will be given to the problems facing people in these remote areas, who wish to live in the West but also wish to provide an education for their children.

Another problem in my electorate is the need for Housing Commission homes in the towns of Barcaldine, Augathella, Charleville and Cunnamulla. There is an immediate need for approximately 15 homes in the Warrego electorate, with possibly more at a later date. If and when these homes are constructed, I should like consideration to be given to the possibility of building them on vacant allotments in different areas of those towns in order to get away from having what could be termed a Housing Commission area.

Another problem which needs investigation is the apparent shortage of teacher accommodation in the Warrego electorate. I ask that consideration be given to the construction of flat-type units to overcome the shortage.

The State Government proposes to phase out road permit fees over the next three years. Because of economic problems in the rural sector, the Government has temporarily suspended this charge on the cartage of livestock. As the rural recession in the beef and wool-producing areas is felt by all sections of the community, I hope that consideration can be given to the immediate removal of road permit fees on the cartage of any commodity in those areas.

While talking about the effect of the present rural recession on inland areas, I would be neglectful of my duty if I did not mention the fact that many businesses in country towns are in a desperate financial position. These businesses are as adversely affected by the rural recession as are many properties, and are unable to get carry-on finance. I mention this in the hope that some assistance can be given to this vital sector of inland areas.

Since entering Parliament I have heard much discussion about flooding in Brisbane. In Charleville we, too, have a flood problem. Bradley's Gully regularly floods a large area of Charleville, causing much damage in shops and homes. At present the Murweh Shire Council has instituted a feasibility study through its consulting engineers in Brisbane into the possibility of diverting Bradley's Gully into the Warrego River. When the report comes to hand I will advise the House of the findings. If it is feasible to divert Bradley's Gully, I hope that State and Federal Government money will be made available to alleviate the flooding in Charleville.

I cannot condemn too strongly the Federal Government's proposed plan to downgrade facilities at the Charleville Airport, and to force local ownership onto the Murweh Shire Council. The Charleville Airport was

used as a major inland airfield during the last war. As an inland airport for emergencies or defence it would have no equal. Only three months ago a Hercules bomber was forced to land at Charleville. During the Darwin evacuation that airport was used in an emergency. Had the runways been shortened, as proposed under the Federal scheme, it would have been impossible to use the field on those occasions. I should hope that the Federal Government can be induced to backpedal on this matter, and that it will not further reduce our air services and amenities. The Murweh Shire Council cannot possibly raise the finance to maintain the airport in its present form.

I could understand the Federal Government's policy of forcing the local authority to take over local ownership if its policy also applied to Tullamarine, Mascot and Eagle Farm Airports, and the capital city councils were required to maintain their own airports. But it appears to me that in country areas we will be paying for our own airports and, through tax, contributing to the major city airports. I oppose the Federal Government's plan of local ownership of Charleville Airport as another retrograde and backward step for my electorate.

Television is a Commonwealth matter, but I feel that I must voice my protest at the Federal Government for failing to provide television coverage for Tambo, Wyandra, Eulo and Mungallala when television was recently introduced in western Queensland. Television today is used in the education of children. Children in those towns are sufficiently disadvantaged without missing out on this amenity which has now been introduced into the western areas. No doubt other western towns in other electorates have missed out, but I hope that in time the Federal Government can be induced to provide this everyday facility to all inland areas.

I should like a feasibility study to be undertaken by the Treasury to ascertain if Federal and State Government subsidies could be combined and used towards the construction of a swimming pool in Augathella and the replacement of the old pool in Barcaldine. Augathella has a population in excess of 400. The people have to travel almost 200 km on a return trip to indulge in the luxury of a swim. Many schools have adopted swimming lessons as part of their curriculum. As we have no public transport service in the West, many parents are forced to offer transport privately. Surely children in country areas are entitled to receive educational opportunities equal to those of their city cousins. Educational expenses are high enough now, and the extra cost to parents through making their vehicles available is more than most of them can afford. In the cities those luxuries are taken for granted, but the people in the West have to pay dearly for them or go without. I know it is beyond the capacity of the local authorities in western areas to finance such schemes without special Government grants and assistance. I only hope that

Federal and State Government aid can be made available for the schemes and also for sewerage reticulation in many unsewered country towns.

I would like to think that Federal and State Governments, and people living in city areas, realise that all people living in inland regions suffer a gross disadvantage when compared with their city cousins. Some of these disadvantages were outlined by the Federal Minister for Northern Development, Dr. Rex Patterson, who, when speaking after the State election of 7 December, said—

“Queensland, the most decentralised State in the Commonwealth, is really a rural State. Its agricultural and mining resources earn huge annual export surpluses which are used to support the standard of living of the great masses of people in Sydney and Melbourne.

“The economic nucleus of every town and city in Queensland and the North generally is heavily influenced by primary industry and development policies—both production and processing. The pouring of millions of dollars into heavily subsidised Sydney and Melbourne, the building of Albury-Wodonga, the establishment of cultural operations, the purchase of ‘Blue Poles’ and so on made no impression on the North.”

After referring to the Coombs report, Dr. Patterson went on to list the abolition of freight rate subsidies, the removal of the petrol subsidy, the cutback in country air services, the removal of the superphosphate bounty and the removal of tax concessions to increase productivity as Cabinet decisions that had done his party “grave damage” in Queensland.

I submit that these and many other measures implemented by the Federal A.L.P. Government have done grave damage not only to the image of the Australian Labor Party but also to the lives and jobs of everyone living in inland Queensland.

Dr. Patterson was absolutely correct in his assessment of the situation in December 1974. However, in addition to mentioning those matters he should have referred to the Federal A.L.P. policy on electoral redistribution in inland areas, to the removal of the free-milk scheme for schools, to the reduction in the education allowance, to inflation, interest rates and unemployment, to dearer petrol, to higher postal and telephone charges and reduced service from the Australian Post Office, and to less money for inland roads. It is because of those things that the people in my electorate, after being represented continuously by Labor members for 66 years, voted a non-Labor representative into office.

It is an inescapable fact that at the present time the world is faced with tremendous problems. In a more local sense, the inland areas of Queensland, particularly the

Warrego electorate, are confronted with serious problems arising from the anti-inland policy of the Australian Labor Party.

I believe in free enterprise and in a society where initiative and incentive are encouraged. Federal A.L.P. members choose to refer to American ambassadors as “hatchet men” and endeavour to cut our ties with the democratic nations of the world. I would point out to those members of the Australian Labor Party that thousands of Australians as well as vast numbers of men and women fighting for our allies paid the supreme sacrifice to preserve our freedom and democracy. In war after war they fought socialism, Communism and oppression.

I sincerely hope and pray that the day never dawns in this great nation when our democracy is lost and we are controlled by a totalitarian socialist or Communist regime.

[Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (2.15 p.m.): The State election held on 7 December 1974 was indeed a devastating blow to the Labor Party in Queensland. It is not my intention at this time to canvass the reasons why this occurred or allocate the blame. Instead, I simply thank the people of Rockhampton for the tremendous personal support they saw fit to give me. One only begins to appreciate how great this support was when one considers that Rockhampton was the only marginal seat held by the Labor Party until that election which, in fact, it still holds.

For months prior to the election—indeed, up to the very day of the election—members of the Liberal Party and the National Party took great delight in telling me and my colleagues how they intended to take my seat. Honourable members will recall that the Liberal president, Mr. John Moore, came out openly in the Press to say that my seat would be probably the third seat to fall. I am very pleased to see that the Liberal Party prophets, and those who thought it was a lay-down misere, were completely foiled in their prophecy. The final result in Rockhampton was indicative of the magnificent effort made by members of the A.L.P., members of the trade unions and the many personal supporters who came out on that day (and prior to that day), to help me. They certainly put paid to the views put forward by my opponents.

The victory in Rockhampton flowed from a combination of reasons, but I think it proved beyond doubt that the tactics used by my opponents, and more so by members in this Chamber against me, simply backfired. Honourable members will recall how, in the very last week of session, the Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Justice and a few back-benchers launched a very dirty, personal campaign against me. I thought about it. I thought that when I first came down here I would be bitter because of what they tried to do, but in retrospect I think I should forgive them. Their whole scheme backfired.

I believe that in the last week of session they set the way for my victory in Rockhampton. I place on record my personal thanks to the Minister for Justice (Mr. Knox) for coming to Rockhampton to campaign against me on three occasions. Had he the time to come more often, my majority would have increased. I offer him the opportunity to come to Rockhampton any time he cares to; he will certainly be welcome there.

There has been a fair amount of concern about the tactics used by the Government. I am talking not only about electioneering tactics, but the over-all tactics and policies propagated by the Government. It is obvious that the Government does not care what it spends, or how it spends it. For instance, \$500,000 is being spent on a political-propaganda unit, under the guise of public relations. Dozens and dozens of people are involved and hundreds of thousands of dollars are being used. I suggest that people who are interested in this might read an article—in fact, I believe it was a thesis—by Derek White, of the A.B.C., who no doubt, is a member of the Liberal Party. He makes very serious accusations about what he sees as a propaganda move by the Government.

I refer also to the \$500,000 spent in setting up four additional and unnecessary ministries, the hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted on ridiculous junketing to London and, we are told, to Disneyland, by the Premier and some of his cohorts, the tens of thousands of dollars wasted by employing an unnecessary team of lawyers in London (we have not had any explanation about how many of these men are there or how much they are paid), the tens of thousands of dollars wasted as the Premier junkets around the State and the Commonwealth and, in fact, throughout the world, with his personal camera crew making films. When we add to all this the millions of dollars wasted by the Government through its apathy and procrastination on vital environmental issues, we realise how negative the Government's policies have been and, moreover, how wasteful.

From the administrative point of view, concern should be even greater because thousands of work-hours have been lost as public servants have been forced to become involved in a bitter campaign against the Federal Government, which is simply confrontation. Dozens and dozens of members of the Crown Law Office, the Co-ordinator-General's Office, the Local Government Department and the Main Roads Department have been put into a team simply to fight the Federal Government. They have been thrown into the fray because of the personal vindictiveness of the Premier.

Everyone knows that the Premier is in fact the evil architect behind the schemes. It amazes me that he knows no rules and no bounds. One expects that he will use his department; one realises that he does not care whom he might hurt or whom he

might use; but surely there comes a point where he must stop in feeding the hate he has against Canberra. Surely when it comes to the use of the high and honourable position of Governor, this Assembly should look very closely at what has happened. I contend that this House should record its disgust at the way our Governor, Sir Colin Hannah, was used by the Government in his Opening Speech. We all know that the Governor's Opening Address is delivered on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Lowes: Did you hear that the Queen almost choked in Canberra?

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am not criticising the Queen in any way. I am talking about the use of the office of Governor.

What does one expect in the Governor's Opening Speech? One expects a dissertation on what the Government has done or intends to do for this State. But in the last two years the Governor's speech has reeked of party politics. In fact, it has become just another part of the forum that is being used to attack the Australian Government.

I think that is a very regrettable state of affairs. It is damaging to the whole concept—the whole public image—of that very important office. I suggest that, if the Governor is prepared to make such a speech, he must accept the consequences. I have always held Sir Colin Hannah in the highest personal esteem for the manner in which he carries out his onerous public duties. I am sure few of us would like to be in such a position. I have always respected him for the obvious personal concern he has for people in distress and those who live in disadvantaged conditions. We have seen examples of this in times of flood and distress throughout the State. I have always thought that he deserved commendation for the relaxed yet proper manner in which he performs his somewhat ivory-tower task as Governor of this State.

But I pity him also. I pity him because he has not been strong enough to stand up to his obligations of office and has allowed himself to be used as simply a tool of party politics in this State.

Mr. HODGES: I rise to a point of order. That is a reflection upon the Governor and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The remark of the honourable member for Rockhampton about the Governor was objectionable and I ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept the point of order of the Minister. I intend to pursue my debate, which will prove my point. However, I accept the point of order.

During his Speech to the Legislature the Governor made the statement—

"It (that is, the State) will continue to oppose, however, the Federal Government's unnecessary intrusion into everyday State consumer protection affairs."

I ask the Assembly: what authority has the Governor to make such a statement? I believe that it is blatantly political. I believe that it is completely unsupported. I believe it is indicative of the ignorance of the person who gave the notes to the Governor; of the apathy and ignorance of the writer of that speech on consumer affairs in this State.

The statement is a blanket one. It gives no evidence. It is simply a blanket one saying that the Federal Government's involvement in consumer affairs has been an intrusion—and in fact is an unnecessary one. I intend to prove that that is a ridiculous, politically biased, subjective view that is unbecoming the Governor of our State.

It is obvious that little is known of the Australian Government's role in consumer affairs because, if the person had taken time to consider what the Australian Government was doing, such a statement would never have been made. From the comment I have quoted it is apparent that the Governor supports this State's wishy-washy approach to some aspects of consumerism.

Let us look at the main aspect of the Australian Government's involvement. It has been centred around its Trade Practices Act, which I believe is one of the most far-reaching pieces of consumer legislation that have ever been enacted in this nation. It affects the manufacturer, the distributor and the retailer in every decision that has to be made about product development, pricing, promotion and distribution. It ensures that consumers are not only better protected but also better informed. I have heard members on the other side of the House stressing the need for consumer education—the need for informing people. This is surely what the Trade Practices Commission will do under the Trade Practices Act.

The Trade Practices Commission will deal with consumer complaints and it will carry out research into consumer affairs. It will involve itself in a very detailed consumer education programme. It will carry out inquiries into the need for a change in the law. Above all it will amass a tremendous amount of information on marketing practices, which can be passed back to the manufacturer, the distributor, the consumer and the retailer.

The Act provides for mandatory consumer protection standards in two spheres—labelling and marketing. The purpose is to give the consumers information about quality, quantity and the nature and value of goods. This information will deal with performance, composition, content, design, construction and the finish or packaging of goods. It is on this type of information that the con-

sumer can make a proper comparison between competing products. Honourable members surely will agree that the housewife is at a loss in trying to make such a comparison or judgment.

Also under this Act individuals will have the right to take legal action against firms which are in breach of the law.

They will have the right not only to take action, but to do so with legal aid, which is something that is surely warranted. There has been a much needed change in the attitude to consumerism. We have needed teeth in legislation and surely this is something that the consumer Act will give.

Mr. Moore: Anyone would think you invented it.

Mr. WRIGHT: No. I appreciate it; that's all.

The Act will allow for the most intensive and critical examination yet experienced in the market-place. It will do away with the old principle of caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—and give emphasis to the principle caveat venditor—let the seller beware. This is worth while. It is a good principle to have, and it is not before time.

For too long consumers have suffered because of poor quality goods and services; for too long they have suffered because of misrepresented products and unethical sales techniques. I admit that efforts have been made in Queensland to do something about it. We have the Small Claims Tribunal, but I say that too often the legislation has been cosmetic—simply of a surface nature. We can mention the legislation introduced recently to outlaw mock auctions, yet we find only two weeks ago that mock auctions were being held in this very city and the law is doing nothing about it.

We find that house-coating and house-cladding firms are bound by a seven-day cooling-off period, yet simply because a firm says it is selling not cladding or coating but, allegedly, paint, it is not bound by the Act. Profiteering in Queensland is outlawed but there is no definition of profiteering.

We have a special law on warranties which we all hailed when it was introduced into this Chamber, and yet New South Wales firms can have contracts signed by Queensland people and the warranties in the contracts cannot be enforced. Again we have no legal aid or legal advice to those in the consumer field. As I said, the Small Claims Tribunal has been effective, but it is limited because of its definition and the quantum of the amount involved. There has been no control of standards.

Some time ago in this Chamber I spoke of the need for a standards or testing bureau. The Minister for Justice, who was in charge of consumer affairs, said it was not necessary. I note now that the Governor says that, while the Australian Government has intruded into this field, the State consumer

affairs office will now co-operate with the Federal Government in the areas of product research and quality standards. Has the Minister suddenly changed his mind? Is there a need for quality control or is it that he suddenly realises that the Australian Government is onto a good thing and the State Government does not want to see the Australian Government get all the credit? Standards are important. We have accepted this. They are an important area of consumerism and the Australian Government legislation insists on safety standards as well as quality and quantity standards.

This has occurred in other countries. In 1972, the United States Government brought down the Consumer Products Safety Act. This provided for uniformity and effective safety regulations at a national level. Surely this is what we should consider here. There is room for both the State and Federal Governments to be involved in consumerism because there are needs that should be looked at on a national level. This is the value of the Trade Practices Act. It will provide uniformity and it will develop national standards.

Queensland introduced laws on warranties and guarantees but, as I said, New South Wales firms have dodged them. The Trade Practices Act ensures that certain conditions and warranties are implied in consumer transactions. It prevents businesses from avoiding these conditions and warranties by the fine-print exclusion clauses. As members of Parliament we have all come across victims of the fine print.

The Act sets out mandatory conditions and warranties that go to the quality and finish of a product, taking into account the price paid for it. They also relate to the fitness of the product for the purpose for which it is acquired.

At this very moment a very big case is developing in Queensland over an implement sold for gouging out foundations of low houses but which in fact is not suitable for the task. At the moment, purchasers of the implement can do nothing about it, but it is to be hoped that under the Trade Practices Act this problem will be overcome.

The Act also has a direct impact on advertising and selling methods. Try as we might, we cannot deal with this matter on a State basis; it has to be dealt with at a national level. Price-fixing agreements will be illegal. Restrictions will be placed on companies because it will be unlawful for them to have market-sharing arrangements which hold back some firms from developing. So often we hear it said that one firm cannot get a certain product whilst another always seems to have it. We know that such arrangements are made under which one firm controls the whole trade.

The Act will outlaw collective boycotts and other arrangements designed to maintain the status quo in an industry. It contains provisions against price discrimination. It will

still allow different prices for different customers. A trader will still be able to obtain special prices to compete with a competitor, but it will have provisions to ensure that other businessmen are not unfairly treated. In fact, the opinion has been expressed that the Trade Practices Act could be said to protect businessmen from each other.

It is far-reaching legislation, and it has been described as the best anti-trust legislation in the world. There are two classes of provisions in the Bill. The first deals with restrictive trade practices, which are practices that are anti-competitive in character, and the second deals with consumer protection against a wide range of false, misleading and unfair practices. Surely the Governor would have to concede that legislation has been required to prohibit anti-competitive behaviour in business. This being so, how could he say in his Opening Speech to this Assembly that it has been an unnecessary intrusion? Will he admit that that was simply something that was written for him?

Six main categories are covered in the proposed legislation, namely contracts and arrangements, or undertakings in restraint of trade or commerce; monopolisation; exclusive dealings; resale price maintenance; price discrimination; and mergers. It will be the first real move to give teeth to consumerism in this country. I say this because it is not going to be wishy-washy legislation like some of the enactments of this State. The pecuniary penalty prescribed may, in the case of a corporation, be as high as \$250,000. That is a prohibitive provision which surely gives an incentive to firms to operate within the law. It will also be possible for an aggrieved person to go to a court and obtain an injunction to restrain a practice of some type. It is very difficult to obtain such an injunction in Queensland at present. A party who has suffered from a trade practice will also be able to obtain damages.

The Act displays common sense. It has been realised that there are needs for exemptions and clearances, as they are called, and interim clearances and authorisations. These have been allowed for in the Act. If a firm sees fit, it can apply for a clearance or an authorisation to carry on a certain type of practice. This provision surely is worth while. The provisions otherwise are stringent, and they will be enforced. The consumer-protection provisions are an advance and an improvement upon existing State laws. They are concerned with practices that are false, misleading and deceptive. They are very closely linked with advertising, and they are in line with the provisions of the Australian Code of Advertising Standards. There is also a difference, because the code is merely recommendatory, whereas the provisions of the Act are prohibitions in themselves.

One of the provisions of the Bill reads—

“A corporation shall not in trade or commerce engage in conduct that is misleading or deceptive.”

There is a fair amount of meat behind such a statement, and there is a backing-up of it so that it can be enforced. It is an effective counter to what is simply described in the advertising world as “puffing”. We have all seen this in advertisements for toothpaste in which a person implies in a very subtle way that he is a dentist and says that a particular brand of toothpaste will do so much for the teeth. I was reading an article only recently in which some examples were given of the types of claims made in advertisements. In fact, I think some of them were given by our own State Consumer Affairs Bureau. For instance, one from Unilever says, “Drive is the nearest yet to total clean”. The committee that investigated this, which was a joint committee of members in the Federal Parliament, said that such a statement is “not capable of verification”, that it is inconsistent with the claim that Ajax gives the cleanest whitest wash. That was the type of claim it was faced with.

Another advertisement said, “All-temperature Punch is the pick of the bunch”. The comment of the committee was, “Does not say why the product is superior. Inconsistent with claim that Spree gives optimum washing results in all temperatures.”

Another one was, “Rinso gets things whiter.” The committee’s comment was, “Does not say what product or situation Rinso is being compared with.” We might ask, “Whiter than what?”

Another advertisement said, “Only Cold Power offers cleanness without damage—hot water damages clothes”. The comment was, “Manufacturer advertises other products for use in hot water or cold water”.

So it goes on. Honourable members know that these things happen, because they see them themselves. Recently I was sitting with the honourable member for Cunningham in the Bellvue building watching television. In one advertisement, a woman was talking about the shampoo that she was using to get rid of dandruff. No mention was made that the person to whom she was speaking was a doctor, but one would take that for granted from the way the office was set out. The consumer would draw the inference that the woman was telling the doctor, and the doctor was agreeing, that that was in fact the shampoo used, that it was backed by doctors, and so on.

Puffing occurs in all types of advertising. One sees toilet paper advertised as having the greatest strength—no matter how wet it gets, it is the strongest. One sees puffing in advertisements for petrols, cigarettes and deodorants.

The committee goes on to point out that Australia-wide legislation is needed on this matter. I should have thought that the

Governor would have done better to aim his criticism at some of the inadequacies of State legislation. For example, he could have called for a move to outlaw profiteering. Let us have an upgrading of the quality of repairs and the service given to consumers. Let us prohibit the fly-by-nighters.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: Obviously the honourable member for Windsor does not agree with me. He does not mind consumers in his area being caught by the people who fly by night—an old widow or a pensioner, for example, being caught for a couple of hundred dollars. He is quite happy to let that happen. I believe that the operations of such people should be prohibited.

If the Governor is determined to maintain his view on “unnecessary intrusion”, let him call for legal aid for consumers, and also for an expansion of the concept of the Small Claims Tribunal. If the Governor is prepared to make claims, he should also be prepared to back them up.

Mr. HODGES: I rise to a point of order. I again draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the despicable and cowardly attack on the integrity of the Governor of this State, a man who cannot come into this Chamber to defend himself. As I said before, it is an unmitigated attempt by the honourable member to decry the position of Governor of this State. We know the feelings of the A.L.P. towards the Governor and Government House in Queensland, and again we see the honourable member, in his usual style, making a cowardly attack. I would like to see it withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton.

Mr. WRIGHT: I make the point that honourable members are in fact speaking to the Governor’s Opening Speech. Surely our task is to debate what the Governor has said. I have taken one point—that he has accused the Federal Government of unnecessary intrusion into consumer affairs. If the Minister wants to take me on about it, let him do so in the Chamber or outside. Instead of merely taking ridiculous points of order, let him back up why he believes the Governor should make such a statement.

I believe that there is room for Governments, at both State and Federal level, to be involved in consumerism, and the Government of Queensland would do well to co-operate with the Australian Government in that sphere. It is obvious that there is a need to strengthen consumer laws in Queensland. There is a need to co-operate with the Australian Government to prevent misleading advertising and limit the cost and waste of unnecessary packaging. There is a need for “class” type actions to be brought in State courts, so that a consumer can be

entitled to sue on behalf of all consumers against a particular defendant for breach of the law.

In my opinion, courts also should be given special power in the contractual field, in order to relieve persons from the performance of their contracts if the courts believe the contract to be unfair or unconscionable. There are many instances in which the need for this has arisen. At the moment, a company named Benlux is under investigation. It knows that it is not bound by the seven days cooling-off period. Its representatives go round and get elderly women—often they are old pensioners or persons living in dilapidated houses—to sign contracts for \$1,100 or \$1,200, and they know they have got them the moment the contracts are signed. When such an organisation is taken on by a consumer group it comes back, as this fellow Festa has done, and says, “I will let you out of the contract for one third of the price.” That is the sort of thing that is going on. Surely powers should be vested in the courts so that judges could say, “We believe those provisions are unconscionable. We believe that in fact they are unfair, and therefore we are going to relieve you of the obligations that would normally apply under this contract.”

We need to review the door-to-door legislation. Let us cover commodities like paint. Why should paint be exempt when house-cladding is covered by the Act?

Consumerism is an issue that affects every person in the community. The Government has an obligation to keep abreast of the consumer needs of its citizens. If we cannot resolve a matter in the State sphere, let us accept that there is a need for Federal responsibility, and let us accept the need for co-operation.

The Governor also made reference to recreation and youth in his Opening Speech. I completely agree with his comments there. Those are two vital issues—issues that will become serious problem areas if we do not deal with them very quickly. We realise that the community has increasing time for recreation. Studies I have read indicate that people form their attitudes to recreation very early in life, some in fact before they reach the age of 12 years. So we do not have much time to develop facilities and attitudes for the new generation.

There is a need to supply the community's requirements in the field of sport and recreation. As a Parliament we have a responsibility to meet this growing need. I am anxiously awaiting the report by Judge Demack on his inquiry into youth problems. I do not know what sort of support he has been given or how many submissions have come forward. I would hope that out of the inquiry will come very positive and constructive ideas that we will be able to act on. But there is no need for the Government to wait for that report; many things have already been

accepted. I do not take credit in any way for what I am about to say. I know that Government members have raised it before, and I raise it again to emphasise it.

There is a need first of all to accept the valued principle of using what we already have. This could certainly be done by using the educational facilities in this State. I have read many articles and comments on this. We need to provide a greater opportunity to use the pre-school and after-school recreational facilities that we have. One might ask: What pre-school and after-school recreational facilities have we got? We come back to the Y.M.C.A., the police youth clubs, and so on. I am not talking about those; I am talking about use of the State's educational facilities—the schools. It is time we had a darned good look at this.

Millions of dollars are being spent every year throughout the nation to provide facilities for sport and recreation in schools, but I do not believe we are obtaining the maximum benefit from those facilities. They are not used for long periods, either in the morning and afternoon or at the week-end. For long periods during the school holidays they are not used. That is not a general, all-embracing statement. I know that in some areas the facilities are used. In some the children are allowed to use the swimming pools and/or tennis courts, but there is no over-all co-ordinated programme. We must adopt a policy aimed at maximum usage. The community should be given the right to use the sporting and recreational complexes that the people of the State have paid for.

Unnecessary costly duplication occurs when community groups have to provide their own independent facilities. We know the difficulties in our own electorates when groups try to raise money to set up gymnastic facilities, soccer fields, swimming pools and so on. They cost many hundreds of thousands of dollars. The proof of this is that now both Federal and State Governments have said, “We need to give special types of sporting subsidies to help people establish these facilities.” Let us accept that. Even when groups do develop these facilities, they are often inadequate for their needs. They would rather have done a lot better. I know one group that wanted to build an indoor bowling complex worth about \$125,000, but as it did not have the finance it had to settle on something worth around \$60,000.

In recent times there has been an added burden on local authorities. They are offering groups no-interest loans to be repaid after, say, two years. They are trying to cater for the various groups in the parkland and other land they own.

What is being done now is not good enough. We have to maximise our usage of existing facilities. It is good economics and good stewardship of our money to have the maximum use made of these facilities. This is necessary to meet the escalation in recreational requirements. In talking to various

people about these proposals the conversations revolve around one central theme, namely, supervision. The schools are available and many of these complexes have been completed. They are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, and it would be very difficult to match them or to duplicate them. How can these activities be supervised? How can the facilities be protected from wilful careless use? There is an answer to that question, an answer provided by the National Fitness organisation, of which the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport is very proud.

The National Fitness organisation is a decentralised body with approximately 17 area committees throughout the State. Those committees comprise community personnel, people who have expertise and real interest in sport and recreation. I envisage changes in the National Fitness organisation that will make it "the" organisation in sport and recreation in Queensland.

I cannot see why both part-time and full-time recreational officers associated with or attached to National Fitness local area committees cannot be employed to supervise these activities. Physical-education teachers, whether they be single girls or married women formerly employed in the education service, as well as others who have gained expertise from working with police youth clubs, the Y.W.C.A., and so on, could be employed, as I say, on either a part-time or a full-time basis, to provide the supervision that is required. The cost would not be great. After all, Western Australia, which in terms of population and finance is far smaller than Queensland, is able to implement such a scheme. I believe that any cost involved would be money well spent.

The National Fitness organisation is the ideal one to co-ordinate and administer such a programme. I can imagine that the moment we implement such a scheme, massive support will be forthcoming from the various service groups in the community and also from other community organisations. I can imagine parents saying, "You little beaut! This is what we want. We want our children taught these skills." Parents will be able to have a little more time to themselves and children will be assured of guaranteed supervision over the week-end instead of having to be idle on the streets. They will become involved in practical activities.

Such a scheme would be of great benefit also to the p. and c. associations, which, at the present time, face mammoth tasks in raising finance. If this scheme were implemented in conjunction with the National Fitness organisation, it could involve not only the Government and the community but the p. and c. associations as well. They would be relieved of much of their burden.

I accept the necessity for supervision. When I was a teacher I disliked the use of my schools while I was not present. The

people who used those schools after hours did not seem to take the necessary steps to ensure that the facilities provided for the school-children were not damaged. This aspect is of great concern to school principals generally. If 200 young fellows are engaged in after-school activities a principal would be concerned at the prospect of wilful damage to bicycle racks, misbehaviour in toilets, and so on. Obviously supervision is a must.

The community could become involved on a roster system. I believe that many parents as well as members of certain organisations would volunteer for inclusion in such rosters.

Mr. Moore: Very few.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am sure they would. I think the honourable member for Windsor is underestimating parents.

Mr. Moore: You have to flog them to get them along.

Mr. WRIGHT: What a terrible thing to say about the people in the honourable member's electorate! The people in p. and c. associations in my electorate are very keen to work in the interests of their children. It is a shame that the honourable member is prepared to make such remarks about parents in his area.

The community generally have expressed concern at the fact that sporting and recreational groups have been called upon to bear too great a burden in providing facilities for children. Their load could be made lighter if these groups could be encouraged to invest their money in schools. This would be good stewardship and would give wide support to the general principles involved. Supervision need not be a barrier if the National Fitness organisation is used.

I know that this matter has been raised on earlier occasions. I am aware also of the fact that a special committee was set up by the Government under the auspices of the Co-ordinator-General's Department to inquire into this very subject. I ask that this whole matter be reconsidered and that the Minister for Education work together with the Minister for Sport in having the services of the National Fitness organisation made available in the way I have suggested.

While I am dealing with education I wish to join with those members who have expressed concern at the textbook racket. And it is a racket. Dozens of people in my electorate as well as thousands in others have complained about this issue, which has been raised time and time again by members of the Opposition. Unfortunately, however, the Government has remained apathetic. It does not seem to be concerned for students and parents who are exploited. The cost of textbooks is excessive, and quite often it happens that the moment a book is selected by a school as a set work for study, its price is increased sharply. In

Rockhampton I noted that one book was marked 95c in the back, but the average price around the town was over \$2.30, while in some instances it went as high as \$2.80. As with windscreens and safety belts, it seems that the moment a certain book is required the price goes up.

Moreover, set books are often unobtainable for months, yet the students are examined in some way on them. During the year, at the whim of some teachers, set books are changed. I have heard of teachers changing them after three or four months. On other occasions teachers transferred decide that they do not like the set books at the new school and ask for different ones.

I have examples in my office in Rockhampton of books that are virtually unused; perhaps only a few chapters have been selected for study. Other books, which are diagrammatical, or used for projects, are never written in. Such books are simply useless. Because the syllabus changes, they cannot be resold. Books cannot be passed on to brothers and sisters when schools change their requirements.

I am not sure who is making the cop. Some say that the publishers are, but I know that some retailers make exorbitant profits. However, I have sympathy for some retailers because I know that they are landed with huge stocks of unsaleable books. However, there are big mark-ups and we should investigate them. New editions are brought out continuously simply because of minor alterations such as chapter renumbering. Teachers appear to insist on children having up-to-date books. This might be made necessary by the school programme, but even so it is a huge waste and the cost is borne by the parents. Allowances given by the Government are totally inadequate. If the new Minister for Education wishes to make a name for himself, the first thing he should do is to double the book allowance, especially for grades 8, 9 and 11. I believe that the problem could be overcome by introducing loose-leaf textbooks; these have been used in the past for some English subjects.

Mr. Moore: They would fall to bits.

Mr. WRIGHT: They might, but they would last long enough. At the same time they would facilitate the incorporation of amendments, even new chapters. Students could also include their own inserts and additional photostated and duplicated material. That would be a very useful way of approaching the problem and I am sure it would be cheaper in the long run.

An Honourable Member: It is used by some teachers.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is in some areas, but we should look further into it.

The present method of selecting textbooks is getting out of hand. I maintain the principle enunciated by Radford, namely, that

we should have the choice of books, but common sense and economic considerations should prevail. There is growing support among parents and teachers for the idea that the number of books required for a subject should be cut back. After all, parents have to foot the bill. There is merit in the idea that students should purchase only a limited number of set books and that the rest be provided in bulk, in school libraries.

This is not the only aspect of the Radford scheme that has been spotlighted. The excessive work-load on teachers in the correction areas and the over-emphasis on internal assessment, which some teachers and students seem to believe has no objective, have been referred to. But many fine things have been accomplished. We have broken down unnecessary rigidity; we have given acknowledgment to the individual and allowed teachers to play a greater role. However, I believe the time has come to review the Radford scheme. There has been enough criticism of it to allow us to say, "Let us look at it again." I am sure that all in this Assembly have had people put points to us. Maybe this is an ideal subject for examination by a select committee of the Parliament. Let us establish a select committee to investigate the Radford scheme. It would give members of Parliament an opportunity to hear from all groups involved in the scheme—that is, the experts, the educationists, the students, the parents and the publishers and retailers of textbooks. It would also permit a detailed inquiry into the textbook racket. We have nothing to lose. This is a very important matter affecting every person in the community. It affects parents, students and teachers. Such an inquiry is a matter of great urgency.

Mr. DOUMANY (Kurilpa) (2.55 p.m.): First, Mr. Speaker, I advise members of the Opposition that, should there be anything in my speech that is untoward, they are welcome to say their piece. That might clear the air.

I express my thanks to honourable members of this Assembly for their courtesy in affording me an opportunity to make my maiden speech in this Address-in-Reply debate, which is one of a general type that permits wide coverage of subjects and an exposition of personal philosophy, which is probably how a new member would want to break the ice, as it were.

First, I take the opportunity to express my loyalty to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, and to express my thanks to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Colin Hannah, for his Opening Speech, which, in spite of the comments of the previous speaker, outlined the Government's balanced and constructive programme and its solid record of achievement in developing the resources of this State.

I believe, too, that the Government has greatly improved the living standards of individuals and their families, and in this

way has done more than promote development of the mining and agricultural industries, which is often attributed to the coalition as its sole achievement and interest. Over the last 17 or 18 years this Government has done a great deal for the living standards of Queenslanders, as I believe the Governor's Opening Speech made very clear. His Excellency's Speech gave us all a very clear idea of the challenge that faces those of us in this House at a time of such national stress.

Next, I thank the people of Kurilpa—the people who expressed their confidence in me on 7 December. From now on, whatever their political colour, they can rest assured of my wholehearted and vigorous representation.

I congratulate, in their absence, the Premier and the Deputy Premier on their leadership in that campaign. It was an outstanding victory—a victory earned through hard work, performance and achievement by the individuals and the Government team. The victory itself was made possible by the common sense of Queenslanders, which is a very rare quality these days.

I interpret that victory as a massive rebuttal of the disastrous dogma of the Federal A.L.P. Government. In spite of the hastily developed middle-of-the-road camouflage of the Tucker campaign the Queensland elector was not deceived. The hairy foot emerged from beneath the silvery robe, and a lot of people saw it. In fact, I should have described those robes as virginal robes, because the policy as presented by the then Leader of the Opposition was as maidenly as anyone could wish for. Of course, when one briefly harks back to that campaign, one cannot help thanking the Prime Minister for his involvement.

Last, but certainly not least, my thanks go to you, Mr. Speaker, for your excellent conduct of the House—though the period that I have had in it has been but short. I pledge to you my full support, and I know that, unlike the experience of an ex-Speaker in another place, you will have the support of this Government when you need it.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. DOUMANY: I believe we all agree that without that support—without the surety of that support—the institution of Parliament is very much at risk.

I should like to cover a number of points dealing with my personal history, background and philosophy so that people may know what I believe in, where I have been, and what sort of interests I will have as a member of this Parliament. First of all, I do have a great deal of kinship with my colleagues in the National Party and I presume we probably would find some in the Opposition benches with similar origins. I was raised

on a farm in the Hawkesbury Valley in New South Wales, between the "Macquarie" towns of Windsor and Richmond.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. DOUMANY: That's right. I was raised on the sandstone ridges.

I undertook an agricultural science course at the Sydney University and majored in agricultural economics. For several years I worked in Government departments, firstly in New Guinea, trudging around the hills, and then in the Department of Agriculture and Stock of that era, now the Department of Primary Industries in Queensland. After that spell in Government work, I entered industry and, in particular, the fertiliser industry, which I regard as part of agriculture. In that industry, right up till my election as the member for Kurilpa, I gained what I believe is a practical background.

I like to think that we can get in this place people who have their feet on the ground. They do not need to have them buried in the dirt, but at least they must be planted firmly on the ground. We want people who do not forget the meaning of words like "work", "productivity", "results" and "performance". The world just does not revolve around rights, welfare, entitlements and privileges. I believe that in private industry, particularly one as basic as the fertiliser industry, there is a great opportunity to learn about work.

Mr. Murray: What Mr. Burns would call the manual labour of a Spanish grandee?

Mr. DOUMANY: That is an interesting reflection on manual labour, but the grandee does not seem to be around.

As well as gaining that industry experience, I must stress that, as a married man with children, I have lived in big cities, so I understand what faces a young family in this current environment and particularly this current economic climate. That experience was gained not only in Brisbane but also in Sydney and Newcastle. I have seen quite a wide spectrum of urban life.

What was the basis of my entry into politics? Many people wonder why a person who has been in industry for 15 or 20 years should want to enter this arena.

Mr. Wright: Did you win a raffle?

Mr. DOUMANY: Indeed, and it was a very good and well-conducted raffle.

The reasons are simple. Firstly, there is concern for the people. I think the people of Australia, the people of Queensland and particularly the people of Kurilpa are worth being concerned about. Secondly, there is concern for Australia. This is a country that is worth being concerned about. Thirdly, there are the freedoms we enjoy. They are well worth being very concerned about. Fourthly, there is the effective continuance of our parliamentary institutions. I also

feel concerned about them and I am certain that, although my endorsement by my party occurred some 15 months ago, my fears then for the parliamentary institutions were well founded when I look at what has happened in the Federal capital over the past few weeks.

My personal philosophy is that of a liberal and I will not specify whether that commences with a small "I" or a capital "L". The first entity in society as I see it is the individual, and respect for the individual and his or her freedom comes first in my mind. I subordinate the State to the individual.

Government and bureaucracy must be set at minimal levels consistent with maximising the well-being of individuals and their families. Unfortunately, we see an increasing trend in the other direction. I see the free-enterprise system, with its characteristic of strong individual performance encouraged by adequate incentives, as the basis of a strong Australia and a strong Queensland. We want the market forces to operate, as far as possible, to direct resources, activity and choice into the best and optimal avenues. I do not deny that trade practices must to some degree be tempered by Government intrusion—none of us would deny that—but I am afraid that I must take issue with the honourable member for Rockhampton on the point that it is a good thing to interfere in every decision of a firm. When that happens, I believe that we might as well put all the business managers into the Public Service.

Mr. Wright: They wouldn't last.

Mr. DOUMANY: I do not think they would last for very long.

The next point in my philosophy is that I believe we have an overriding responsibility to the needy. But I qualify that and say "the genuinely needy." Certainly I do not refer to the loafers and bludgers who have been supported at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars over the last few years.

An Opposition Member: What a shocking thing to say about your constituents!

Mr. DOUMANY: I have every respect for my constituents.

I believe, too, that self-help, through community effort, must be part and parcel of any programme to help needy people, because their respect and dignity must be preserved, just as their obvious needs in material goods and services must be met. If we take self-respect and dignity from the needy, we do as much harm as we do by giving them nothing at all.

Law and order comes next on my list. There is certainly a need for greater enforcement of the law, and there is certainly a need for greater means of enforcement. In that respect, I certainly trust that the Government can do even more to enforce the

laws of this State, because this is the very basis of harmony in our society and the future well-being of our families.

Mr. Armstrong: You mean industrial laws, too?

Mr. DOUMANY: The common law is sufficient, I think.

I believe, too, that we need to create and preserve an attractive, pleasant environment for the people to live in, as long as we remember that its cost cannot exceed our means to provide it. The moment we embark upon conservation and preservation measures that do not take account of cost and the ability of the economy to sustain them, we lead the country into disaster.

I believe, too, that some of the \$20,000,000 spent on culture by the Federal Government, which included several paintings, might well have helped many of the needy constituents in West End, for instance, where there are pensioners waiting for aged persons' units who may never live to see them, and where there are young couples who, in this era of 12 per cent housing money, are trying to save for houses that have an average value of about \$25,000 to \$30,000. Although we want our young people to grow up with cultural traditions, there must be cheaper, more balanced ways of achieving that than by spending \$1,500,000 on one piece of art.

Finally, in my personal philosophy, I should like to stress that I think we should all have a national commitment. We should all look to what we can do for the nation and not always be preoccupied with what the nation owes us. Unfortunately, that sentiment crosses all party barriers; it is a general problem.

Next I wish to speak about federalism. I am committed to federalism because I believe that the federal system that was set up over the latter decades of the 19th century was not the product of hasty, stupid effort or wishy-washy thinking but was carefully thought out. It contains within it the checks and balances that are a safeguard against tyranny.

Every time one speaks about tyrants in Australia one gets a reaction, particularly from honourable members opposite, that they are a little bit like leprechauns under mushrooms—they are just not around in Australia. It so happens that about three weeks ago one very tall leprechaun emerged from under a toadstool in Canberra and set upon the institution of Parliament just as effectively as Henry VIII might have done several hundred years ago. So leprechauns do come out from under mushrooms, and if there is one thing that safeguards us—and it safeguards all of us, as a matter of interest, not just those of us on the Government benches—it is the federal system. Honourable members opposite must also admit that it gives them a feeling of comfort to know that

the checks and balances of the federal system are there to preserve the rights of this State and also their rights as members of this Assembly.

Mr. Lamont: Henry VIII would have known what to do with a Prime Minister like Gough Whitlam.

Mr. DOUMANY: That is true.

I wish to speak now about the institution of Parliament, to which I have already alluded several times, and how I, as a newcomer, view it. As a newcomer, I should like first to make one point. Although new members may not be versed in the procedures of the House—they may be babes in the woods where procedures and devious little tricks are concerned—they all come from walks of life in which they have made reputations, gained experience and acquired skills. I should say that their standing in the fields from which they have come is just as weighty and just as high as the standing of honourable members who have been in this Chamber for quite a long time. So I think it is wrong to say that, simply because they are new members in this House, their views should be taken lightly or their rights are non-existent. They are equal with every other member, regardless of seniority in years.

I should like to dwell on the role of Parliament, because I believe that the Westminster system of parliamentary government that we embrace is a unique institution and within it is the essence of the will of the people. Every honourable member in this House, whether he be a Government member, an Opposition member or an Independent, has run the gauntlet of election by universal franchise. That is what distinguishes all honourable members in this House from the people outside this House. We should never forget it. We have run the gauntlet, Mr. Speaker, and we have been selected by the people. It is for that reason that we, as their representatives, are responsible for maintaining the freedoms and the rights of the people. We are the bastion against tyranny, and we should never forget that. We are also the bastion against bureaucracy.

I should like to dwell on that point because one of the greatest corrosive factors in a modern western economy, whatever its political colour or shade of colour, is the growth of bureaucracy. I, for one, will not be subjected to bureaucracy. I trust that most of the new members have the same determination not to be subjected to bureaucracy.

I should like to comment on the workings of the parliamentary institution. It is a great pity that we are regularly confronted with articles such as the one I am holding which appeared in the "Sunday Sun" on 9 March. It is headed "Democracy a Meaty Matter". I will not read it in full, but generally speaking there is a tone running through the article that denigrates parliamentarians and

the institution of Parliament. If the honourable member who is just leaving the Chamber thought very highly of his position and of this institution, I think he would have been prepared to listen to me. The articles that are coming out about us are the worst possible signs of disaffection for the parliamentary system. We want to see an end to them. The only way we will get to the end of them is by putting our feet on the ground, being practical and making Parliament work on real issues.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. DOUMANY: It may not mean a thing, but it has to be said. If, as a new member, I did not say it, I believe I would be letting my electorate down, and letting Queensland and Australia down.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

A Government Member: It can work, too.

Mr. DOUMANY: It can work.

Parliament is for the people. That is why we are all here, and that is why I am here. The ultimate task of every parliamentarian is concerned with the well-being of the people, with meeting their needs and expediting their aspirations, and making it possible for them to do the sort of thing they want to do within the limits of law and economic means.

Let us look briefly at some of the critical elements of people's needs. Probably Kurilpa is a good example to look at. Because of the fast pace of change many people are being left in the wake. They are the aged, the infirm, and the single-parent families. Something is going to have to be done to help them. While Canberra, which holds the purse-strings, insists on spreading the butter over an enormous slice of bread, there cannot be enough left to do a proper job for these people. In my electorate there is a wealth of evidence of these needs. There is also ample evidence of the struggle by small businessmen and small factories to survive. It is very important that they do survive, because about 70 or 80 per cent of private enterprise is made up of small businesses, including small farms. Over the past 2½ years the Federal Labor Government's policies have put them at risk.

A large number of people are hopping onto the education band wagon. The more I see of my electorate and the more I hear from other honourable members, the more convinced I am that the basic need in our community in material terms is housing. There can be no doubt that inadequate housing and the inadequate means to provide housing have resulted in much of the hardship and distortion in our society. The break-up of marriages is a direct result of the concern, worry and all the other unhappiness that go with not having a proper roof over one's head. We can provide the fanciest classrooms in the world and implement the fanciest education

system in the world; but if we are not providing adequate housing for the children they are of no avail whatever. We must review our priorities. Housing is fundamental.

It so happens that education has been represented by the most vociferous and most articulate of interest groups. It is time that some of us defended those who do not speak forcefully enough for themselves. I should like to see the Queensland Government inject vast sums of money into the provision of housing. But this is not one-sided; there must be the same sentiment and intention in Canberra. Enormous resources are needed to provide sufficient finance for housing.

I turn now to the best means of meeting the material needs of the people. I am firmly of the belief that the economy of a nation can be likened to a cake. Just as a cake contains certain quantities of ingredients, is baked in an oven, and cut into slices when taken out, so too does the economy contain certain ingredients and is divided into portions. If the cake contains fewer ingredients than are necessary, the slices have to be smaller, and some people may even miss out altogether.

Over the past 2½ years Australia's economic "cake" has got smaller at the rate of 4½ to 5 per cent each year, and the demands made upon that "cake" have become heavier by the creation of money by a Government that is prepared in the short space of eight months to incur a deficit of \$2,768 million. By the end of this year the figure will probably have climbed to \$4,000 million. This new money is pouring like a waterfall onto the economy. Somewhere it has to find a way up, and it will shoot up like a geyser. We have expressed concern at an inflation rate of 16 per cent. We have been lucky. It is possible that in a year's time there will be an inflation rate as high as 30 or 40 per cent. The title of this little booklet issued by the Institute of Public Affairs—"Inflation—everybody's responsibility"—is very apt. I refer to a fascinating table in it in these terms—

"If prices rose, on average by 10 per cent every year, this is what we could expect to pay in 40 years' time. (Prices are rising at present at a rate of over 16 per cent a year.)

—	Year 1974	Year 2014
A Melbourne "Herald" ..	6 cents	\$ 2.70
A Bottle of Beer ..	about 50 cents	22.50
A Pound of Butter ..	about 60 cents	27.00
A Haircut ..	about \$2.00	90.00 "

We will all give up cutting our hair. It might be amusing for us to consider these enormous comparisons and say, "This is short lived." And it might be amusing to think of us all with hair down around our knees as we avoid haircuts, but let us return to realities in our economy.

At this point in time we now have a legacy of 2½ years of business-bashing and farmer-bashing. Until about six months ago, when the Prime Minister and his deputy appeared to clasp the theory of profit very close to their breasts once again, profit was anathema to Federal Government Ministers and members. It was pernicious and could not possibly be good. It could not possibly lead to new investment or greater employment; it could not possibly be the hedge against the massive unemployment of well over 300,000 people that we face today. The mind boggles when we consider that number and the seasonally adjusted figure. Each time Clyde Cameron releases quarterly figures on unemployment, he uses either the real figure or the seasonally adjusted figure—whichever suits him best. On the last occasion the actual figure went down but the seasonally adjusted one rose, so he used the actual figure.

We are all becoming very confused about it, but we are very certain that a lot of people are out of work. We are also certain that not many businessmen, farmers or graziers have confidence at the moment to spend new money—if they have it to spend. Until we restore confidence, until we cut taxation back to realistic levels—and remember that the high level of taxation has been allowed by the Federal Government to grow and grow and spread through the body of the economy like a cancer—and stop feeding the coffers of the Government, and until we get some new incentives and new capital-investment allowances, with the restoration of the superphosphate bounty, there is little hope.

We have to consider not only restoration of the superphosphate bounty. Members sitting on the Opposition benches should note what their counterpart Government in New Zealand did in its wisdom. It not only restored the superphosphate bounty to its former level, but last August, when the price of phosphate rock rose from about \$US14 f.o.b to \$US60 as a result of action by the Moroccan and OPEC countries, the New Zealand Labor Government actually increased the bounty on superphosphate so that the New Zealand farmer still paid a reasonable price for it.

Mr. Murray: And national production was maintained.

Mr. DOUMANY: That is so.

When I look at the performance of the New Zealand Government, which was supposed to be on its knees about three or four years ago, I wonder how it has performed so much better than Australia with its diversified economy. I do not think anyone can dispute that fact. At the moment New Zealand is holding tight.

Whilst on the subject of Queensland industry, I make the point that agriculture and primary industries generally are the backbone of this State. The sugar industry has

demonstrated that. In the coming year it will be worth something like \$1,200 million, which is a massive contribution to the economy not only of Queensland but also of the nation. The beef industry, too, has great potential. What has been done for it in Canberra, despite the efforts of the honourable member for Dawson? He has bashed his head against a brick wall—a measly \$20,000,000 at 11½ per cent!

A Government Member: Shame!

Mr. DOUMANY: Shame indeed! The State Government, with its very, very limited funds, was able to offer \$10,000,000 at 2 per cent interest as well as a lot of other concessions, too. At least its sentiments are in the right place.

One thing to be remembered about the beef industry is that its markets will not be out of commission for long. The long-term prospects—

Mr. Wright: The thing you have to remember is that they asked Canberra for the money at 11½ per cent.

Mr. DOUMANY: In Canberra anything is possible.

The long-term prospects for beef, as has been agreed by the marketing experts, are still as strong as they ever were. Beef will come back. The last thing we want is the shooting of their breeding stock by graziers. We want to have that industry in a position to go when the opportunity comes again. We do not want graziers on their knees so that when the markets start to recover they do not have the means to take advantage of them. We want them to be in the same position as sugar farmers were this time when the market went up. They were able to capitalise on the opportunity. It is not just for the good of the sugar farmers or the graziers; it is for the good of the State and the nation. Let us make no mistake about that. It is from the dollars earned in that way that we tap the stream of prosperity for everybody, particularly those who are in need.

I wish to make one final comment. In looking ahead, I see a lot to be confident about. As a new member, I believe that this Parliament can show the way. I believe, too, that with your leadership, Mr. Speaker, it can show the way for the proper working of a Parliament in this nation. The State's resources are tremendous; the market opportunities for our major products are still strong; but we need to embrace a realistic philosophy that one cannot have more than one can afford and one cannot afford more than one produces. Until that fact is driven home to every one of us—man, woman and child—we are deluding ourselves, we are deluding our children and we will not do anything for the future of Queensland and Australia.

Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg) (3.34 p.m.): First I express the loyalty of the citizens of Bundaberg to Her Majesty the Queen and our Governor, Sir Colin Hannah, and Lady Hannah. I thank the electors of Bundaberg, who again returned me as their representative in the face of the propaganda of the Premier and his National Party stooges. I sincerely thank also the people who worked for me. I had to face propaganda from the Premier himself, who came to Bundaberg and who was reported in the "News Mail" as saying that the electors of Bundaberg had to get rid of Jensen and Blake if they wanted any money for irrigation.

Mr. Houston: Blackmail!

Mr. JENSEN: It is nothing but blackmail. I will illustrate to the House how the next night in Bundaberg the Treasurer indicated that he would have nothing to do with the Premier's statements.

The "News Mail" report reads—

"He had today been asked for assistance for the Monduran Dam.

"But after leaving Bundaberg he had invariably been given a kick in the shins by the people returning a Labor candidate.

"How can you continue to expect our support unless you are prepared to return some support by voting for National Party candidates for Bundaberg and Isis?" he asked."

That was complete blackmail by the Premier. That shows how vindictive he can be.

Another article reads—

"Dam funds a problem, says Premier."

At a meeting that night with the Irrigation Committee, he could not give funds to Bundaberg because it returned a Labor member. He could not give them to Isis. He went through Maryborough, Childers and Bundaberg saying the same thing to get rid of Jim Blake. He did more than anybody else to destroy Jim Blake.

The following night, Friday, the Deputy Premier and Treasurer came to Bundaberg and the newspaper reported—

"Premier's complaint refuted by Chalk.

"The Deputy Premier and State Liberal Party Parliamentary Leader, Sir Gordon Chalk, last night dissociated himself from remarks about Bundaberg voters made on Wednesday night by the Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen."

Mr. Houston: That would be another example of using public funds for the National Party?

Mr. JENSEN: It was using funds all right and it was blackmailing the people.

But they did not get rid of me even with this blackmail, although they did get rid of Jim Blake. Their real purpose was to defeat him first because he held a National Party seat.

The newspaper article also read—

"Mr. Bjelke-Petersen had complained that although Bundaberg frequently sought funds from the Queensland Government it had continued to return a Labor member.

"...
"Sir Gordon addressed a meeting in the C.W.A. hall attended by about 50 people"—(that's all he could get there)—"in support of the Liberal candidate for Bundaberg Mr. Keith Powell."

But he refuted the Premier's statements. He did go on to say that a member of the Liberal Party could put in his little spoke at the caucus meeting, as if he was offering a little bribe there. Sir Gordon, in his shirt sleeves, addressed the people in Bundaberg and refuted the Premier's blackmailing statements.

On 7 December, the morning of the election, the editorial read—

"New Slant

"Our unusual type of Premier, during his Bundaberg visit has this week on his vigorous election campaigning, brought a new dimension to campaign tactics. It is traditional during these campaigns for voters to apply some pressure to the contending parties if they are seeking support on a specific issue—asking for Government funds, for instance. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen turned this around during a Bundaberg address. He sought to use the funds disbursement power of a Government to question whether an electorate that returned an Opposition member deserved to receive funds from a Government which he led.

"The implications of this curious form of threat are astounding. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's Deputy Premier, Sir Gordon Chalk, speaking in Bundaberg 24 hours later, felt compelled to dissociate himself, as Treasurer and Liberal Party Parliamentary Leader, from such an assertion.

"There may be, as Sir Gordon suggests, an advantage for an electorate to be represented in the parliamentary party rooms, although it would not be easy to prove this in Bundaberg's case."

The people in Bundaberg know that they will get everything possible with a Labor member.

The article continued—

"There are known cases of parish pump priming in politics, usually in a Cabinet Minister's electorate. Taking the Premier's view to its limit as a principle, however, would make a mockery of parliamentary democracy."

That is the sort of dirty work that went on in the electorates of Bundaberg and Isis. The Premier had some of his stooges—the National Party leaders—trying to blacken my character. He also had two Press secretaries writing articles. They spread rumours around Bundaberg to blacken my character. They tried to advertise it in the Bundaberg "News

Mail" but were kicked out of the office. They were told not to go there and try to blacken Jensen's name. They were told that, although the newspaper was not on my side of the fence politically, it would not allow my character to be blackened in the "News Mail". That is the type of thing that goes on. The Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement knows quite well about it.

Mr. WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I do not go along with the honourable member's statement.

Mr. JENSEN: I accept that—I know that the Minister is not responsible in any way at all—but he knows the pig Peter Nielson, who was responsible for it. He knows the pig Peter Nielson, who runs the Country Party in Bundaberg and has every say in it. He is nothing but a pig, and the honourable member for Burnett can go back to Bundaberg and tell him so. I could not get the necessary evidence to take action against him on a writ, because those who told me about him were his friends and would not go to court against him. The honourable member for Burnett probably knows of the dirty moves that they made against me.

Mr. WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I do not know anything of this. The honourable member is making accusations off his own bat. I am not aware of what he is saying.

Mr. JENSEN: I am sorry I said that. I understood that most members of the Country Party in Bundaberg knew what was going on. These things came back to me from members of the Country Party and the Liberal Party. They brought the information to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I take it the honourable member accepts the explanation of the honourable member for Burnett?

Mr. JENSEN: I do, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is quite a good friend of mine both inside and outside the House. But he belongs to the Country Party, and I thought he knew what was going on.

Mr. Houston: He would be the only one who would not have known.

Mr. JENSEN: He must have been the only one who did not know. If he did know about it, he might have given evidence for me so that I could have taken the pig Peter Nielson to court for \$200,000. I would have loved to do that.

I should now like to refer to a few passages in the Governor's Opening Speech. We are, after all, discussing the Address in Reply to that speech. The first point that I was going to mention concerns the 1974-75 Budget. However, I think the Leader of the Opposition covered that fairly well. It was interesting to note in the Governor's speech that in three months the

Budget deficit had reached a quite ridiculous figure. It was claimed in the speech that that was caused by salary and wage increases.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that this is the Address-in-Reply debate. He will have the opportunity to deal with the Budget later.

Mr. JENSEN: I am referring to what was said in the Governor's Opening Speech. He said—

"However, since that time, the state of the economy has changed dramatically. Salary and wage award increases and rising costs generally have presented serious problems to the Government."

That is quite ridiculous. When the Budget was brought down in September, everyone knew of prospective wage and salary rises of 20 to 30 per cent. In fact, Sir Gordon Chalk made such a statement when he increased the amount allocated for wages and salaries because of inflation. He knew about it in September, yet three months later he was blaming the deficit on wage and salary rises.

Mr. Houston: It was an election Budget.

Mr. JENSEN: Yes, and it was supposed to be the best Budget ever. It was supposed to be a Budget that looked forward to the next 12 months, yet in three months the Treasurer ran into trouble. The Governor said in his Opening Speech that a sum of \$93,000,000 was allowed in the Budget for award increases alone, and they are now expected to be some \$105,000,000. That is a difference of only \$12,000,000, yet the Treasurer asked the Federal Treasurer for \$41,000,000—and got \$47,000,000! It is interesting to note that two years ago the State Treasurer was saved by the receipt of nearly \$10,000,000 from the Grants Commission, and last year he was saved, again by the Grants Commission, by just over \$20,000,000. This year he is saved by \$47,000,000 from the Federal Government. I do not know how the Treasurer budgets each year. I think the Liberal Party is waking up to the Treasurer, which is why they want to get rid of him. I shall not say any more about him because he is already in so much strife with the Liberal Party. But when one sees how each year his finances have to be rescued by money from outside the State, one wonders if he really is a very good Treasurer.

Further on in the Governor's Speech mention is made of an increase in the Government guarantee from 75 per cent to 90 per cent of the cost of a factory building in pioneer-type industries, and I congratulate the Department of Industrial Development upon that. It is important to new industries in country areas, and I am always pleased to see new industries being established.

The Governor also said—

"The Main Roads Department's works programming this financial year has been influenced by the provisions of the Commonwealth Government's new roads aid legislation.

"Available funds are well below needs . . ."

Almost every day one hears in this Chamber about the Federal Government's allocation for main roads, and both the former Minister and the present Minister have said that the Federal Government has not given enough money for rural arterial roads. On the other hand, Mr. Jones, the Federal Minister, says that the allocation to Queensland is much higher than it was last year and that the State Government has also been assisted by not having to supply out of its own funds money for main roads. One does not hear anything from the State Government about spending on rural arterial roads the money that it has saved on main roads.

The position must be cleared up. It is no good the Federal Minister in Canberra saying one thing and the State Minister saying another. They should get together and resolve the matter. Every local authority and council in Queensland is concerned about it. Each is told that the State Government cannot make money available to it because the Federal Government has not supplied it, but the Federal Government says that it has supplied much more money than was supplied in the previous year. As I said, people are sick and tired of reading one statement from Canberra and a different statement from the Government here, and the two Ministers should get together and resolve the matter. I read in a newspaper that Mr. Jones intended coming to Queensland in the near future to correct some of the statements made by the Queensland Minister for Main Roads. I hope he will be able to clear the matter up.

I know that the Government is doing much for pre-schools, and I hope that it will continue to do so. Two areas in Bundaberg still lack pre-schools—North Bundaberg and Millbank. I know that North Bundaberg pre-school is programmed; I do not know about Millbank.

I am particularly concerned about the mention in the Governor's Speech of the reorganisation of police regions and districts. Recently honourable members heard the honourable member for Mackay refer to the mess that the Minister for Police has made in Mackay. He is doing the same in Bundaberg. The police strength in Bundaberg is being reduced by one senior sergeant because five divisions have been taken out of the Bundaberg District. As I understand it, the five divisions come under the inspector, not under the senior sergeant. Two shifts are worked, so two senior sergeants are needed. There are two inspectors, and if anybody's work has been lessened it is that of the inspector, not that of the senior

sergeant. I ask the Minister to explain to me why the senior sergeant's work has been reduced because five divisions have been excised from the Bundaberg Police District.

The Minister is all right in his own electorate. He has shifted the main region to his electorate, with the chief superintendent in Gympie, which is a city less than half the size of Bundaberg. It may not even be a city or it may just be one. Bundaberg is a growing city and the main centre of the Wide Bay area. According to the Department of Industrial Development, it is growing faster than any city in Queensland other than Mt. Isa. In spite of that, the Minister is trying to reduce the Police Force in Bundaberg. The people of Bundaberg cannot afford to lose a senior sergeant; they need six more policemen, in addition to a senior sergeant.

Police are needed, as I have said here year after year, to walk the streets and educate people who cross the roads against red lights and to warn children against riding bicycles on footpaths. In fact, the inspector in Bundaberg warned children recently about doing that. Never does one see a policeman walking the street today.

The Minister is now going to start on the circle again. In industry an experiment can be carried out and twenty years later somebody else will make the same experiment, but in industry there is nearly always something new. Now, after messing up the whole Police Force by closing down stations in small areas, the Minister has come out with a grandiose idea—

Mr. HODGES: I rise to a point of order. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement. I have not closed down one police station in a small area since I became the Minister in charge of police.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member will accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. JENSEN: I will accept the Minister's denial, but he is trying to reduce the strength of the Bundaberg Police Station now. I know that certain police districts have been reduced. Small areas have been closed down. In some suburbs in Bundaberg the police houses are still there but the police officers living in them do not perform duty in those suburbs. They are concerned with the station itself.

In the past police officers tried to educate the people. For example, they went out to the schools. In reply to a question I asked the Minister about a year ago, he said that he wanted welfare officers to do that sort of work. That is about the stupidest thing he could say. Police officers should do that. We must get children to respect the police uniform. Let police officers do that job, not welfare officers. The Minister would have welfare officers on the street corners to tell kids not to walk across the road against the red light and in front

of cars. That will do no good. As soon as the kids get cars at 17 years of age they disobey every traffic law as they speed through the streets. The Minister's education programme has gone to pot. Although the Minister has a big academy to educate police officers, it is doing no good for the people themselves. We want a friendly Police Force whose members mix with the people and understand the people and their problems. Police officers were like that 20 years ago. They gave a person a good boot in the backside if he did not do the right thing. The Minister can bring that back as fast as he likes. Let him give them No. 9 boots. Let us get the kids back to a bit of sense. When I see kids riding their bikes on the footpath and ringing their bells to warn old people to get out of their way, I am willing to pull them off their bikes. Of course, if I did that I would be up. I have asked the police to do something about it. The education of kids is all-important now before they go too far in their conduct. The juvenile crime ratio has gone way up. The Minister for Welfare Services has said that it has increased by 100 per cent. It is only because of the inadequacy of the Police Force that it has increased by 100 per cent. Police officers cannot do their job. The Minister will not protect them. If they do anything that is supposed to be wrong, the Minister hauls them over the coals. One honourable member said a little while ago, "Give the police back some control." I say, "Yes, give them back control."

Today all we have are police riding around in motor-cars trying to get revenue for the Government. That is all they amount to—revenue collectors. They drive around looking for people travelling five or 10 miles an hour over the speed limit or for drink-drivers. No police are made available to walk the streets and check on the actions of the public. There is nobody to move people over when they are blocking the Queen's highway, as used to be done.

Mr. Hodges: How many times have you approached me to get a fellow off a charge made by a police officer?

Mr. JENSEN: Never.

Mr. Hodges: Be truthful.

Mr. Houston: What has that got to do with this debate?

Mr. Hodges: The police endeavour to do their job and he is interfering with them.

Mr. JENSEN: I would like to know the case. There would be special circumstances. In my history as a member of Parliament I have never gone against police officers in any way at all when they have been carrying out their duty. I have always backed them up. I have fought on this matter at every opportunity. I do not believe in using police officers in cars as

revenue producers for the Government. I believe in using policemen out on the beat and in educating people.

Police officers should be got back into the schools to talk to the children, particularly to those who ride bicycles three abreast. It is useless asking social workers to visit the schools to talk to children. Their psychology might be all right in theory, but it does not go over with school-children between the ages of 10 and 12 years. They want to see the force of the law; they want to come to know and respect the police uniform.

I will let up on the Minister for Police for the time being and turn to the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission. The commission is doing a very good job in the general provision of storage dams and weirs throughout the State, but progress in the Bundaberg irrigation scheme has been slowed down. The annual report of the commission reveals that the total sum invested so far in Queensland schemes is \$158,350,000 and the receipts amount to \$1,700,000, or a return of only one per cent.

On earlier occasions I claimed that the work on the Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme has been slowed down because of the Premier's refusal to provide money to two electorates then represented by Labor members. Now, of course, Bundaberg is represented by the Labor Party and Isis by the National Party.

Stage I of the scheme was funded by the Federal Government to the tune of \$12,800,000 and by the Queensland Government to the extent of \$8,300,000, or at a ratio of 3:2. By comparison, the ratio of spending is 4:1. In other words, of a total expenditure in round figures of \$4,822,000 last year, the Federal Government spent \$3,224,000 and the State Government \$1,597,000. The total expenditure to date has been \$15,827,000, of which \$12,609,000 has been incurred by the Federal Government and \$3,218,000 by the State. This shows that the State Government has been slowing down in its spending.

Mr. Row: How much of that Federal money was contributed by State taxpayers?

Mr. JENSEN: Goodness me! A total of \$12,000,000 has been spent by the Federal Government in contrast with Queensland's expenditure of only \$3,000,000. As I have already said, although the funding ratio, Commonwealth to State, is 3:2, the expenditure ratio is 4:1. The Premier failed to make this clear when he visited Bundaberg and tried to blackmail the people of Bundaberg.

Two years ago the Pike Creek dam, on the Queensland-New South Wales border, was commenced. Its construction was intended to be funded by the Federal Government, the New South Wales Government and the Queensland Government. However, the Federal Government claimed that the scheme was not viable and refused to provide the necessary finance. The result was that the

Queensland Government joined with the New South Wales Government to complete the scheme. The Queensland Government spent \$4,400,000 over two years on that dam compared with only \$3,000,000 over five years on the Bundaberg scheme.

The honourable members for Isis and Burnett would not disagree with my claim that the Bundaberg scheme is of utmost importance. Although the member for Burnett frequently gets the Press when he "presses for more funds", he cannot get more funds from his Government. He knows, as I do, that the work must go ahead. The Bundaberg area will inevitably be faced with another drought. In fact, this year it nearly suffered a drought. However, a fortnight ago the rains came and saved some of the cane fields. The honourable member for Kurilpa told us how important the sugar industry is to Queensland and how important it is in the Bundaberg, Isis and Gin Gin areas.

Mr. Miller: He spoke very well.

Mr. JENSEN: I was very pleased about some of the things he said.

Mr. Miller: He was impressive.

Mr. JENSEN: I was impressed by his speech in some ways, but I do not know how much he knows about the sugar industry.

This scheme has been proceeding for about five years. It was supposed to be complete in 1976-77, but now the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply admits that it will not be completed until 1980 or 1981. In the next few years we could well experience a serious drought which could cost that area alone \$50,000,000. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in reporting on phase 2 of the scheme, said that it was more viable than any other scheme in Australia. In doing so, it worked on a sugar price of \$100 a ton. The present price under our long-term contracts is about \$250 to \$300 a ton, while the world sugar price is about \$600 a ton and was over \$1,000 a ton not many months ago. Yet the State Government is holding back funds! The barrage on the Burnett River should have been completed by the end of this year but, according to an answer the Minister gave me, it will not be completed until 1976. The Bundaberg City Council spent over \$2,000,000 on a scheme to draw water from the barrage. That will be a white elephant until the barrage is constructed.

Mr. Wright: That is another example of the Premier's blackmail.

Mr. JENSEN: Yes. I do not wish to go over that matter again. The Premier is vindictive; he intends to cut the A.L.P. to ribbons. He tried to cut me to ribbons but could not do so.

A Government Member: You have not got a cricket team now.

Mr. JENSEN: I know that, but the Premier is not satisfied. He is using vindictive tactics in cutting down our representation on overseas committees. The Minister for Primary Industries and Fisheries left for overseas accompanied by a member from each of the Government parties, but none from the Labor Party. On a proposed trip to Japan, there are to be six Government members—three each from the Liberal and Country parties, and one Labor member. It has been said that politics is a numbers game, but it was not a numbers game last year when Labor had 33 members and the Liberals had 21. It was not a matter of three Labor members to two Liberal members, or three Labor members to three Country Party members. It was mainly two Country Party, two Liberal and two Labor. I think I have demonstrated how vindictive the Premier can be.

Mr. Hodges: Didn't you have three Opposition representatives last year?

Mr. Houston: Don't give us "three Opposition". The third always votes for you.

Mr. JENSEN: The Minister should not try to tell me that the Independent member is on our side.

Mr. Hodges: He is in opposition to the Government.

Mr. JENSEN: That does not matter. He supports the Government on everything.

This action has been taken deliberately. It is a rotten move. It is about as rotten as the blackmail which was started in Bundaberg. I do not know whether the Premier knew that I would be the member to go and he would not accept it, but that is what he did. On this occasion, a member of the Liberal Party—I say good luck to him—who has not been in this Assembly one month, is getting the trip.

Mr. Wright: That is the member for Belmont.

Mr. JENSEN: Yes. He has not been in this Assembly for a month.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: He was selected before he was sworn in? That's lovely! I think the Press should headline these matters. What the Premier is trying to do to our party should be highlighted.

When we had the numbers last year, this was not suggested, but now it is a numbers game; the Government intends to play us as dirtily as it can. Who is rubbing it in now? The honourable member for Belmont was very fortunate to get the trip. I understood that these trips were designed to let parliamentarians learn something about other areas and that they were for parliamentarians who had been in this Assembly for some time and knew something about Parliament. That honourable member is very fortunate,

because I believe none of the other Liberal Party members wanted to go overseas with Lane. That was the reason he got it. They said they would not go over there with Lane. They did not want to be put in his black book and be run down in the same way as he runs down members of the Labor Party.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: What was that?

Mr. Wright: That was an inane interjection.

Mr. JENSEN: This is a serious matter. If the Premier intends to play dirty like that, will the people of this State put up with it much longer?

Mr. Hodges: If he had followed your example, we wouldn't have had any trips.

Mr. JENSEN: I would be very fortunate to get one now. The honourable member for Bulimba had probably been here for 15 years before he was sent on a trip. No member on this side of the House had been in for under 15 years before getting a trip.

Mr. Hodges: The Premier was a member for 20-odd years and he did not get one from your Government.

Mr. JENSEN: I know, but the system has changed.

Mr. Hodges: We changed it.

Mr. JENSEN: It goes on seniority in our party.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order!

Mr. JENSEN: The honourable member for Bulimba has just mentioned to me as another illustration of the vindictiveness of our Premier the representation at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. Every other State has representation from the Government and the Opposition. It has nothing to do with party, but rather Government and Opposition. But this time the Premier wants to make the representation six Government members to two from the Opposition.

Mr. Houston: In 17 years we have never had one trip overseas.

Mr. JENSEN: No. Even the latest one—

Mr. Houston: That is a convention.

Mr. JENSEN: On overseas trips like that, never at all. It has always been one National Party member and one Liberal Party member on overseas trips.

Mr. Houston: Queensland is the only State in the Commonwealth where the Opposition is not recognised.

Mr. JENSEN: Our representation at the Australian Constitution Convention has been cut down, too. It should be equal representation by the Government and the Opposition, as it is in every other State in Australia with the exception of Victoria. The attitude is to cut the Opposition down if at all possible.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Is it true that the Premier said that the only overseas trip the Opposition would get would be to Bribie Island?

Mr. JENSEN: I would not know if that is right; nor am I interested. What I am interested in is the rotten way the Premier has gone about things and the rotten way he conducted his election campaign in Bundaberg.

The Minister for Community and Welfare Services can be pretty dirty, too. In Bundaberg at a meeting he had for the Liberal Party he said that the honourable member for Bundaberg had never been to his office in three years. That was quite right. I have never been to the office of any Minister, except to that of Sir Alan Fletcher on a deputation. I do not have to go to the offices of Ministers. I can see them in the lobby, the dining-room or the billiard room. The Minister thought he would be very smart in saying that the member for Bundaberg had never approached him on anything. I invited him to open the Bundaberg licensed rowing club, and he came up and opened it; yet he said I had never approached him on anything. That is the way they lie.

Mr. Houston: Did he shout at the bar?

Mr. JENSEN: No, not at all.

At the same meeting the Minister said that neither the honourable member for Bundaberg nor the city council had approached him about a tourist seminar in Bundaberg. Because I understood that the city council and the development board had it lined up, I did not approach him. They told me that the next one was to be held in Bundaberg. The city council arranged with Mr. Wilson to have the civic centre available. However, at a later stage the honourable member for Maryborough wormed his way around the Minister to have Bundaberg wiped so that the seminar would be held in Maryborough. The development board wrote to the Minister, saying—

“During a recent visit to Bundaberg you were reported in the Bundaberg “News-Mail” of 9/11/74 as saying that no effort or approach had been made to your department by the local Bundaberg member or the City Council inviting your Department to conduct the 1974 Tourist Seminar in Bundaberg.

“As you are aware we are responsible to the Bundaberg City Council.”

The board went on to say that the city council did invite him. Disregarding that fact, the Minister wrote back and said that the honourable member for Bundaberg had not approached him. That is how he got out of that smartly. That is what goes on in election campaigns.

The Treasurer referred to the grants made to local authorities. The total relief amounted to \$3,400,000. The Treasurer said that the grants ranged from \$500,000 to the Brisbane City Council down to \$8,000 to each of 38 shires. Bundaberg is one of the 38 shires that received \$8,000. And it is the 8th biggest city in Queensland. Other grants were—

Shire	Amount \$
Gold Coast	320,000
Redcliffe	68,000
Rockhampton	146,000
Toowoomba	124,000
Townsville	373,000
Albert	176,000

And I repeat, Bundaberg received \$8,000. The Treasurer said that Bundaberg received some money from the Federal Government.

Mr. Ahern: That's right.

Mr. JENSEN: That's right. Bundaberg put a case to the Federal Government and proved its need. Some of the other shires put cases to the Federal Government but they were not accepted. The Treasurer squares off to all the little National Party shires by handing out grants to them. I imagine that the \$3,400,000 was part of the \$47,000,000 he got from the Federal Government to balance his Budget. He passed around that \$3,400,000 because the Federal Government did not give it to the local authorities. Probably the \$10,000,000 he is giving to the cattlemen at two per cent interest came from the same source. It was also probably part of the \$47,000,000 he picked up in Canberra, and he is making political capital out of it. So is the Premier. That is a wonderful instance of how the Treasurer can cut anybody about if he wishes to.

Mr. Ahern: How much did you get out of the R.E.D. scheme?

Mr. JENSEN: \$270,000.

Mr. Ahern: That answers your question then.

Mr. JENSEN: I am sorry—that money came from the Grants Commission. Bundaberg had to submit a case and anybody who did not have a case got nothing. The Bundaberg City Council had a case and got approximately \$270,000. Then the Premier says, “You got it out of the Federal Government so that I will give someone else some of the Federal money.” We were put among all the little shire councils throughout the West who received \$8,000.

Mr. Frawley: How much did the Bundaberg Show Society get?

Mr. JENSEN: It received about \$118,000 out of the R.E.D. scheme.

Mr. Frawley: Are you criticising it?

Mr. JENSEN: I criticise it because it did not come under council control. Any money that is given out should come under the control of the State Government or the local authority. I do not believe in the R.E.D. scheme of putting money into every little organisation throughout Australia. Library societies and others are running to the Federal Government for money.

Mr. Casey: You should have a good show in Bundaberg this year.

Mr. JENSEN: I suppose we will have bitumen roads and gutters for three days of the year. It might be of some assistance, but the money should be spent under the authority of the city council and the city engineer. I will say that to anybody. I am quite against money being provided by the Federal Government if there is no control over it. It is my money as well as everybody else's. I will say that to the Federal Government and I will repeat it at any time.

I did want to get onto many other points, especially the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Mr. Miller: Do you believe in one man, one vote?

Mr. JENSEN: I want one vote, one value.
(Time expired.)

Mr. POWELL (Isis) (4.14 p.m.): **Mr. Deputy Speaker**—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! This is the honourable gentleman's maiden speech. I ask the House to accord him the usual courtesies.

Mr. POWELL: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I rise to support the motion so capably moved by the honourable member for Mourilyan and equally capably seconded by the honourable member for Salisbury. I, too, should like to extend the continued loyalty and affection of my constituents to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and to His Excellency the Governor.

It is with a great deal of honour and humility that I sit in this place as the people's representative for the electorate of Isis. I am conscious of the fact that the electorate has had, before me, at least two very great representatives. They were Sir Alfred Brand, who represented the electorate for some 30 years, and the late Jack Pizzey, a past Premier of Queensland and also the person who revolutionised education in this State. Both these gentlemen served the district thoroughly and well.

On behalf of the electorate, I should also like to thank the person whose place I have taken in this Parliament, Mr. J. R. H. Blake, who served the electorate to the best of his ability for a period of six years.

I should like to congratulate the Premier for the excellent way in which he led the Government during the election campaign, and for the way in which he was able to present the policies of the Government in such clear terms. This, of course, was in marked contrast with the way in which the then Leader of the Opposition presented his hotch-potch to the people.

I should like to take issue with the honourable member for Bundaberg, who spoke immediately before me, on the meetings held in Bundaberg by the Premier. It was quite interesting to note that the honourable member for Bundaberg did not mention that the street meeting held by the Premier in Bundaberg was the largest that Bundaberg has known in recent years. When the Premier made the statement about the people electing a Government member instead of an Opposition member, he was cheered by at least 95 per cent of the people present. The Premier is held in very high regard in Bundaberg, and I believe that his entry, with other Ministers, into the election campaign contributed largely to my success, and certainly the success of all Government members present today.

I should like to thank the Premier; the Minister for Water Resources (Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt); the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr. Sullivan); the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport (Mr. Herbert); Sir Alan Fletcher; the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement (Mr. Wharton); and the Honourable Ian Sinclair, Deputy Leader of the National Party in the Federal Parliament, for the time and energy that they put into assisting me in the recent election campaign. That I won that election was a tribute to the work that they, and members of the local branches of the National Party, did during the election.

My thanks for personal support must go, of course, to my wife who, through great difficulties, managed a campaign office in Bundaberg; to the chairman of my electorate council, Mr. Harry Bonano; to Mr. Paul Neville, chairman of the Bundaberg branch of the National Party; to Messrs. Mal Campbell and Ted Egerton of Hervey Bay; and to many hundreds of others who stood in the boiling sun on election day handing out how-to-vote cards.

I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the new Ministers who were sworn in yesterday, especially my neighbour the honourable member for Burnett (Mr. Claude Wharton). I should also like to congratulate Mr. Speaker on his appointment, and trust that he will receive the respect that is due to him in his high office.

During the time allotted to me for this speech, I intend to deal with the many problems of my comparatively large electorate. It extends from the southern suburbs of Bundaberg south to Boonooroo, and it includes all of Fraser Island. It takes in a third of Bundaberg by population, all of Childers, Hervey Bay, the rich agricultural areas around Maryborough, and the cane lands of the Isis district. Primary industries in the electorate include sugar-cane growing, pineapple growing, tobacco growing, smallcrops cultivation, fishing, dairying, beef-cattle raising, and a small fish-breeding industry at Hervey Bay.

The electorate, which is classed as a provincial city seat, has approximately 12,000 urban dwellers and approximately 5,000 rural dwellers. The problems of the beef industry are not so serious to the electorate as a whole, although they are, of course, desperately serious to those who obtain most of their livelihood from beef. The prosperity of the city of Bundaberg and the towns of Childers and Hervey Bay results very largely from an efficient and prosperous sugar industry.

The honourable member for Bundaberg mentioned water conservation and the Burnett-Kolan scheme. I should like to point out that this scheme includes an area set aside for the distribution of water to the Isis district, including its cane-growing areas.

I am disappointed that the area has not received just recognition of its importance in the sugar industry. It is an area that depends largely on rain for the growing of sugar cane. As most honourable members should be aware, sugar cane requires a large amount of water; without water, it will not grow effectively. I believe it is imperative that the Isis section of the Burnett-Kolan scheme be pushed ahead and completed as soon as possible.

In the 1974 season the Isis Central Mill produced about 100,000 tons of sugar. At current prices, it is easy to see how important that is not only to the Isis district as a whole but also to Queensland. It is most important, therefore, that the Isis-Burnett-Kolan scheme goes through as quickly as possible, and it is to be hoped that, now that the Federal Government has at last brought forth the report from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Queensland may be able to get some money from it to push the scheme forward.

No first speech by me would be complete without reference to education, a subject in which I have been interested and a field in which I have been employed for the last 20 years. I wish to deal first with pre-school education.

The Queensland Government has given a lead to the other Australian States by introducing pre-school centres throughout Queensland. These centres are very important, for no real education can take place unless the child has a complete introduction to a system of education. Many honourable members present will recall being in preps

1, 2, 3 and 4 before they entered grade 1. A system of prep. teaching in Queensland certainly needs to be reintroduced, and the pre-school system is an area in which that can be done.

To date, there are three pre-school centres in my electorate, and I am urging that more be established. A pre-school centre certainly is needed at Hervey Bay, which has a population of about 9,000 people, the nearest pre-school centre being 25 miles away, in Maryborough. That is not satisfactory, and I hope that the Education Department will do its best to establish pre-school centres in that area as soon as possible.

My electorate contains a large number of primary schools. One, which is the largest in the Wide Bay education region, is situated fairly close to my home. It is a very well appointed school and, in common with all the schools in my electorate, has a very dedicated teaching staff. However, the smaller schools in the Isis electorate do not seem to be serviced as they should be. Some schools lack adequate library facilities, and today, with modern education techniques being introduced to Queensland, the library becomes the focal point of the school. An attempt is being made to teach children to research and report; to teach them to find out for themselves what different topics are about. That cannot be done without adequate libraries, and I put it to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that libraries tucked away in a storeroom are just not adequate. A number of schools with over 40 children in my electorate do not have adequate library facilities, and I shall do all I can in the following years to ensure that they receive those facilities as soon as possible.

I am concerned, too, that there is no real carry-on from primary to secondary education. Anybody who has taught at the grade 7 level at primary school and then heard the comments of grade 8 teachers in secondary school knows that the grade 8 teachers believe that grade 7 teachers do not teach anything. That, of course, is wrong. In the grade 7 syllabus the children are prepared, it is believed, for secondary school. However, for some obscure reason, there is no real carry-over from the primary syllabus to the secondary syllabus, and I urge the syllabus and curriculum planners to get their heads together from both the primary and secondary angle and make sure that that happens.

Bundaberg currently has three secondary schools, and a fourth is desperately needed in the south-western suburbs to take off the busy roads of the city, children riding to and from school each day.

One of the over-all problems in education that this State is going to have to face in the next few years is teacher accommodation. The Queensland Teachers' Union is very much concerned about the lack of teacher accommodation. Teachers in country areas are at a great disadvantage compared with

other people in the community. Teachers are prepared to be transferred to country areas as long as they are provided with somewhere decent to live. I can see no reason why a teacher should be transferred from a city area to a country area and then be expected to live in a caravan without any services. In the past the Education Department has expected this of teachers. It would not be so bad if the teacher were paid for the disability, but under the present system a teacher living in Brisbane gets exactly the same pay as a teacher living in, say, Mt. Isa or Camooweal, except for some pitiful allowance that is paid as a cost-of-living adjustment.

Mr. Moore: It applies to the railway fettler, too.

Mr. POWELL: It applies to every member of the Public Service who is transferred away from capital city areas. Surely this Government should understand the needs of country people. Surely it should understand that the country person requires, indeed deserves, exactly the same services as people who live in other parts of the State. I appeal to the Minister for Education to look seriously at the problem of teacher accommodation and to make sure that the department provides accommodation for teachers on a reasonable basis.

The transfer system within the Education Department is something else that comes under constant fire from members of the community, particularly members of the teaching service. There is nothing more disruptive to students than to have two or more teachers in the year for the one class, but this is happening throughout the State, and it is not good enough. Often the reason for it is that a teacher who is transferred to a centre does not want to stay there; consequently he applies for a transfer and is shifted. But the problem goes deeper than that. The transfer system, as it presently exists in Queensland, should be changed and a priority system established. We need to have a system whereby certain teachers elect to be on a staff for transfer, while others elect to be on a staff where they will not be transferred. At present there is something of an unwritten law that nobody can get his hands on and learn about. We want a system under which transferable teachers are paid for the disability.

Under this Government the pupil-teacher ratio in Queensland has been increased to such an extent that at the moment there are still too many teachers facing more than 35 pupils a day. It is to be hoped that in the coming years sufficient teachers will be available, with finance to pay them, so that the pupil-teacher ratio will be such that the pupils of this State will be able to receive the best possible education.

Students in my electorate who wish to carry on with tertiary education have to leave the area and live either in Rockhampton, Brisbane, Toowoomba or Townsville.

This is not satisfactory. For the life of me I cannot understand why students from the very rich Burnett-Mary Valley district should have to travel long distances to be boarded out, and why their parents should have to pay extra money so that they can receive the same education as students living in the closely settled city areas. I will be urging for the establishment of an institute of technology in my electorate, because there is a great need for one in that part of Queensland. At present there is one in Toowoomba and one in Rockhampton. The total population of the Burnett-Mary Valley area is as great as that of the Darling Downs. No logical reason can be advanced for the lack of such an institute in the Isis area.

While dealing with tertiary institutions, might I make a comment on the Queensland University, with which I have had some dealings over the years. This year I received a number of booklets circulated during the university's orientation week. I bring to the attention of the House the orientation handbook that was included in the kit supplied to students. This publication is the usual mixture of the bad writing, worse advice and juvenile nonsense that one has come to expect not only from the orientation week handbook but also from the works of rather more senior scholars in the employ of the university. I suppose a high degree of nonsense is to be expected from such a publication, so I hope that the majority of incoming students have sufficient good sense to be able to pick the few grains of wheat from the several bushels of chaff.

There is, however, one particular item that is not an expression of trivia but rather an attack upon the rights and privileges of the Aboriginal and Islander citizens of Queensland. If honourable members are prepared to waste time reading this document they will find half a dozen paragraphs of distorted fact, omission and deliberate lies. These paragraphs are a deliberate attempt to set to one side the Aboriginal Advisory Council and the elected councils in communities throughout the State.

It is apparent that the writers have placed their own interests before those of Aborigines and Islanders and are determined to force them to agree that the opinion of a white university student is of more importance, and is more likely to be correct, than those of Aboriginal and Islander men and women who have served the interests and needs of their communities for many years. The example that is given to students by some members of the academic staff at the university is hardly inspiring.

Honourable members will perhaps have read a survey report published recently by the Commonwealth Government Printing Office. The preparation of the report on Aborigines and Islanders in Brisbane was financed by the Commonwealth Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, and the survey was conducted by members of the Social Work

Department of the university. The object was to examine the economic and social state of Aborigines and Islanders in Brisbane. The result of the survey is hardly believable. It outrages almost every commonly accepted principle of research, distorts any facts that do fit the preconceptions of the so-called scientists who wrote it, bases a host of opinions upon a mass of highly unlikely statistics and concludes by making recommendations that have nothing to do with the doubtful evidence gathered.

In this particular instance honourable members are able to observe a classic example of a group of people who take advantage of their status. The idea is to play upon the public belief that all social scientists are objective and honest characters who draw conclusions from facts. While this belief continues, it is possible for these academic confidence tricksters to get across to the general public as factual any number of ideas so long as they are included in an impressive-looking document in which statistical tables and jargon abound.

As I have already pointed out, there need be no relation between these tables and what is decided; but that, I regret, is all part of the game. Unfortunately lack of ethics and lack of professional standards will in the long run convince the general public that anything produced by university people should immediately become suspect. If this occurs, great harm will be done to many reputable and brilliant scholars who work honestly and painstakingly to produce material that is of immense value both to the State and to the nation as a whole.

I ask honourable members to secure copies of "Aboriginal and Islanders in Brisbane" and to read the publication with care. It is the most blatant example of intellectual dishonesty and individual power-seeking that has been made available in this State for some years. The orientation handbook, to which I referred earlier, is in many respects another example of this. I imagine that the students who produced it are unable to perceive the insults and damage that their inherent racist attitudes can accomplish; but the appalling feature is that they are not even capable of accurate basic research. Alternatively, if they are, they are quite prepared to ignore, or simply to alter, anything to suit their own convenience.

In the first paragraph they refer to the indigenous population of Queensland as being approximately 60,000. Apparently the fact that their estimate does not agree with that of the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics is beside the point. Presumably they believe that the larger the number of people the more important their case. Once again if a figure does not suit them, they simply alter it. This is surely a pathetic introduction to a university career.

The next two paragraphs refer to Queensland legislation in the field of Aboriginal and Islander affairs. Even here they have managed to forget one complete Act of Parliament—in this case, I suspect, by mistake rather than intention—but the important thing is that the extent of their research is so shallow they are able to miss a piece of legislation. On the other hand, of course, we are well aware that accuracy and facts are not very important to these people. There is therefore little point in reminding them of the amendments that have occurred and have not been listed.

According to the authors, Aborigines have no right to appeal to any court and are, as is stated, subject to a protector who has control of their personal and private lives. It is suggested that Queensland pursued this policy when every other State in the Commonwealth had reversed it. I will not treat in detail the accuracy of this assertion but simply comment that it is totally incorrect and make the particular point of reminding honourable members that the existing legislation is the work of indigenous people, that it was provided at their request and that it is composed of provisions that they nominated.

I remind honourable members that on a number of occasions the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement has offered to amend or completely repeal both pieces of legislation if the elected representatives of Aborigines and Islanders in Queensland want him to do so. I am also anxious to inform honourable members that the Minister has always considered the wishes of Aborigines and Islanders as the only ones of any real force and effect in this field. The Minister is to be congratulated on his stand and upon the fact that he has not allowed himself to be swayed by the attempts of white radicals to return this Government to a paternalism that would certainly be worse than anything that has occurred in the past because it is an attempt to dictate not only what Aborigines and Islanders should do but also how they should think.

One other point that I commend to the attention of honourable members relates to the assertion by students that Queensland is a racist society. In fact, one gentleman from overseas appeared at the University of Queensland recently and assured students that this was so. He mentioned that he had run away from his own country with the assistance of a forged passport and alleged that his own nation had proclaimed him a banned person and gaoled him on a number of occasions. He said he felt that Queensland was just as bad, yet of course he had the sure knowledge that he had been accepted in Australia and Queensland and could say precisely without fear of reprisal whatever he liked in vicious criticism of the State that offered him refuge—a situation that would certainly not appear to apply in his own country. This is just another example of the dangerous and irrational distortions that are becoming accepted.

Unfortunately, no-one cares to mention that Queensland is the only State that seems to be able to produce indigenous parliamentarians, university graduates and business people, and provide a climate with scope for individuality—a climate that will not remain much longer if students are to be trained in a fashion that would have delighted Herr Paul Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's Minister for Propaganda.

I turn to tourism, which is most important in my electorate, and I mention Hervey Bay, Woodgate and the areas around Bundaberg and Childers. Hervey Bay has been called the caravan capital of Australia, yet the roads that lead to it are among the worst in Australia. Anybody with the slightest knowledge of caravanning will realise that immediately a road becomes narrow it can be very dangerous for towing a caravan, especially a busy road used by large trucks. I appeal to the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads to look at the road that connects Torbanlea with Hervey Bay, the road that connects Bundaberg with Goodwood and Woodgate, and the road that connects Goodwood with Childers. These roads carry tremendous holiday traffic and they are roads on which there have been deaths—roads on which this State should be spending a lot of money for the sake of tourism. I sincerely hope that the Minister in his busy schedule in my electorate next week-end will find time to look at these roads carefully enough to insist that the State spends some money on them.

I move on to conservation, an area of Government endeavour that seems to arouse a good deal of ire among some people. First let me define what I believe conservation to be—the wise use of our natural resources for the benefit of man. If mining or any other activity meets that criterion, I will agree with it. But for the life of me I cannot understand why we should be allowing sand-mining in some of the areas of my electorate from which I cannot see man benefiting in any way at all. It does not constitute a wise use of our natural resources. Surely the scenic value of Fraser Island is far more important than a few dollars now and a sandy wasteland later.

I sincerely hope that in the life of this Parliament—and, if not this one, then the next—the Queensland Government will see to it that more than .7 per cent of our total area is set aside for national parks. National parks are most important. I believe that they should be created where the people will use them. They should not be large tracts of land set aside with fences built around them so that nobody can enter, but rather areas set aside for people to look at, walk through and, to a limited degree, drive through.

My electorate already has a number of national parks, but I would dearly love to see the whole of Fraser Island declared a national park. It is unique. It is the largest sand island, not just in Australia, but in the world. Immediately the high dunes on

Fraser Island are mined or destroyed in any way, whether it be by mining, trail bikes, dune buggies or anything else, Fraser Island itself will become a desert. If it becomes a desert, we will have lost something for ever. Once the salt air is allowed to get to the areas between the high sand dunes, the tropical rain forests will never be able to regrow. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to have Fraser Island declared a national park. I will be doing all within my power—if need be, even after I cease to be a member of this place—to ensure that more than .7 per cent of Queensland's total area is declared national park.

Mr. Miller: We will help you, too.

Mr. POWELL: I thank the honourable member.

I now turn to housing, a subject that I thought the previous speaker might have raised. As I said before, the Bundaberg part of my electorate is the most populous. Over 7,000 of my electors live in Bundaberg but are regarded as coming within the Isis electorate. My electorate contains a large number of Housing Commission homes. The part of Bundaberg that is growing fastest is in the Isis electorate. Perhaps that is a tribute to the member for Bundaberg!

In the Bundaberg city itself there are available for rental only 100 houses. At present the Clerk of the Court has something like 133 application for houses. It is a deplorable state of affairs in a city the size of Bundaberg that so few houses are available. Just last week the Housing Commission let tenders for seven more houses, two of which I understand are already spoken for by Government departments. I believe that this Government, which has a very sound policy on housing, should do all within its power to ensure that more houses are built in Bundaberg by the Housing Commission both for rental and for sale.

Dealing with some of the matters raised by previous speakers in this debate, I am incensed and annoyed by the attitude adopted towards our Premier by honourable members opposite. If they stood up and criticised his policies, I would have no argument with them, but I believe that, in standing up and trying to denigrate the man himself, they are doing both this Parliament and themselves as an Opposition a great deal of harm.

It seems that electoral distribution is the point that really raises the ire of the members of the Australian Labor Party. They continually try to tell us that Queensland has elected a minority Government. One has only to look around this House when a division is called to see where the minority is. The coalition parties have 69 members and the A.L.P. has 11. Even a little girl or boy, playing with rods in grade 1 or even perhaps at pre-school, could understand where the majority lies.

Then we have the inane remarks based on figures and percentages. Figures can be made to mean what we like. A rational and logical look at the election figures shows that of the seats contested—and I emphasise that point because it is the only fair way of evaluating it—the National Party obtained 51.2 per cent of the vote, the Liberal Party 48 per cent of the vote, while the A.L.P., which contested all seats in the State, obtained 36 per cent of the vote. Looking at those figures logically it is quite plain that the state of the House as it is as it should be.

In dealing with the police both in my electorate and the places on the fringes of my electorate, let me back up the statements made by the honourable member for Bundaberg on the strength of the Bundaberg Police Station. As an individual citizen and a member of the community in Bundaberg, I cannot speak too highly of the activities and work done by the Police Force in that place. The same can be said of the Police Force in the other centres in my electorate. But their numbers are sadly depleted.

In Hervey Bay, which has a population of 9,000 people at ordinary times and up to 40,000 at Christmas, the strength of the Police Force hardly changes. In other words, the men who are expected to look after 9,000 people and their problems have to look after 40,000 people and perform the same tasks. I believe this is very unfair and that something should be done by the Police Department to staff its offices in a sensible fashion.

Like the honourable member for Bundaberg, I should like to see police on the beat a lot more. I should like to see them near schools, especially when children are going into school or leaving it. It is most important that the police be on hand. It is all very well for a few adults to be there and it is all very well to have a road patrol, for which unfortunately a teacher is responsible, but there is nothing like having a man in uniform standing there to control traffic. I suggest that a great deal needs to be done in this service to our community.

During the election campaign much was said and written that people possibly have since regretted. I suggest that some of the things the honourable member for Bundaberg said should have been regretted. I should like to pay tribute to the newspapers in my electorate, which I believe dealt with me very fairly during the election campaign, in spite of some of the feelings and leanings of some of the editors and reporters. I have no complaint whatsoever.

I believe, however, that the honourable member for Bundaberg is quite astray when he claims that a certain person runs the National Party in Bundaberg. He just would not know. As far as I know he is not a member of that party. I doubt that we would have him, anyhow. The point I make is that it is quite improper for the

honourable member for Bundaberg or for any other honourable member to stand up here and castigate a party member in Bundaberg whom he does not even know.

The question of the number of members on different committees was raised by an Opposition member. In a Parliament in which there are 39 National Party members, 30 Liberal Party members and 11 Labor Party members, I fail to see why the Opposition should have equal numbers with the Government on committees. I believe that the system that has been introduced of two members from each of the major parties is very fair to the Labor Party. Perhaps we should even feel a little sorry for some Labor members because of the way in which they will be overworked in the next three years. One wonders how on earth they will cope—and perhaps it might be pleasing to see them fade from the scene, anyhow.

The previous speaker referred to the R.E.D. scheme and said how good it was. But he then castigated it, because the money was not made available through Government channels. I strongly reinforce those sentiments. This Parliament and this Government believe that money should be made available through the correct channels; it should not be given out willy-nilly to all who ask for it. But, of course, we have to remember that this is just one more attempt by the Federal Government in Canberra to do away with both State and local Governments so that it can, to coin a phrase, absolutely rule the roost, to the detriment of everyone in the community.

When the Leader of the Opposition was talking about electoral redistribution and electorate sizes, he referred to an organisation known as the Christian Citizens' Committee of the Methodist Church. He quoted this organisation as saying in a news article that it disagreed with the Premier and the Government on the present distribution of electorates. I should like to point out that I have personal knowledge of this committee, and I know that it does not represent the majority of the thinking of the Methodist Church in country areas of Queensland. I believe that that should be pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition. But, of course, he, like that document that was distributed to university students, deals with facts rather carelessly.

In summing up, I should like to emphasise a few points. The need for water conservation in the Isis electorate is basic. The vast sugar areas of Isis need water, and the sooner the Burnett-Kolan scheme is completed and heading in that direction, the better it will be. In the field of education, I believe that pre-school centres are a must in all areas of Queensland, and I will be doing all that I can to make sure that they are established in even the smallest areas in my electorate.

I look forward to spending the next three years, and also the years after them, as the representative of the electorate of Isis in this place. I shall consider it an honour to do so, and I thank honourable members for their tolerance.

Mr. LAMONT (South Brisbane) (4.53 p.m.): I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to contribute to the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor of Queensland. I am reminded that His Excellency is the direct representative in Queensland of Her Majesty the Queen. I wish to express my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth. I have studied at some length, and as best I am able, the history of political institutions and the development of political philosophy, and I have come to the conclusion that the stability of a monarchy, in partnership with a democratic constitution, provides the ideally best polity for a State. My reason for saying this is that I believe that the continuity of the monarchy leads to the security that is so necessary for planning for future prosperity, whilst a democratic constitution gives responsiveness in Governments to the changing needs of the people. Thus a constitutional monarchy combines the need for both change and stability within the same governmental system.

I say that I believe in democracy because I believe, as a liberal, that sovereignty must reside with the people. There have been many definitions of democracy. Probably the most memorable is that of Lincoln at Gettysburg. But the one that I prefer appeared in an early 20th century edition of the Westminster Gazette. It read—

“Our democratic system rests on the assumption that the wise cannot be trusted to speak for the foolish, nor the rich for the poor, nor the learned for the ignorant, or, as in a familiar saying, that only the wearer knows where the shoe pinches.”

In a democracy the people govern. But today it is no longer possible for the people actually to govern. With the growth of the mass society, it is no longer possible, as I pointed out in the Chamber last week, for the people to maintain a proper check on the governors. And so, to solve the dilemma of the democratic principle in today's expanding 20th century society, we have representative government. This is a compromise, I believe, between the practical absurdity of government by all the people and the ideological desirability of sovereignty remaining with the people.

However, representative government is twice removed from pure democracy, and I believe that every back-bencher in the House must be mindful of that fact. We, the representatives, do not govern. We only check the Government; that is our role. Therefore, to defend the sovereignty of the people, we

must examine and check all legislation in this House, both direct legislation and subordinate legislation.

I believe that the Government should give every opportunity to back-bench members of this Assembly to make an adequate check upon all legislation that passes through the House, so that we may all properly dispose of our duties. I believe also that Ministers ought not—and I hope they do not—regard our checking of the Government as a hindrance, because this is what was always intended. It is not always automatic that facilities are placed before back-benchers to enable them to maintain that check, and I believe that we must never lose sight of the need to do it. It is our contract with the people, and I believe that members of the Cabinet must respect the fact that we must honour our contract.

In this regard, therefore, it is somewhat regrettable that a system of political parties has developed that sometimes may make back-bench members of Parliament rubber stamps of the leadership. In many cases—in fact, in most cases—we can acquiesce to the will of our leaders with a clear conscience, because we can expect in general to have a like-mindedness with our chosen leaders. After all, our being members of political parties presupposes like-mindedness with our leaders. But this must not be automatically expected and must not become a convention in itself.

It is more regrettable that some parties have a dogma—even some parties represented in this House have a dogma—that binds their representatives to a party machine. I denounce such a system as being at odds with the entire concept of democracy and of representative government. When we look at the sort of parties that have a dogma that binds their politicians to a party machine, we find that it is doubly unfortunate, because it is often those parties which began as the most idealistic, those with the greatest fanatical fervour, those with the most high-minded reformist policies, that are most prone to demand of their members a conformity with the party line that is stifling to enlightened membership.

For that reason, I am a liberal, because liberalism provides safeguards against dogmatism. Liberals know that, while representative government does make possible the protection of the individual against the ever-encroaching State, it does not guarantee the protection of the individual against the ever-encroaching State.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. LAMONT: Socialists believe in the tyranny of majority, in the grinding down of the individual. A tyranny of the majority happens when the mass of citizens grow ever more confident of their collective power. The tyranny of the majority is as great a threat to liberty as any other tyranny.

Our history is strewn with examples of men and women who suffered outrageously merely because they lived differently, thought differently, or spoke differently from the great mass of the people. Their only crime was that they were not in a majority, did not conform to majority opinion, and therefore were not tolerated by the majority. Tolerance of those who are different is the key to liberalism. It is important to note, I believe, that the majority can never sanctify an act, it can only give legality to it. In the situation that pertains in Queensland today, I believe that we in the joint Government parties must be ever mindful that, although we have an overwhelming majority, our majority cannot sanctify an act but only give legality to it.

A respect of liberal virtues, a recognition of the right to dissent, a recognition of the right to be different, is the only way to avoid opening the gates to a tyranny of the majority. As always, the great enemy of liberalism is socialism. I regard socialism as any system that places the State ahead of the individual, whether it be the national socialism of pre-war Germany, the Communist socialism of Russia and China or the dithering socialism of the Australian Labor circus in Canberra. Any system under which the State imposes its unbending will on all, is a system I regard as socialism. Socialism is any system where the State limits freedom of choice. As I develop my argument into various areas in education and health services, it will be seen that freedom of choice is what I am mostly concerned with today.

Liberalism must not be confused with permissiveness, as many people in the community unfortunately are doing. Liberalism recognises that rights connote responsibility, and liberalism recognises that liberals must respect the rights of others.

No person can do anything he pleases without Government intervention. Radical non-intervention would lead to anarchy. Therefore, activities which affect others do require restraint—either self-restraint or restraint by a Government. But activities which do not affect others, and there are many daily activities of every individual in the State which do not affect others, totally self-regarding actions, should be free from Government interference. That is my understanding of liberalism. The Government has no place in the private world of individuals. The Liberal Party, I hope, respects this. Unfortunately, too often, the Liberal Party has respected this in the economic sphere but not always in social affairs. Today society is becoming more tolerant. I welcome that because intolerance is a backward step. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is briefly my understanding of what liberalism is all about.

When I talk about rights and liberty, and when I talk about freedom, as a former teacher I immediately think of academic

freedom. For that reason I wish to speak about the academic freedom that has been brought to the education system in this State by virtue of the Radford scheme. Earlier today the honourable member for Rockhampton spoke about the Radford scheme but, I am afraid, not very intelligently. I recognise that the honourable member for Rockhampton is a qualified gentleman. By that I mean he is a gentleman with some qualifications. But he has never served in the secondary system in Queensland since the Radford scheme was introduced. Therefore he speaks without experience of it.

The Radford scheme emphasises the individual student, and it emphasises academic freedom. In this it is admirable. True, there have been problems in implementation of the scheme, but the problems are not within the scheme itself. The scheme that this Government introduced was an enlightened one. Opposition members praised it when it was first spoken of in this House. What is wrong with the Radford scheme is the result of the blithe assumption that a teacher who has been brought up as a pupil in a tradition-bound system, trained at a college under a tradition-bound system and has gained his teaching experience within a tradition-bound system can immediately adjust to the flexibility of the Radford scheme. Teachers must be taught to respond to the new academic freedom of Radford. Now, in-service training schemes have to be done at an autonomous teachers' college or university funded by Federal grants, and therefore it has been a Federal responsibility to keep the teaching profession up to the mark and able to give of its best to the Radford scheme.

The Labor Government's Department of Education is at the moment starting to do this but, as with all things with the Whitlam Government, it is too little too late. Any teacher who has lived under a system with a principal at the elbow, an inspector over his shoulder and the Department of Education on his back cannot be expected to act as if he had been conditioned to an entirely new order of things. And it is important to note this; students cannot feel free and students cannot understand academic freedom if teachers do not feel free. So it is at the teachers that we must launch the first blows to get education into the system that Radford originally intended. We therefore must have in-service training schemes so that teachers can be taught to respond to Radford, so that they can feel free in the classroom and so that the students will also feel that freedom.

A second misuse of the Radford scheme, and a great hindrance to it, comes from the University of Queensland. The University of Queensland decided that a student at the end of his secondary education would receive a point for each subject—a point mark out of seven. This point would represent his achievement compared with

other students. The University of Queensland in its great wisdom began adding the points together until it got an aggregate. It said, "If you have 96 points you will matriculate." This, I submit, was sublime ignorance. The points are points of achievement relative to other students doing that particular course. The points, therefore, are relative and not absolute. The professors at the university added together these relative points.

Now, it is in grade 3 at primary level that children of 8 years of age are taught that we cannot add together unlike things. Why then do professors at the university perpetrate this mathematical error? Why do they add together these unlike things? Why do they add together these relative figures to get an absolute aggregate of scores? They do it because it absolves them of the responsibility of finding the necessary criteria for selecting matriculants to their faculties. This makes the secondary schools a clearing house for the university, but since only 10 per cent of students go on to university, why should the other 90 per cent serve a system geared to the 10 per cent at the top?

The result in Queensland has been that too much emphasis is placed by students and teachers on the acquisition of points rather than on the acquisition of knowledge. Many teachers lose sight of the very important fact that they cannot educate all their students to get a 7 or a 6, because a 7 or a 6 represents a position in relation to everyone else and only a certain percentage or quota of students can attain that level. This is the crux of the matter. The figure is a shifting one, not a steady target at which students can aim.

Schools should be for learning, not for processing and labelling. Students must become the subject of education, not the object of education. When the university learns this, it will learn to co-operate with the Radford scheme.

Employers in commerce and industry make the same error. They look at the total of points. They should know that the reports that are written on students and that accompany the students when leaving school, are a better guide to the work of those students. Employers, who are not educationists, can be forgiven for committing this error. Nevertheless, they should set their own criteria, just as university professors should set theirs.

Let me give an example. Any honourable member who is looking for a secretary would require an applicant to possess certain qualifications. Secretarial duties require secretarial skills; a receptionist must have a personality. I would place certain character traits much higher than academic records. The traits of loyalty, trustworthiness, patience, initiative and energy are of utmost importance, and they are not indicated in an algebra result or geography result. Therefore I believe that the individual

reports that attend school-leavers, not the marks that they receive from school, should be most valued by employers in commerce and industry.

This implies, of course, that people in commerce and industry as well as professors at the university and principals at teachers' colleges should trust secondary-school teachers and principals. This trust must be forthcoming before the Radford scheme can be respected. If we do not trust teachers and say that such trust is too much to ask, what is the use of an education system at all? The Radford scheme recognises this and lays on the shoulders of teachers and principals both responsibility and the authority to carry out that responsibility. I applaud the efforts of this Government in introducing such a scheme.

The scheme has also been criticised as being one in which internal assessment within the school leads to favouritism and discrimination. This is possible. In every profession there will be some who let the side down, but the entire profession cannot be condemned merely because of a few. The first point I make to rebut this criticism is that the teacher has always done an internal assessment, except in the final decision at the end of the course, where a public examination previously was held. Now the teacher is simply being asked to continue internal assessments up to the final decision as well.

The other point I make in relation to secondary-school teachers and internal assessment is that primary-school teachers as well as teachers at universities, institutes of technology and teachers' colleges still make internal assessments of all their students, as they have done since the abolition of the scholarship in Queensland, and there has been no great outcry about favouritism and discrimination. Why there should be in the secondary school context I do not know.

I do not think that here today I have to justify internal assessment. It allows progressive assessment and does not rely on the results of a hit-or-miss examination. It allows a teacher to examine all facets and all the scales of ability of a student, not just his examination temperament and memory. It allows a teacher to take into account exceptional circumstances such as sickness and other trauma. It is better than a public examination system, which ignores all these aspects.

While I am on the question of education I draw the attention of the House to the Board of Teacher Registration. It was constituted to defend the professional standing of teachers and today all teachers must be registered with it. Certain standards have been set. However, as is often the way with bureaucracy, the board is devoid of sensibility. It is a measure of the mindlessness of bureaucracy that it takes as hard-and-fast rules what ought to be only guidelines—when a teacher is asked to abandon

one course which he believes to be beneficial and take another of some dubious value, merely to satisfy the board.

I speak in this case in reference to a sports-master who is doing a university course in physical education, which he finds interesting and helpful in his job, who is being asked to abandon it to do a two-year external course at the Kelvin Grove Teachers' College. It is nonsense to suggest that such a tenuous, external association could make a person with seven years' experience in a secondary school a more acceptable teacher—so acceptable, indeed, that the board would condescend to register him.

That brings me to my first point: the Board of Teacher Registration should have registered all teachers currently teaching at the time of its inception. It is impertinent for a new board to constitute itself as an instrument that judges the worth of practitioners already operating within their profession. I have seen a second case where a university teacher with a bachelors and a masters degree, who is a recognised tertiary teacher, has been told he may not be registered to teach at a secondary school, that he must go to the Kelvin Grove Teachers' College, where, of course, he would be taught for two years by lecturers with lower written academic qualifications than he.

Any teacher will advise honourable members that no course will substitute for experience. To treat a practised teacher thus is not just bureaucratic myopia; it is bureaucratic arrogance.

The whole question of the rights of the individual and the best interests of the profession are involved. There is also the problem of autonomy. The Board of Teacher Registration is autonomous. Now I recognise that a system of responsible government has some problems attached to it. I spoke of this the other day. One of the problems is that the Executive members of Cabinet have also the duties of legislators. But there are advantages: One of the singular advantages of responsible government is that at the top of bureaucracy, at the top of a Government department, there is a person who is also a legislator, a parliamentarian, a person, a human being with sensibility, who can look at exceptional cases and look at the human nature involved in cases.

This sensibility becomes forfeit where a board is both unwilling and unable to look at exceptions. Where a board is bound to its own decisions and rules, an individual case becomes mummified in red tape. My recommendation to the Board of Teacher Registration is that, firstly, there should have been accepted for registration all university teachers and similar cases; secondly, that there should be greater flexibility with reference to teachers with overseas certificates; and, thirdly—and this relates to the craziest

situation of all—that there should be a recognition of the standing of a headmaster's recommendations.

It is a ludicrous contradiction inherent in the Board of Teacher Registration and its principles that, as the guardian of the professional standards of the service, it should reject the judgment of a headmaster who knows an individual case and says, "This teacher should be registered without being required to continue any further study." To turn away from such a recommendation is a complete contradiction of the guardianship of the professional standards of the teaching profession.

On the matter of education I turn finally to the question of bonding. I believe that the bonding of students is an iniquity which has been with us too long. I shall never know how in this day and age we, in a democratic Parliament, can countenance the bonding of students to a profession. There will be departmental officers who talk about an immediate teacher shortage if the bonding of students is done away with. Where is the logic in that? Does it happen that as soon as a person fulfils his bond he leaves the profession? Surely the majority of teachers in Queensland are not bonded to work only as teachers because of some contract with the department. Teachers do not abandon the Education Department in their droves after three years.

As a liberal I believe in the law of supply and demand and I believe that the law of supply and demand for jobs will prevail except in exceptional circumstances. So the requirement for teachers and, of course, the employment situation itself, will keep individuals teaching as economic units in themselves. As well, teachers will want to teach, because that is what professionalism is all about. We do not have to bind people by some legal contract. Some departmental officers will argue also that it is vital to country service that bonding be retained; that there will be an adequate supply of teachers for country areas only as long as there are teachers under bond. Surely the answer to that is that conditions and allowances in country areas should be made attractive enough for people to want to teach there, not to have to be blackmailed or shanghaied, or whatever the word is, to get them to go to country schools. I believe that the result would then be that a larger number of older and more experienced teachers would go to the country. The implication of the present argument, therefore, is that a large percentage of country teachers are under bond and thus have less than three years' experience. I do not believe that that is in the best interests of the education of our country school-children.

The worst way to start any practitioner in a profession is to hold him under bond. Bonding is restrictive in its nature, whether it be for the student or for the teacher serving out the bond. It has a prejudicial effect on

the attitude of both students and young teachers. In effect, the concept is, "We will make you professional, but we will not trust you. We will not allow that you are responsible."

Bonding has been abused by the Education Department over the years to stifle initiative. Students who have wanted to go on to further studies, but whose bonded period of studies was up, have been told, "No. You will go out and teach. You will not complete the course that you wish to proceed with." Teachers who have sought leave of absence to go on to further studies or even to travel overseas to enrich their experience while under bond are told, "No. This will not be granted. There will be no leave of absence while bonding exists." Of course, bonding holds adult teachers to teenage decisions. On that ground it is immoral. I believe that bonding of teachers is both counter-productive and contrary to enlightened educational philosophy. It is wasteful and it is iniquitous. I trust that the new Minister will use his good common sense, not the advice of his department, and reject this blight on the system.

I had hoped to speak for some time on the economy. However, time is pressing on and I will have to leave that to the words from a speaker who preceded me, the honourable member for Kurilpa, who dealt so well with the subject. Let me say, however, that the Terrigal conference of the Australian Labor Party was an admission that the only way for a Labor Government to survive in this country—indeed, the only way for a Socialist Government to survive in this country—is to start looking like the best free-enterprise Liberal-Country Party Government that it could possibly imitate. That could be the only explanation of the twists and turns, revisions and recriminations of not just the Terrigal conference but the whole sad history of the Australian economy since 1972. It is an admission by socialists of fault, guilt and the sublime wrong-headedness of Government interference in the private sector.

In spite of this, and not satisfied with having mismanaged every venture into the private sector, the Federal Government is now about to turn its destructive talents to health care. I agree with the Queensland Minister for Health, who this morning said that we would accept further financial assistance for Queensland hospitals. That I endorse—if there is no catch; if it does not mean that we would be deprived of funds in other areas and under other agreements.

Mr. Moore: Of course we will. It will mean that.

Mr. LAMONT: It probably will. The honourable member for Windsor is quite right.

However, I do reject Mr. Hayden's national health scheme, which at the moment has the codename Medibank. If we do not reject the proposals of Medibank, we

will regret it immediately and go on to repent every concession with an increasing bitterness as the socialist realities become known. I am indebted to the Federal Opposition spokesman for health for drawing my attention to the appropriate comments of Arthur Koestler on socialism. Koestler said—

"They whip the groaning masses to the theoretical happiness which only they can see."

That is what Medibank is all about. It is an ideal system which only Mr. Hayden and a few of his lap-dogs can see. Mr. Hayden claims to be concerned about health care. He is interested in health care in the way that Bonnie and Clyde were interested in banking. The socialists intend to rob health care of quality.

The greatest complaint I have is the way they are currently misleading the people. The advertising by the socialist party in this country is giving no facts; it is appealing to the emotions. First of all it says that the scheme will be free. I say that that is downright fraudulent. The honourable member for Rockhampton today spoke of restrictive trade practices. If Mr. Hayden represented a private company he would be taken to court on a restrictive trade practice because that advertisement is entirely fraudulent.

How can health care be free? It is a very expensive business. The socialists cannot wave a magic wand and suddenly delete the expense of health care. Estimates are that the Medibank system will cost anywhere between \$1,680 million and about \$3,000 million in its year of inception. If we follow what has happened in England and Canada, the cost will treble in the first three to five years.

On the most moderate estimate of \$1,680 million, there would be an increase of 9 per cent in taxation generally and if, in fact, it reaches \$3,000 million, there will be an 18 per cent tax increase in the year of its inception. National health services in other countries have been shown to have appetites that are gluttonous and insatiable. They have become bottomless pits into which the taxpayers throw good money after bad.

What else the advertisement does not say—and the good people in my own electorate were deluded by this—is that the Medibank scheme is compulsory for every citizen in Australia. There is no choice about joining as there is about joining a medical benefit fund. It is compulsory. There is no freedom of choice about it. Everyone is a member.

It is important that we put it about this country that Medibank will not cover a wide range of health services. For a start, it will not cover physiotherapy. Where does that appear in the lovely ads on television? It will not afford cover for intermediate beds. That also is omitted from the advertising and, of course, it will not cover private hospitals.

Private medical benefit schemes will still exist. If a person wants to have physiotherapy treatment on referral by his doctor, intermediate beds, or privacy in hospital, he will have to remain a member of a private medical benefits fund as well as contribute to this tremendous burden on the public purse that Medibank will cause. The cost will be prohibitive for people to remain in both. If they cannot, the result will be as it would be with education if every person said, "I will no longer send my children to private schools. I will send them to a State school." The private schools would close down and children would go to State schools. Imagine the long line of students outside State schools waiting for desks.

Medibank will create the same situation, except that there will be a long line of people, on paper, waiting for beds. It has happened in England and it will happen here, if, by force of economics, people have to leave the private medical benefit funds. They will be lining up, on paper, waiting for beds in hospitals.

It is different with urgent cases. A victim of a shark attack or a person whose hand or leg is severed in a traffic accident will be admitted to hospital quickly, but a person with tonsillitis, hernia, varicose veins, or a squint, or a person requiring orthopaedic surgery (or plastic surgery for children, which must be done at a very early age before the child grows up with a slightly deformed minor part of the body) could have to wait five to eight years or, if we follow the example in England, 10 to 15 years.

Here is another fraudulent part of that advertisement. It is implied that in maternity cases women will have their own private doctors. This is again a fraud because women will have their own doctors for ante-natal and post-natal care—yes, but even now, the doctors' assistants or nurses take care of some of these difficulties—but at the all-important time of delivery they will be put into public hospitals because Medibank only caters for public-hospital care and they will be attended to by the first doctor who comes along. This will probably be a young resident who is one or two years out of training. The doctor may or may not be good. One thing is for certain. It will not be a doctor whom the patient knows or the patient's private doctor, as is fraudulently implied in the ads of the expensive spending programme of the Labor Government.

Let us have a look at that propaganda. Three Federal elections have been fought on the Hayden health scheme. It received considerable propaganda then. In 1973 \$500,000 of taxpayers' money was spent by the Federal Government in trying, on false premises, fraudulently to sell the Medibank scheme. And the honourable member for Rockhampton was speaking not long ago about wasting public money! This year, \$1,000,000 of taxpayers' money is being spent, again in trying

to sell Medibank on false premises. The last Gallup Poll showed that the people of Australia have good common sense because, in spite of the waste of public funds on Labor propaganda, 68 per cent of the people in Victoria last month still said that they would not accept Medibank.

The alternative to the Commonwealth Government scheme is the scheme presently operating in Queensland. Pensioners should not be made a lever in a socialist scheme to interfere with health services. That is what the Federal Government is doing. Pensioners are being made to feel scared. "Put fear into the pensioners and you can beat the Liberals every time." That is the Federal Government's plan. Pensioners should not be made such a lever. They should be free from charges in matters of health. I acknowledge that, and so do the joint Government parties.

The Queensland system has the capacity to be the best system in the world, and it has that capacity because it provides for freedom of choice. Under this scheme, people can have full cover for intermediate wards, private wards, physiotherapy and treatment by their own doctors, and they can obtain this full cover by membership of a private medical-fund scheme. If a person chooses not to pay for his health care, he can be treated in a public ward and pay for it through taxation. That is what Queensland offers—freedom of choice. And that is what the Labor Government would deny the people of Queensland, and of every other State. Although in Queensland there is this freedom of choice, 57 per cent of Queenslanders still use the private system rather than public hospitals. The remaining minority of 43 per cent includes people who qualify under repatriation and other schemes and who do not need to concern themselves with the cost of health care. The Canberra centralist bureaucrats ought to look at the Queensland situation and note that almost 60 per cent of the people have chosen private treatment in preference to a Medibank-type of scheme. There is much more that the Canberra centralists could learn from Queensland.

I now wish to turn my attention at this late stage of my speech to a specific social issue that I believe endangers liberalism. It is the question of capital punishment. Although I understand that there is no legislation on this matter pending at the moment, last year the public had an overdose of arguments in favour of capital punishment, and I believe that the liberal argument has not been prominently put.

In the system of liberalism, there is no way in which the taking of life for an offence can be countenanced. I draw the attention of the House to the words of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, in which he said that the right to life is an inalienable right. He said that life cannot be put up for forfeit or contracted away as a condition of living in society. There are those who say that capital punishment is a

deterrent. But this is proven to be not so. No criminal really expects to pay for his crime; no criminal really expects to be captured.

Let us now look at deterrents. In the United States, there has been violence in every decade. It is possibly the most violent country in the Western world, and capital punishment has always been the law in that country. There has been no deterrent effect noticeable in the United States. If capital punishment is not a deterrent, it is a case of an eye for an eye—a case of revenge. Now I know that revenge is sweet, but it is something that is personal. I know that if anything was done to the loved ones of any one of us here, myself included, we might well be moved to anger and revenge. We might well be moved to passion. But the State cannot afford the luxury of passion; it cannot afford the luxury of revenge. An individual may be excused for resorting to passion, but a State cannot. Laws must be based on reason, not emotion. If a State does not respond to reason and logic, the irrational will prevail. Where that has happened, history shows that a reign of terror has resulted.

There is another matter to be considered, and that is the value of life. If we, as a Government, say to people that we will countenance the taking of human life, then we denigrate the value of life in the eyes of other people. If the State can take a life, it shows that it holds life to be cheap. That is what I submit happened in the United States. If we cheapen human life, then we supply an example of injustice which should be avoided at all costs. If any life could be held forfeit because of an offence to the State, for what other reasons would we take a life? The State that sanctifies life sets one example to its people and the State that cheapens life sets another example again. Life is either precious or it is not. There is no room for equivocation.

Liberals believe that if the meanest member of society is safe from the supreme penalty of a vengeful State, then we have security for all. But let us look at the alternative. If one person is hanged in error, if one innocent person is hanged, not one of us is secure. Just prior to the abolition of capital punishment in the United Kingdom, Scotland Yard admitted to the hanging in error of 11 persons, and it was the abhorrence of the people to those incidents that brought about the public clamour for the abolition of capital punishment there. It is a dangerous practice that we discuss when we talk of taking human life. In accepting it, we would be turning our face to the past. If we admit that the taking of life for an offence is a solution, then we are admitting the failure of civilised society.

I should like to conclude by turning my attention to the other end of the judicial scale—summary offences. I am not prepared to say in the House at this time that evidence is manufactured; I am not prepared to say

that charge sheets are not the true belief of the prosecution. But it is probable, I think, that if laxity creeps in to charge sheets, it is more likely to be at this end of the judicial scale than in serious charges.

It is a well known fact that cases that are defended by legal counsel are more successful. This may mean that more criminals will get off if they have a clever lawyer. But I am afraid it may mean that more innocent people are convicted for lack of adequate defence. I am also sure that many people plead guilty because the penalty for the offence is less than the cost of defence. I congratulate the Minister for Justice on extending the role of public defenders as far as he has, but I implore him to extend it further.

I have stated my philosophical stance. There has been much talk here, even today, about "big 'L' Liberals" and "middle-sized 'L' Liberals" and "little 'l' Liberals". There is only one liberalism. It is the liberalism of John Locke and John Stuart Mill and those who have followed in that tradition. I hope that my statements will put an end to the ludicrous and wasteful practice of journalists and politicians running round and trying to measure the size of a man's "L".

As advised by a man whom I respect greatly, I have nailed my colours to the mast. I hope that honourable members will judge that my colours are worthy of flying close to the top of the mast, and I thank the House for the opportunity of taking part in the debate on the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Opening Speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member for Carnarvon. This is the honourable member's maiden speech. I ask the House to extend to him the traditional courtesy.

Mr. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (5.33 p.m.): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I say at the outset that, if members of the Opposition find anything obnoxious in my speech, they may interject.

I associate myself with the message of loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, Her Majesty the Queen, and I also associate my electorate with the motion. Never in the history of Australia has it been more important for us to remain loyal to our Sovereign. She stands between us and the possibility of Australia becoming a republic, and I think it is very important to remember that loyalty is a two-way process.

Sir Colin and Lady Hannah have carried out their duties conscientiously and well, and I thank them for the courtesy of having already visited my electorate.

Naturally, I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion. The manner in which they carried out their duties was a tribute to the people in their respective electorates who elected them.

As honourable members know, I follow in my father's footsteps, and I do not think I should let this moment go by without paying a tribute to the able way in which he represented the people of Carnarvon. I was amazed to hear the former Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Bulimba, say that there never has been a Cabinet Minister who suffered from overwork. I do not agree with that. I am sure the Premier does not agree with it, and I am confident that it is one reason why he found it necessary to increase the size of Cabinet to 18. Ministers do work too hard. The fact that the former Leader of the Opposition saw fit to say that none of them have suffered from hard work is an indication of his lack of knowledge about the problems of being a Minister or, for that matter, of being even a back-bencher in a country electorate.

I thank the electors of Carnarvon for the confidence they have placed in me by electing me to be their representative. I assure them I will try to carry out my duties conscientiously and well. I will represent every man, woman and child in Carnarvon, regardless of his or her political belief or station in life.

It is about time the people of Brisbane realised that country people do not have some of the services that are taken for granted in the capital city. Surely they are entitled to them. I know it is more economic to provide a service in Brisbane than it is in a country town. We have heard the Opposition speak about democracy and one vote, one value. Surely it is democratic to extend existing services in the capital city into country areas before providing any new service in the city. If we are going to have one vote, one value I can assure the House that the trend of providing new services in Brisbane before existing services are extended to country areas will continue, and that people will continue to flock to Brisbane like bees to a honey pot.

If we accept the fact that it is not good for the State—which is the important thing—to have everybody living in Brisbane, we should do more about decentralisation. We should look at ways and means of equalising freight and energy costs. In its election campaign the A.L.P. said it would equalise the price of petrol. The scheme it was putting up was one that this Government rejected because it was not practical. That is why the previous Commonwealth Government—the Liberal-Country Party Government—agreed to implement the petrol stabilisation scheme which the socialists in Canberra today so ruthlessly took away.

I say to the people of Brisbane: surely it is better to tackle existing problems rather than create new ones by unlimited growth. Imagine the hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that it would be necessary to spend on public transport and the building of freeways if Brisbane grew by another

100,000 people! This would not be good for Brisbane. While I am a member of the House it will be one of my aims to try to point out to the people of Brisbane that it would be in their own interests to press this Government to decentralise more. In any event, this Government has a proud record of decentralisation. Queensland is the most decentralised State in the Commonwealth. But the Government can go only as far as the people in the major areas of population will allow it.

All good Governments will take some notice of public opinion. We must provide further incentives for industry to decentralise, and for existing industry to remain in country areas. These could include the abolition of pay-roll tax in country areas. We could make it more attractive for country businessmen to train apprentices. At the moment many businessmen have to release their apprentices for seven weeks a year for every year of their training. They get no work out of them during that time. This is apart from public holidays and normal annual leave. Perhaps something could be done to help country businesses overcome the financial problems associated with the employment of apprentices, thereby enabling them to employ a greater number of apprentices and help to reverse the population drift to the cities.

If what I would term limited population growth could occur in Brisbane, the metropolitan area would be a much better place in which to live. Eventually it would be relatively free of pollution, it would be easier to defend and it would provide much more pleasant travelling conditions to those workers who live 10 or even 30 miles from the centre of the city. Unlike such a city-dweller, a worker in Goondiwindi, for example, has to travel only a mile or so to his employment. If the people of Brisbane demand that the State Government relocate some of its resources and thereby better its already proud record of decentralisation, this prosperous State would become an even better one to live in.

I am pleased to see the Minister for Transport in the Chamber. He has a wonderful opportunity to help bring about decentralisation in my electorate. Wallangarra is a static border town served by rail from both Queensland and New South Wales. In spite of the fact that rail traffic on the coastal line is far too heavy, a very low quantity of freight is carried on the inland line and transhipped at Wallangarra. The reason is, of course, that the facilities are just not there. Over the next few months I will be pressing the Minister for Transport to provide better facilities for railwaymen at Wallangarra so that their working conditions as well as their quality of life may be improved. The provision of better facilities would also lead to greater use of the inland line so that freight may more easily be diverted to the inland areas of the State. I realise that freight consigned

from southern cities to Brisbane should naturally be transported on the coastal line. Freight destined for other areas of the State, however, could be brought up on the inland line, thereby reducing congestion on the coastal route.

Wallangarra also has a unique water problem in that, being a border town, it is required to supply water to a meatworks located in New South Wales. The cost of a decent water reticulation scheme in Wallangarra would be approximately \$650,000, a sum that is beyond the capacity of the town's 157 ratepayers and of the New South Wales meatworks to pay. Therefore I urge the Queensland Government to liaise with the New South Wales Government with a view to providing Wallangarra with a decent water reticulation scheme.

The most populous area in my electorate is the Granite Belt, in which the major town, Stanthorpe, is a wonderful cultural centre. In the past it has enjoyed the rather doubtful reputation of being a very cold place and one that it is not pleasant to live in. I refute such a claim. I came to Stanthorpe from the heat of North Queensland, and arrived in the middle of one of its coldest winters on record. Stanthorpe is a most pleasant place and is quickly developing into a health resort and a retirement centre. I know at least two people who went to Stanthorpe on short visits and, after an improvement in their health, stayed. In fact one of them went there 50 years ago suffering extreme ill health and has recovered and has established one of the few inland postcard industries in Queensland, if not in Australia. A large number of coloured postcards are printed at Stanthorpe.

The town is a fast-growing one with a multi-racial make-up, and from this it is deriving great benefit. However, it requires industry. A fruit and vegetable processing plant is a must. As well, the wine industry will eventually expand, and I look to this Government for encouragement to these industries.

Every effort should be made to retain existing industries in Stanthorpe. In no way should we price them out of existence by requiring them to pay high freight rates. One of the major problems confronting growers around Stanthorpe at the moment is the possibility of the Australian Apple and Pear Corporation introducing an acreage levy on apples and pears grown in the Stanthorpe district. That would be a very unfair levy in Queensland. The growers are expecting the Queensland Government to stand up for their rights by telling the Federal Government that this scheme simply will not be implemented in Queensland. It seems that growers are to be charged an acreage levy despite the fact that they have a very low return per acre compared with growers in southern States. They have no representative on the Apple and Pear Corporation to stand up for their rights. Such a scheme would be

similar to basing stock returns on an acreage basis so that a man with 50,000 acres at Charters Towers would pay the same rate per acre as a man running cattle on irrigated pastures in the Lockyer district.

The cost of marketing primary produce is a problem in my electorate and all other rural communities. Primary producers would be helped greatly if fruit and vegetables now unloaded at Moolabin could be transported by rail to the Brisbane markets. While I am a member of Parliament I shall press very strongly for a rail line into the Brisbane fruit market from Moolabin. It now costs 10c a bushel merely to transport fruit and vegetables half a mile from Moolabin to the market and place it on the agent's stand. That is a ridiculous cost.

Excessive unloading and stacking charges at the Brisbane Markets pose a problem to my growers and other growers in Queensland. One reason for the trouble is that the Brisbane Market Trust has granted a monopoly in unloading and stacking to the Chamber of Fruit and Vegetable Industries. After having watched personally what happens at night, I know that it took two men 10 minutes to shift 24 half-bushel cases of produce 10 paces and it was a further five minutes before they started their next job. This is utter inefficiency, which is being passed on in excessive charges to growers. I should like the Government to use its influence with the Brisbane Market Trust to give private enterprise a go in at least part of the Brisbane Markets to see if the excessive unloading and stacking charges can be reduced.

The Texas-Inglewood district in my electorate has an education problem which should be brought to the attention of this Parliament. Both districts have grades 8, 9 and 10 facilities at their respective high tops, but no grades 11 and 12 are provided. At Texas and Inglewood there is an enrolment of 270 children in grades 8, 9 and 10. I understand that the Department of Education requires 200 students before it considers building a high school. I appeal to Parliament to help me in my endeavours to ensure that grades 11 and 12 are provided at either Texas or Inglewood, which are only 34 miles apart, with a bitumen connecting road. They are definitely within bussing distance.

The construction of the Glenlyon Dam will mean a lot to decentralisation. I know I am being parochial, but the result would be typical of what could happen if similar facilities were built in all inland areas of Queensland. Originally this dam was to be funded, in equal proportions, by the Queensland, New South Wales and Commonwealth Governments. But the Commonwealth Government welshed on the deal. Luckily for the Texas and Inglewood districts, the Governments of New South Wales and Queensland agreed to go it alone. If only the Federal Government could help a little by increasing the content of Australian

tobacco to be included in tobacco and cigarettes sold in Australia, we would have a guaranteed market for our produce as well as guaranteed water, which the Queensland and New South Wales Governments have provided despite the Federal Government's decision to pull out of the deal. Beans and grapes could also be grown, thus helping decentralisation. This example could be followed all over Western Queensland.

One problem experienced in my electorate is connected with the declaration of areas as drought stricken. I appeal to the Minister to consider the matter with a view to finding simpler procedures for declaring areas as drought stricken when the need arises. A similar problem exists with the remission of rates. The Texas-Inglewood district and the Waggamba Shire were the only areas in Queensland that did not receive really good rain last year. Because cattle from those areas were away on agistment for much of last year and cattle prices have deteriorated rapidly this year, graziers in those areas are in need of some special assistance. I have already approached the Minister about this and I trust that I will receive support from the Parliament.

Goondiwindi is another area that will benefit from the Glenlyon Dam. However, it does not have as many primary products as the Granite Belt. Therefore, the future for processing is not as bright at Goondiwindi, but I remind the Parliament that Switzerland, a completely land-locked country, has a viable export industry. It is a country that benefits from having industry to provide jobs. Surely it is possible for Goondiwindi and other inland areas of Australia, whether in my electorate or not, to benefit from some incentives that we as a Government may be able to introduce to encourage decentralisation of industry.

I realise that such moves would cost the Government money; but I believe that, rather than increase taxes, we should consider our priorities and ask, "Is the money that we are now spending being wisely spent?" I know that we are spending it much more wisely than most other Governments, but we have to return to the basic principle of producing goods. While services are necessary, services can only be provided if the goods are produced that will provide the money for those services. It is about time that priorities in this State—but more particularly in the Commonwealth—were reassessed.

Secondary industry would be established in rural areas if it were demanded. It is of no use country people demanding it. They have been doing so for years. Those honourable members representing Brisbane electorates should use their influence and say to the people of Brisbane, "Uncontrolled growth caused by a continual drift of the population to Brisbane is not good for you. In a few years' time you will be moving 30 miles away from Brisbane to buy a home, if you are not already doing so." Some people are doing

that now. Pollution is a problem. What would it matter if there were three or four smoke-stacks in Goondiwindi? Three or four more smoke-stacks in Brisbane would add to the destruction of the quality of life for people in this city.

I turn now to the cattle industry. I am sick and tired of hearing the member for Rockhampton claim that the industry asked Canberra for money at normal bank interest rates. I do not know whether that is so or not. I accept his word on that. However, the pertinent point is that, on the record of the present Canberra Government, it would be useless to ask for long-term, low-interest loans. They just would not be forthcoming. Dr. Patterson has been belting his head up against a brick wall for ages, with no luck. I hope he has some luck in the future, because I am very concerned about the cattle industry and I wish the Federal Government would give it a little more consideration.

Perhaps it is time this Government gave the lead and conducted a poll among cattlemen to decide whether they want stabilisation or not. The Department of Primary Industries has a record of all owners of live-stock and I think that the cattle growers themselves—the individuals—should be given an opportunity to vote on whether they want a stabilised industry or not.

All primary producers should have some say in what they receive for their labour. No other industry would tolerate the conditions under which primary producers and their employees have to work. Primary industry experiences great heights and low troughs. The workers do not have security of employment—and security is one of the basic needs of any individual.

People in my electorate realise that country towns are largely dependent on the prosperity of the surrounding district. Similarly, people in the surrounding district know that they are largely dependent on local towns for the provision of services and amenities. For too long has the city been fighting the country, and vice versa. We are interdependent. The trouble is that not all the services that city people enjoy are available in country areas. Small towns and communities, such as Cement Mills, Watson's Crossing, Yelarbon and Kurumbul should have the same services as the people in Brisbane. If it is uneconomic for us to provide them, the people there should be compensated in some other manner.

The previous Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra tried to do this. It was accused of giving hand-outs to country areas. But what has happened to the economy since that Government lost office and the hand-outs, as they were referred to by the A.L.P., have been stopped? The chickens have come home to roost. We are facing massive unemployment. This has happened because the incentive to produce in both the country and the city has been taken away and people no longer have the will to employ as many men as they used to.

Local government is the cause of great concern. Its loan debt has risen dramatically in recent years and it should be given a rightful and known share of Federal tax moneys. I believe the money should be distributed through the States because it is not known with any certainty whether it is constitutional for the Federal Government to deal directly with local government in the financial field. The present structure is already geared for the State Government to hand money to the local authorities, so why should the Commonwealth duplicate the procedure?

We should encourage Canberra to give more power back to the States. I challenge Opposition members to use their influence with their mates in Canberra to get government back to the people. If Canberra will give us more power, I hope that the Queensland Parliament will hand more power back to local authorities so that decisions can be made on the spot by people with a knowledge of local facts.

One thing was brought home to me very convincingly when I was electorate secretary for my father. If a problem was sent to Brisbane I received an answer within a week or a month. However, some matters I sent to Canberra five months before I resigned had not then been replied to. I do not blame the Labor Government for that. I am merely pointing out that this is what happens when government gets a long way from the people. We should do everything in our power to bring government back to local people.

Country roads, especially rural arterial roads, are suffering from lack of funds owing to the Federal Government's policy of directing vast amounts of money to be spent on national highways. It suits that Government to do this. But, in my electorate, there is barely enough money to maintain existing highways.

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

Mr. McKECHNIE: Before the dinner recess, I was speaking about the problem of country roads, especially rural arterial roads, suffering from a lack of funds because of the Federal Government's policy of spending vast amounts of the available finance on national highways.

I now pass to the problem posed by kangaroos. This is a very real problem in my electorate and in many other western areas. I might say that the kangaroos in my electorate are like A.L.P. members in Canberra; when they are in manageable proportions they are a joy to behold, but when they are in excessive numbers they create havoc and waste wherever they choose to govern or graze.

Schools in my electorate have some additional problems which I am sure are experienced in many other schools in other electorates. The shortage of remedial

teachers in country areas is a problem to which the Government should give close attention.

School buses are necessary for the transportation of country children to school, and it is my opinion that the Government should encourage the Education Department to pay two rates for the operation of school buses. One rate should be for bus proprietors operating on sealed roads and the other for those operating on unsealed roads. Two different cost structures are involved, and bus operators should be given justice and paid adequate remuneration for their services.

The people of Goondiwindi look forward to the time when the Government provides money for the establishment of a science block at their high school. This was promised some time ago but, because of shortage of funds, it has been postponed. I hope the Government sees to it that the building is started in the very near future because of both the unemployment situation in Goondiwindi and the need for the building.

Although I do not agree with the approach of the honourable member for Rockhampton to the beef industry, I agree with him on the problem of school textbooks. There are too many of them; they cost parents too much; and, what is more, many of them are full of rubbish. I have read some of them, and I think it is time that the Minister for Education looked into the problem. I am sure he will do so as he has been receptive to the representations of the many Government members who have already approached him on this matter. He will make a very good Education Minister and I am sure he will straighten out this difficulty.

More money should be made available to assist parents in isolated areas who cannot afford to send their children away to receive higher education. In addition to being separated from their children, parents who do send them away to be educated have to suffer financially.

The honourable member for Kurilpa spoke at length about the housing problem. I should like to endorse what he said. Housing is a basic need, and I think that we as a Government must provide more funds for housing, possibly at the expense of some other Government department. Teachers in country areas do have housing problems, and I assured teachers in my electorate that I would make representations on their behalf to the appropriate Minister.

I made brief mention of electricity when I was speaking on the equalisation of energy costs. There are people in my electorate and other areas of Western Queensland who have no reticulated electricity supply. I think it is wrong that, because of a shortage of finance, they should be made to do without electricity while electricity is put into holiday homes on the coast.

Mr. Jensen: What are the people of your electorate doing about one vote one value?

Mr. McKECHNIE: The whole purpose of our being in Government is to try to give decent representation to all Queenslanders; but it is by no means as easy to represent a large country electorate as it is to represent a Brisbane electorate that one could pedal a bicycle round before breakfast.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Acting Leader of the Opposition to restrain himself.

Mr. McKECHNIE: Death duties impose an unnecessary burden on many widows and widowers, and I hope that this is another area in which the Government will review its priorities.

I notice that the Treasurer said recently that it may be impossible for the Government to remove road transport permit fees in the present year. I say to him that the people in my electorate, and I think the people generally, would much rather he took money from another department and eliminated road tax than postpone that election pledge for even 12 months.

The women of my electorate are heartily sick of the way the Federal Government is leading the nation. They are tired of the corrupt way they are encouraged to bring up their children. While I am a member of this Assembly, I will try to put forward a Christian point of view. That is the view I expressed in my election campaign; it is the view that I am sure most of the people of my electorate expect of me.

Last night I attended a function in Stanthorpe at which the Lions selected their candidate for the Youth of the Year award, and I am sure that the youth of this State is not nearly as bad as it is painted in the newspapers. I think all youth needs is a little bit of leadership, which I hope members of this Parliament will give.

I thank honourable members very much for listening to me so attentively.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (7.22 p.m.): I am delighted to take the opportunity afforded by this debate to pay the traditional courtesies to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Colin Hannah. I think it is particularly important in today's political climate, which is very threatening to all the established traditions and institutions, to recognise that the Governor, in his person in this State, represents the direct and absolute link between Her Majesty and this sovereign Parliament. It is very important that we remember what the role of the Governor is and bear that aspect in mind when we see what the self-styled Australian Government, which must be the most un-Australian Government ever to be inflicted on this unhappy nation, is trying to do to established institutions and traditions.

I very gladly congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion, not because they are women—I do not want to be paternalistic

or patronising—but because they delivered good addresses, containing good material, and spoke well, as did so many other members who have made their maiden speeches in this debate. In fact, honourable members have been fortunate in hearing some wonderfully good speeches.

The Leader of the Opposition—I refer to the real Leader of the Opposition, not the honourable member for Bundaberg—both in this debate and in the debate on the election of the Speaker, which offered particular opportunities, made some very extravagant assertions. As usual, he went on not at 19 to the dozen but at 119 to the dozen, and foamed and fulminated about the Premier, so much so that at one stage I wondered whether someone should give him a saliva test.

The Leader of the Opposition does not seem to remember that there was an election last year—although, if he looks at the Opposition benches, he should remember it constantly. In his speech on the election of the Speaker, he went on about the Premier's stance and the Government's stance against Labor's socialism and centralism, saying what a terrible thing it was and how awful it was that the Premier should continue in that stance. Does not the honourable gentleman know that the election last year was all about the Premier and his stand against the Labor Government in Canberra, and the centralism and socialism of that Government? Does he not know that the election was all about what this Government did in terms of defying the central Government? Let us cast our minds back—it was not so long ago—and remember that it was a State election and that the Prime Minister saw that election as a challenge. He was prepared to accept it as a test. He made the statement that he would accept the results of the election as a decision of the electorate. In plain words, the Prime Minister, who likes to sound so wise, is, of course, the most gullible fool that ever strutted across the political stage. He swallowed the bait hook, line and sinker. He turned the State election into a full-scale replica of a Federal poll. What happened? Labor suffered a most abysmal and cataclysmic defeat. It was literally the State A.L.P.'s Armageddon. It was the greatest rout that any political party has suffered in any Parliament in Australia for more than three generations. Honourable members opposite now sit as the sole survivors of the stricken crew. Indeed, right now they have somehow whittled themselves down to a mere trio. After the brave comments of the Leader of the Opposition about how good a showing this Opposition would make—although short in numbers, long in talent, initiative and boldness—its performance tonight in having only three members in the Chamber is quite deplorable.

Let me point out that the Leader of the Opposition himself is the greatest political accident of all time. He is Leader of the

Opposition only by dint of a series of political accidents that would surely make records for the Guinness Book of Records. That man leading his sorry, tattered little team has the gall to talk about the obsessive concern of the Premier and his Government with confrontation with Canberra.

I honestly think that the honourable gentleman is still in a state of shock following the last State election. He has not really recovered; he has a memory block; he is trying to put that awful event behind him. The plain fact is that the December poll was all about confrontation. The electorate showed quite massively, almost with violent emphasis, that it wanted our style of confrontation with Canberra. It showed that it wanted us to fight Labor's socialist blitzkrieg. The electorate most certainly showed in fullest measure that it did not want socialism and it did not want centralism. It did not want bureaucratic paternalism, either. Most certainly it did not want an arrogant, stupid, central Government lurching from crisis to crisis as it tried to gain ever more power for itself. Most certainly the electorate in Queensland showed in a two-to-one measure that it did not want a Prime Minister who preached austerity and wage control for others, but himself operated like a Byzantine emperor. Above all the electorate showed that it did not want an A.L.P. that was prepared to fawn on its federal masters and give this State away. That is what happened in the poll held in December last year. One would think that the Leader of the Opposition and his small, rattle-taggle band would get with it and get out of this cuckoo cloud-land they are living in where they are continuing to serve up the same nonsense they served before the poll—the nonsense that brought them to such total disaster.

For the sake of this Parliament and this Government it is important to make a couple of small references to that election. The Government victory was so colossal that it inevitably poses—to me, anyhow—the problems that are always generated by gross imbalance. I foresee that we are going to need very wise counsels in the top echelons of Government, and very bold steps by Cabinet to delegate real responsibilities to a swollen, adventurous, impatient, and perhaps sometimes restless Government back bench.

We need to establish quite urgently useful parliamentary committees—these are always more necessary when there is no Upper House, as is the case in Queensland—and they must not be envisaged by the Executive branch of the Government as just toys to keep the back-benchers playing happily and out of Ministers' hair (that is, out of the hair of those who have it) but as genuine meaningful extensions of the apparatus, power and machinery of Parliament. It is only by recognition now of the problems that undoubtedly can come from too much success that we will ensure

that overweening executive power will not be tempted to run amok in a Parliament in which, as has been demonstrated tonight, the Opposition both in numbers and sense of purpose is a mere sorry travesty of what an Opposition should be.

Another point needs to be made about the election, and I make it whether some find it palatable or unpalatable. It is this: essentially the election was a victory for the Premier. I as a Liberal say this and recognise it, because the undeniable fact of the poll is that the National Party, as the Country Party is now termed, did extraordinarily well, both vis-a-vis the Liberal Party and its new essays into urban areas. Indeed, National Party members sit here as representatives of an Ipswich seat and Wynnum. The result is that we Liberals in this coalition are relatively in a more inferior position in terms of numbers than in the previous coalition. I must accept the weight of the viewpoint that has already been expressed publicly by a large section of my party, that is, that with another great victory like last year's the Liberal Party may well find that we don't need defeat to face party disaster.

Those like myself who have spent many years fighting for the Liberal cause and who get extremely worried when things go wrong ask ourselves: how has it happened? Why in a massive Government swing were we Liberals bested in so many areas which hitherto were Liberal preserves? The answer is clear, direct and quite uncomplicated. For a long, long time now there have been many situations in which the top echelons of Liberals have been bland, ambiguous and ambivalent where essential Liberal philosophic tenets have been involved. The result is that we are reaching the point where people wonder whether there is the deep yawning chasm separating us from Labor that there used to be.

I do not name the situations of the moment that cause people to think this, but I could, for I have taken up the Liberal cudgels on every such occasion, and, of course, have accordingly been rewarded with total political oblivion! But in the same period in which we have had this ambivalent attitude on the part of many top Liberals, the Premier has been bold, resolute, stubborn and intransigent—perhaps too much so for many people. However, on the great issue of the day—centralism versus individual freedom—he has been able to convey to the electorate with force and total conviction where he stood and why he stood there. The December poll showed with absolutely dynamic force that his stand is what the electorate approves; what he says is what the people want to hear. The members of my party must face facts if we are to improve our position in the future. Those Liberals who are deeply concerned about the party's long-term well-being—I was one of the founders of the Liberal Party in this State—must ask ourselves, "Have

we been right in abdicating the very heart-land Liberal philosophy and so creating the vacuum into which the Premier quite rightly, promptly and forcefully moved?"

It was significant that the Opposition's gambit in this Parliament should have been its offer of support to the Liberals for a separate Government, on the grounds that the Liberals had shown they were happy to get along with Labor, that we were not as obsessively dedicated to fighting socialism and centralism and to defending the federal system as were the Premier and the National Party. I make it very clear that if some people in my party express this view, it must not be taken as the general Liberal view. It is not. It is most certainly not mine. I, for one, am utterly opposed to any sacrifice of essential federalism as it is provided in the Australian Constitution and, as has been endorsed by some 30 referenda, six of them by overwhelming margins in the last 18 months. I am utterly opposed to any sacrifice of federalism for financial baits (which are our money, anyway) that Canberra dangles before us.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Would you classify the honourable member for South Brisbane as a dangerous revisionist of the Liberal Party policy and platform?

Mr. PORTER: I think I should classify the honourable member who asked that question as a fool, but probably that is an unparliamentary reference.

I make it absolutely clear that in talking in this way I will not be a party to any quiescent policies in this fight for the preservation of the federal system. All that I am saying has particular significance to newly elected honourable members on this side of the House. I am sure that many will have acknowledged that they have been washed in, as it were—I do not say this in any derogatory way—by an abnormally high political tide. They run the risk of being washed out again if we are unable to ensure that the tide continues to run very strongly in our favour. Therefore, any Liberals (who are in the position of greatest peril), who put themselves in the situation where the electorate doubts whether we are as adamantly opposed to Labor as another party give a passport to political oblivion for many promising new young members.

That would be a great pity in view of some of the speeches made today. Obviously, this Parliament received a splendid influx of new members from the last election. I do not think that any Parliament in Australian history has ever been so richly advantaged at the one time by so many young and able people as this Parliament was following the recent election.

At this point I think it useful to say something to my colleagues in the National Party. I do not mean my colleagues here because I know that they all want unity. To those outside, where organisation tends to have a

tougher, rougher attitude—where they see vested interest perhaps in a different way, and take a strong party stance—I say that politics have never been more polarised than they are today. People want one party opposed to socialism. I can understand the National Party's feelings that it has the wind with it and that this is the time to make every post a winning post, but I want to make it quite clear that the circumstances which created their strong position are not immutable. Indeed, they must change. It is possible that they will change vastly, and quickly. Today's advantage for any party on this side of the fence may be tomorrow's disadvantage. This is not the time for parties on our side of the fence to cannibalise each other. As I say, politics were never more polarised than they are today. If people who want protection against socialism see the two main parties who stand as the bulwark between them and socialism withdrawing from the great fight against the centralist octopus and occupying themselves with aggrandising themselves, at the expense of each other, they will be extremely disappointed in us. And we will be judged accordingly.

It is quite clear that not only the election results in December but, indeed, all election results in recent years show that voters do not want the Labor Party's programme. That is so crystal clear that I cannot think that even honourable gentlemen on the Opposition benches would dare to claim otherwise. But the election results also showed that we can get a major party now which gets just over 33½ per cent of the total vote, that great masses of the people are fed up to the back teeth with major parties in the way of any strict adherence to narrow, party policies and loyalties. A good third of the electorate is now prepared to freewheel from one end of the political spectrum to the other. In effect, what these people are saying to us all is, "We are vitally concerned with great policies and if your parties put selfish party advantage before true national interest growing out of these policies then a plague on all your houses."

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I have been in this House for some years now and I have been saying this kind of thing for some time. The honourable member for Archerfield says that I am a relic of the 19th century. Has he, too, forgotten that there has been an election which overwhelmingly endorsed the point that I have been taking here week after week, month after month and year after year? He represents a point of view that has been so disastrously rejected that he should go back to the hole from which he came and draw the shutter over it.

The necessarily vast change in the composition of this Parliament has resulted in many new members. Some of them may find, as the honourable member for Archerfield seems to suggest, that I am an archaic eccentric, but let me make quite plain what

I stand for as a member of this Parliament. My first loyalty is to the people; my second loyalty is to my party (I would hope that those two loyalties do not diverge; but, if they do, my loyalty is to people); and my third loyalty is to particular political figures.

I stress that attempts to pressure members on this side of the House into any rigid doctrinaire strait-jackets is illogical, illiberal and unwanted by my party and by the electorate in general. That is not to say, of course, that all of us here should be a collection of individuals going our own way—of course there must be mass agreement on a great range of issues—but it must also mean that there is an acceptance of dissent where that is based on deep conviction on matters of principle. That must always be acknowledged and accepted, or the Liberal Party is indeed in a bad way. On the subject of loyalty to people—loyalty is a two-way street; if it is to flow up from the rank and file, then it must flow down from the top to the rank and file.

I wish to refer very briefly to two matters which are to me a classic illustration of the political polarisation that I have been talking about that has emerged from the current scene. The first one is the matter of the New South Wales Parliament's replacement of the erstwhile Senator Murphy. I was one of those who rejected from the outset the convoluted notion that there was some noble, traditional, unwritten constitutional compact involved and that we as gentlemen were committed in advance and honour bound not to break this compact, convention, tradition—call it what you will. I now ask the House, including the Opposition: what compact? What convention? What tradition? What agreement? There is no unwritten constitutional convention on this matter. There never was. There is no agreement, written or unwritten, explicit or implicit. If there were, it would have been produced by now. There is no compact. A compact with whom? Is there a compact with the electors at the previous Senate election in New South Wales that, because they elected a Labor Senator, when a Labor Senator goes the State Parliament is in duty bound to put back another Labor Senator? If that was the compact, who broke it? Mr. Whitlam broke it. The erstwhile Senator Murphy broke it. They repudiated the compact. There is certainly nothing in honour, in propriety or in constitutional law that touches the New South Wales Government in this matter.

Of course, when we see that Mr. Whitlam put Mr. Murphy on the High Court to stack it—to tilt it a little more towards the centralist aim—then it was inevitable and proper that the New South Wales Government should take action.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Row): Order! There is too much cross-firing in the Chamber.

Mr. PORTER: This is very much a Johnny-come-lately in so-called traditions and conventions. I say there is no convention, and no tradition. It is purely a matter of convenience for political parties following Labor's introduction of proportional representational voting, or a very peculiar form of it, for the Senate in 1949. One might in ordinary circumstances see this as a convenient arrangement; but to believe that what might be seen in most circumstances as a convenient arrangement has the sanctity of a convention involving high principle is, to me, a classic case of not being able to see the wood for the trees. One might accept, as I say, that for the sake of convenience to political parties normally the arrangement or the tradition or the compact—whatever one likes to call it—is followed; but to elevate it to the level of an honourable compact is nonsense. A rational man does not make compacts with a robber baron. Otherwise, while he is considering protocol and honour, the baron will have raped the wife, ravaged the daughter and pillaged the estate. The Whitlam Government is the robber baron in this context.

I ask again: why was Mr. Murphy moved to the High Court? As a reward justly earned? A reward for what—the A.S.I.O. raids, his centralist legislation or his moves to open the flood-gates to obscenity? Was that his reward? Of course not. I say he is there to tilt the High Court scales, which Mr. Whitlam wants, remember, to be the sole arbiter in all the States endeavouring to retain the federal system. He is there to tilt the scales further towards centralism and further away from federalism. And remember, as I think the Minister for Justice said, there is in fact no limit to the number of High Court judges that the Federal Government can appoint, if it has the numbers.

The New South Wales Premier and Parliament were utterly right to do what they did. To do anything else would be to play the dispicable role of a craven victim who lies supine whilst his assassin cuts his throat. This Government quite rightly and strongly supported Mr. Lewis in the early stages and I am proud to think that I may have played some small part in generating this support and strengthening the New South Wales hand. I congratulate the Minister for Justice, who spoke out so strongly over the week-end on this matter.

The other matter of principle which exemplifies the polarisation of politics in this country that I want to refer to is Medibank. What is Medibank? It is an attempt to foist upon us a system which is the very essence of the socialist dream. It is the socialist Utopia—something for nothing. It is something for nothing, of course, that has to be paid for at huge expense out of the public purse. Medibank will create a huge bureaucracy. It will set up a complex piece of machinery, and once it is going no new Government would dare to dismantle it. It has no known outer limits to its costs, and

no known inner limits. It will make doctors dependent on the public purse. It will lead to deteriorated hospital and medical services as every country in the world that has tried the system has found to its very sorry cost.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That's not true.

Mr. PORTER: Not true? Could the honourable member tell me which country at the moment is not running into total trouble with its nationalised health services because of cost? The United Kingdom is dismantling it; Canada is dismantling it and New Zealand—

Mr. Wright: Contrast it with America and tell us the costs over there.

Mr. PORTER: There is nothing in terms of medical costs that cannot be coped with under our present system.

Medibank is the very epitome of what Labor wants to do in this country in the name of a new humane egalitarianism. It is also the very epitome of what we, as the protectors of a free society, should want to stop. For us to accept Medibank and to embrace this extravagant, unwanted, unworkable and bigoted proposition, merely because the State will get some money, would be contemptible, and, in a political sense, abysmally stupid.

A story told by Lord Beaverbrook was that he was at a dinner sitting next to a pretty young lady who was talking about the new women's world of that day. He eventually got tired of this so he said, "Madam, if I offered you £100,000 would you sleep with me for one night? Nobody need know." She said, "£100,000. I would have to consider it." He said, "Suppose I offered you £5." She said, "What do you think I am?" He said, "We have established what you are. We are now bargaining about the price."

Exactly the same thing will apply to this Government if we accept Medibank. If we tell the electorate that all the things we have stood for over the past two years are now untrue, we must not be surprised if the electorate see us as prostituting our principles if the money offered is big enough. They would believe that all we have said, all we have stood for, all we have fought for, and all we went to the election on and on which we were given a tremendous mandate, was so much eye-wash and cynical opportunism. I believe that the electorate would feel very strangely about us from then on, and we certainly would not be able to complain if, from then on, the electorate took us at our own valuation and, at the next poll, judged us accordingly.

Should we embrace Medibank, which is the very diadem in the socialist A.L.P.'s glittering array of welfare treasure trove, we will be damned from then on as false defenders of the individual free-enterprise faith. The Premier, above all, is the man who will be most damaged. His great

strength, and the thing that brought us such success at the last election, was his capacity to project himself to the people as a man of honour, of iron principle, and of steadfast purpose, and, if he now permits himself to appear as just another politician whose principles collapse when enough money is waved in front of him, it would be a dreadful thing for all of us. The effects that would flow from it would be tremendous. The significance of such an event is so monstrous, and the implications so horrible, as to be terrifying. Every member in this House who, on the 1972 figures, had a marginal seat could well be threatened at another election, and every new member who won a seat from Labor last year would really have cause for worry.

Why should anyone even contemplate Medibank? That is what I cannot understand. Is it for the money? Does anyone seriously think that a Federal Labor Government that has to retrieve some ground in Queensland would refuse to give money to this State whilst giving it to other States? Does anyone believe that we would get whatever blame or guilt came from this? I tell the House that the Federal Labor Government has to look after Queensland, whether it wants to or not, or it will lose every seat in this State. Instead of six Senate seats out of ten, the Government parties will win seven. I remind the House that on the last State election figures we would have won seven Senate seats out of 10. Let no-one imagine that that could not happen.

I say that if we succumb to the Lorelei song about Medibank merely to get money, we will be playing, I believe, a Judas role to those sister States and Governments that have announced that they will not accept it, and we will be pulling the rug from under our Federal colleagues who may find it necessary to go to the people this year. It would make us totally contemptible. I say to the Premier and Cabinet, "Don't do it!" I for one—and I know there are others who feel the same way—will have no part of it, and I would well have to consider my part in the Government if this sickening about-face took place.

I feel strongly about this, and I want noted what I say, which I believe also represents the view of others in this House. If accepting Medibank were necessary in order to obtain this money, I say that honour and political principle both require that we still turn it down. But when elementary political common sense suggests that it is not necessary, and that the money will not be withheld because the Federal Government could not afford to do that in the present political situation, we should not touch the proposition with a 40 ft. pole.

Earlier in this speech I said that I believe it to be imperative for the Liberal Party to return to first principles. I believe that it is essential that Liberals not only enunciate unequivocal tenets of faith but that they also

act so as to make the electorate believe that they would translate those philosophic beliefs into legislative and administrative action when given the chance. I feel that over recent years we on this side of politics have too easily fallen for the A.L.P. three-card trick. We have believed that their give-away policies have popular appeal, so we have adopted similar policies. By imitating Labor, I believe we fall into the error of over-valuing economic man and undervaluing the spirit of man.

All of us must agree—there cannot be any argument amongst honourable members on either side of the Chamber—that to seek to abolish the extremes of want, disease, squalor and ignorance is a very noble aim. But it will never be achieved by purely economic means, and all history shows that. In the final analysis, these things will be overcome only by community self-control, by the helpfulness that each member of the community is prepared to display to other members. And if we do not recognise this inexorable fact of history, then we are going to share with Labor some of the responsibility for the expansion of the permissive society, because the permissive society is really an extremely reactionary credo, in which our young are officially taught—and this happens in many of our teaching institutions—to despise the virtues of thoughtfulness, truth, honesty, courage and industry that over generations have built the house in which civilised man lives and has his being.

Mr. Wright: I hope the teachers read this.

Mr. PORTER: I sincerely hope they do.

Mr. Wright: It is a serious accusation.

Mr. PORTER: In my view, any attempt to put excessive and disproportionate emphasis, as do other major parties besides my own, on the purely economic aspects of our corporate life is very wrong. Man does not live by bread alone. But, unfortunately, in recent years we have tended to become more and more concerned with the economic aspect of life, and elections have, therefore, tended to become contests of competing packages of enticing give-aways, all paid for out of the public purse, competing with each other for votes. It is quite inevitable that, in this context, election campaigns tend more and more to raise expectations that cannot be fulfilled; hence they generate grievances and discontents, and that is precisely what we are suffering at the present time.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What you are suggesting is: hovels on earth but mansions in the sky.

Mr. PORTER: The honourable member is so full of "pie in the sky" that he can only make rude, uncouth noises.

I believe that today's fashionable myth that the great majority of people see economic growth and ever-widening welfare services as all-important is utterly and totally wrong. I most certainly do not believe that the people

think that; such a belief shows a profound disregard for man's innate yearning for worth-while achievement.

In any case, let us just look at the facts for a moment. If anybody believes that an improvement in material well-being is the gateway to heaven on earth, what are the facts? Real incomes per head throughout the western communities have risen to levels that would have been beyond the wildest dreams of anybody a couple of generations ago. Budgets for services such as education and welfare have risen astronomically; but, at the same time, so have delinquency, truancy, vandalism, hooliganism and illiteracy. Teenage pregnancies are rising; so are drunkenness, drug addiction, sexual offences and crimes of sadism. All these things are increasing while material well-being is rising.

I say it is high time that parties and political leaders in our part of the political spectrum returned to the old truths and re-established faith in the old virtues and gave people once again a sense of purpose and need beyond the mere satisfying of selfish wants.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. PORTER: Members of the A.L.P. are the greatest destroyers of character and morale that this country has ever known. They are the direct descendants of the Bukharinites and Leninists, who have made such a mess of the European world.

If we allow people to believe that the only thing that matters in life is the satisfying of their own wants and their own desires, we will be supporting the "pleasure principle", which suggests that the only thing that matters is what you want—your own selfish desires—and which is infinitely destructive of all that is best in the human race. Man is a creature of challenge. Once we remove that challenge, character withers.

Liberalism for me was once very deeply concerned with man's character. When Sir Robert Menzies, (Mr. Menzies, as he was), founded the Liberal Party, he said that our beliefs would appeal to all people because they were of the very essence of the spirit of man. They were once; they must be again. The time for Liberals to see the writing on the wall is long overdue, and the time for us to return to our old and established principles is also long overdue.

Mr. TENNI (Barron River) (8.1 p.m.): I desire at the outset to associate myself with the motion of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen so ably moved by the honourable member for Mourilyan and seconded by the honourable member for Salisbury. In doing so I affirm and place on record the allegiance to the Crown shared by the major proportion of electors of Barron River. Allegiance to the Crown, which is a symbol of our democratic parliamentary system of government,

is more important than ever when all nations in the world are going through an unstable and uncertain period of government.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office. I hope that you can bring some semblance of order and control during the parliamentary sittings. In the last few weeks we have witnessed through the media conduct in Federal Parliament which can bring only scorn and disrespect on the Federal governing party which allows such rabble behaviour. I consider that all members should support you in any attempt you make to keep order in this House.

I thank all branch members and supporters of the National Party in the Barron River electorate, my wife Dawn, my two campaign directors, Percy Hansen and Gordon Venables, my Premier, Doug Anthony and Senator Ron Maunsell for their efforts in making possible my election for the seat of Barron River.

My electorate of Barron River covers an area of 1,810 square miles. Barron River is a heavily populated area, taking in Mareeba, Kuranda, Mossman, Port Douglas, portion of Cairns and the northern beaches. The electorate has a tremendous tourist potential, with such places as Kuranda, the Barron Falls and the coastal strip from Cairns north to the Daintree River—a coastline which is a mere 10 to 20 miles from the Great Barrier Reef.

My electorate has tremendous agricultural potential, with Cairns and Mossman as sugar areas; Daintree, Molloy, Julatten and Mareeba for beef cattle and dairying; and Mareeba for tobacco, which is worth \$21,000,000 a year. The area has great potential for seed-growing stock-feed, vegetables, soya beans, peanuts, timber, sorghum and maize.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. As this is the maiden speech of the honourable member for Barron River, I ask honourable members to extend to him the courtesy of hearing him in silence.

MR. TENNI: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But do not let the Labor fellows worry you; they do not worry me.

Mareeba is a railhead and the nearest centre to a vast mineral field in the hinterland, with opportunities for discovery of gold, tin, scheelite, bismuth, copper coal and lime.

Prior to 1972 our cattle, seed and mining industries were booming, but Federal policy has shattered these industries. Primary producers in my area who have no income cannot claim social services from the Federal Government, and must face poverty for their families as they are not entitled to social service hand-outs received by the average loafer in the street who does not wish to work, the hippie and a great section of the Aborigines. Restrictions in the building industry mean recession and unemployment for our timber workers.

Local highlights in the area are the Mareeba rodeo, which is one of the biggest in Australia, the Mareeba tobacco sales and the Cairns "Fun in the Sun" festival. It is unfortunate that in the summer months our beaches are plagued by the deadly sea wasp. I would push for more research into this problem as well as into the problem created by the crown of thorns starfish. These two menaces have an adverse effect on the ever-growing tourist industry in my area.

I am conscious of the honour bestowed on me as the elected representative for the Barron River electorate, which was held by the Labor Party for countless years. It is my intention to get things on the move in Barron River and to see the area developed into one of the most prosperous in Australia.

My whole outlook in business has been service to people, and that brought success. My business activities, which covered an area north from Babinda and west on the Cape York Peninsula, were successful and were built from the ground up by my personal efforts. It is my intention in my term of office to give service to my electors and at all times to consider the welfare of my fellow man. On my election I, honouring an electoral promise, resigned from my business as managing director.

MR. K. J. HOOPER: There are only two in the business.

MR. TENNI: Unlike some A.L.P. members who have been in this House and who as school-teachers bludged on the Government before they entered Parliament, I was a businessman.

Opposition Members interjected.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Row): Order! Honourable members will cease interjecting.

MR. TENNI: During my working life I joined charitable, social and local government associations. I became chairman of the Mareeba Shire Council, which covers an area of more than 20,000 square miles, and chairman of the local ambulance committee. I was also a member of school committees and of homes for the aged committees.

Honourable Members interjected.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I would point out to the honourable member for Barron River that his earlier remark provoked considerable interjection. I ask him to be more guarded in his comments.

MR. TENNI: My local business interests as well as my local government and welfare work have given me local knowledge, which, along with my love of North Queensland and my untiring efforts to serve my electors, will make it possible for me to be a successful member for Barron River.

On behalf of my electorate I must speak out as forcefully as I can on the deterioration of its roads. Prior to 1972 sufficient money was available to carry out a programme of bituminising the main roads. Progress was slow, but at least some maintenance work was carried out. New work was also being done slowly. Prior to 1972 we were going ahead, but now we are going downhill fast.

The construction of a new bridge over the Barron River at Stratford, the alleviation of flooding of Thomatis Creek, the widening of the Kuranda-Mareeba road, the work on the Rex Highway, and the work on the Daintree road and bridges, the Chillagoe road and the Cooktown road are just a few of the major works programmes that should be continued if not completed. I am determined to get these programmes going in the interests of my electorate.

We know that the Federal Government is to set up a number of growth centres. In fact, Queensland's second-largest city, Townsville, has been selected as such a centre. Are we going to allow our bigger towns to become bigger, or is it better to promote growth centres in smaller areas? We must push to populate the Far North if only for defence. Let us be fair dinkum about decentralisation.

Over the years millions of dollars have been spent on immigration, and in many instances a number of people who have been brought to Australia will do nothing to lift our standards. Let us spend similar amounts on increased baby bonuses and on encouragement to wives to stay at home and raise our best citizens, our young Australians.

Another problem in North Queensland relates to education. Some of our schools need replacing and further school buildings are required. Old schools such as the one at Mt. Melloy should be rebuilt. I shall work to rectify these conditions. At the same time, business people in my electorate complain about the quality of education and the abilities of school-leavers whom they employ. Our education methods leave a lot to be desired. Our teachers continually request better conditions while our business people request better-educated school-leavers. As the knowledge of school-leavers has deteriorated in the past 10 years, I believe that more pressure must be put on teachers to do a better job. A better method of education must be evolved. If we cannot improve on our new system let us go back to the old system.

Mr. Moore: Teach them to spell.

Mr. TENNI: That is correct. The proof of education is to be found in the efficiency and knowledge of our school-leavers.

Another problem in my electorate is beach erosion. The Beach Protection Authority controls most of the beaches in my electorate. It is trying to introduce buffer zones that are to extend inland from 50 to 400

metres from high-water mark. I appreciate that, in buffer zones, approval of the Beach Protection Authority is required for building on existing blocks of land, and that no alteration can be made in the way of rezoning any area of land presently in a proposed buffer zone. As a Government, we should believe in democracy and free enterprise. I do not think we should worry about the area inland from high-water mark. We are responsible for the area below high-water mark and should leave the rest to private enterprise.

If a person wishes to build on the sea-front, he should accept responsibility for beach erosion. He cannot expect taxpayers generally to subsidise him because he wishes to have a sea breeze or a sea outlook from his front patio. He should be advised by councils that he is responsible for the control of beach erosion on his own block and that taxpayers and ratepayers cannot be responsible financially for remedying or protecting his mistake. Any new beaches opened up should have a parkland area at least 200 metres wide along the foreshore. That would create an automatic buffer zone between the sea and any new developments and would provide beautiful picnic areas for residents to use. I do not believe that we should tell private enterprise what to do on its own land. We should keep our noses out of it.

I am very concerned about the poor reception of black-and-white TV in parts of my electorate, in particular, in the Stratford, Freshwater and Daintree areas, and in other isolated areas in the Cape York Peninsula, which are outside my electorate. People in these areas have limited avenues of entertainment. When they read of the millions of dollars spent on colour TV by the Federal Government, they get the idea that the Federal Labor Government has forgotten them. These people should receive every consideration as they are developing isolated areas. Our governing body talks about decentralisation, yet we have been neglecting people who are trying to develop isolated areas. I suggest that pressure should be brought to bear on the Federal Government to rectify this neglect of people in isolated areas.

I come now to problems associated with the Queensland Railway Department. I, with many other people—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Row): Order! I again ask honourable members to extend to the honourable member the courtesy of hearing him in silence.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: He should not be provocative.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will decide that.

Mr. TENNI: I, and many other people, have received poor service, and, at times, insulting remarks from some members of the railway staff.

We sometimes see many of these employees wasting time and showing no interest in their work. A campaign should be started amongst Queensland Government railway employees to keep the Railway Department the top means of transport in our State. The employees should remember the tactics of the waterside workers years ago, which led to other methods being used and eventually a great reduction in the number of such employees. The railway workers should see that the move by the Labor Party in Queensland to open inter-port shipping to the Australian National Line would drastically reduce the number of railway employees.

I know that the majority of Queensland railwaymen are conscientious, and this is their time to move. They can compete with road transport and, with a little effort, come out well on top. Then there would be no need to open interport shipping and there would be no reduction in railway staff. If the railways could be run on the lines of a private-enterprise undertaking, they would run at a profit and the railway employees would be happier working for an efficient, well-run department rather than one which is considered to be inefficient and badly run.

Mr. Yewdale: That is a reflection on the Minister.

Mr. TENNI: I see that young fellow shaking his head, but I believe in telling the truth.

I would not be doing my duty to my electorate if I did not speak about the Aboriginal problem. First, I must say that Aborigines need help and training to take their place in our community as Australians. The Federal Government treats Aborigines as different people. It strives to set them up as a different race. It panders to and seeks favours of dissidents and trouble-makers, who in most cases are not full-blood Aborigines.

The theory that they own Australia cannot apply. The same problem is encountered in all countries where the original people have been conquered. What about England? Who are the original owners there? And who were they? In this vote-catching operation the Federal Government is making a hell of a mess of the Aboriginal situation. Racial hatred is being introduced because poor Aborigines are receiving all benefits and poor white people are receiving nothing. For instance, coloured children receive \$10 a week to go to school, while the children of low-income white people receive nothing. Houses are being bought in areas where Aborigines have no chance to mix. If an Aboriginal family is put between two

families who are in a \$20,000 or \$30,000-a-year income bracket, they could no more mix than could the family of a white basic-wage earner in the same position.

Too many highly paid advisers are employed to help Aborigines, yet many of them were failures in their own field before being appointed as advisers. We have set up councils dealing with Aboriginal affairs. Why separate these people? They should be given all the help and assistance they require, but that should be done through the normal channels. They should be treated as Australians and the word "Aborigine" should be forgotten. Never has money given for no effort helped to create employment. They should be made to earn their money and, in that way, made proud to be Australians. They are a proud race. Once their pride is killed with handouts, they will never be good Australians. Handouts to both black and white through social service benefits should be abolished. Those in receipt of such payments should be made to earn their money by working for public utilities.

Returning to the subject of decentralisation, encouragement to settle sparsely populated areas should be given through taxation concessions, particularly in the Far North.

Another very critical blow to my electorate that was achieved through actions of the socialist Government in Canberra was the announcement of the closure of the C.S.I.R.O. station at Mareeba, which was made three or four days after the double dissolution. The Tinaroo Creek Research Centre, which has been operated jointly by the C.S.I.R.O. and the tobacco farmers, is to be closed down by the Federal Labor Government in June. I cannot remember the exact number of men being put out of work, but it is about 30. This centrally located centre would be ideal for an agricultural college where young North Queenslanders could be given practical training in farming and grazing the dry tropics. Training and tuition could be given in such agricultural pursuits as dairying, maize-growing, peanut production, sugar farming and, of course, the growing of irrigated crops.

There is no practical teaching centre of a college type anywhere in Far North Queensland. The only agricultural tuition is being given at schools. However, agriculture is not taught at the Mareeba High School. This type of teaching does not involve practical training.

A centre for training our future farmers and extension officers in farming the dry tropics is very much overdue. The Tinaroo Creek establishment has buildings of the type required and is so laid out that it could easily be adapted as a practical agricultural college in the Far North. At the moment, in the area are suitable staff who will be out of work—at the end of June—thanks once again to our fine friends in Canberra. They would provide an excellent staff nucleus for a college such as I propose.

One worth-while project being undertaken at Tinaroo Creek was the possible propagation of grapes as an alternative crop to tobacco. It has become necessary for this, owing to the tobacco industry being pressured and threatened by the Federal Labor Government. We think it is only fair and sensible that every effort be made to find a suitable alternative crop for the area to ensure its economic stability.

North Queensland is an agricultural area with tremendous development potential, which cannot take place until we can train farmers and extension officers for the area. The only place to give the practical training is a suitable college. We need an agricultural college in the dry tropics providing practical experience in farming in the region. How else are we to develop this area in the Far North? We must not let this opportunity to avail ourselves of this facility at Tinaroo Creek slip through our fingers because of departmental inertia or the self-interest of individuals. An agricultural college located in the dry tropics and providing practical training in agriculture there is needed to train the men who will work in the area. Far North Queensland needs a college of this type.

Storm-and-tempest insurance premiums charged in parts of my electorate are outrageous and require an immediate reduction. From 1867 to 1935 the amount of damage caused to property through cyclones on the Atherton Tableland could be paid out of the hip pocket of the Leader of the Opposition. It is ridiculous that, in this part of North Queensland, with mountains on the coast to protect it and considering the long distance a cyclone would have to travel overland if it came from the Gulf of Carpentaria, my people are subsidising people in the cyclone-prone areas. Consider the amount of damage to the Cairns and Mossman areas over the past 45 years. It has been very small by comparison with that from Townsville south as well as in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast.

The Insurance Commissioner claims the Atherton Tableland area is close to the coast and is potentially subject to cyclonic disaster. For this reason it has been included in Zone 1, northern coastal area. I suggest that he visit the area, see its topography and check on records of disaster and cost in my electorate. Perhaps then he might reconsider his decision.

In times of inflation, unstable and unplanned Federal Government vote-catching hand-outs, non-productive jobs, unwieldy Public Service, high pay for little work, severe taxation on workers to support loafers, high taxation on successfully run businesses to keep over-staffed Public Service departments and the creation of countless committees and experts all seeking new ways to take away the incentive to work, we should remember

a famous quotation from a very famous man—Abraham Lincoln—many years ago. He said—

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer. You cannot further brotherhood by encouraging class hatred. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

I intend to use those thoughts as guide-lines in my fight for the Barron River electorate.

In conclusion—I will at all times uphold the dignity of this Parliament and strive to be a valuable representative of my electorate in the tradition of the great statesmen who have adorned this House and made their contributions to the glowing panorama of Queensland's progress.

Mr. GYGAR (Stafford) (8.26 p.m.): In acknowledging my loyalty to the Crown, I rise in this Chamber with mixed feelings of humility, pride and awe. It is humbling for a new member to bring to mind the significance of this Assembly, the great men who have taken their places in this Chamber, and the distinguished Queenslanders whose company we join. And what distinguished men these are, Mr. Speaker! They are members of a Government which has been a guiding light to all Australians over the last two years, ably, strongly and unflinchingly led by our Premier, whom I take this opportunity to thank on behalf of all Queenslanders.

Our Premier has been an inspiration to all Australia. Convinced of the righteousness of his stand, firm in his resolve to do only what is best for Queensland, he has been unbending in the face of the most extreme pressures.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You sound like a parson.

Mr. GYGAR: I do not ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for any mercy from the remnants of the Opposition during this speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Row): Order! I remind honourable members that a member is entitled to be heard in silence whilst making his maiden speech. I hope I will not have to remind members of that again. However, if a member wants the protection of the Chair, he should refrain from provoking other members.

Mr. GYGAR: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Deputy Speaker. However, I do not ask for it during this speech.

Some may disagree with certain aspects of the Premier's policies, but all must admire his strength of character and faith in his

conscience. The Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen and his colleagues have earned a place in history which time will not dim. To be joining men such as these as a part of the Government of this State is a humbling experience for any person, for it brings a realisation of the standards to which we must rise, and by which our actions in this Chamber will be judged.

There is also a feeling of pride which comes with being a member of this Assembly. I think it only human that one feels a sense of pride and achievement in taking a place in this Chamber, for it is an honour which falls on few men, and one which is not earned easily, or earned alone. Victory in an election comes only from the confidence and support of the electors of this State, but it takes a large team of willing and enthusiastic helpers to build the confidence of the electors in a candidate for public office. I was fortunate in having a group of helpers who left no stone unturned in their efforts to point out to the people of Stafford the issues involved in the December election. It is not possible to thank each of these able and dedicated people individually, but they know how much their support is appreciated.

I must, however, make special mention of the support and tolerance of my long-suffering parents, and the day-and-night efforts of my fiancée over many months. All these willing and able people who volunteered their help can feel justifiably proud of their achievements, and can rest assured that I will expend my best efforts in ensuring that their confidence in me has not been misplaced.

The third emotion I feel is one of awe, engendered by the realisation of the tasks and responsibilities of members of this Assembly. It is unfortunately apparent that members sometimes lose sight of these great responsibilities which rest on their shoulders. The behaviour of the Opposition on the first day on which we assembled indicated that they at least have nothing but contempt for the institution of Parliament. We face here a great task, for the future development and prosperity of all Queenslanders rests firmly in our hands. On our deliberations and decisions will be erected the structure of the society in which 2,000,000 Queenslanders will make their lives. It therefore behoves us all to cast our minds to the principles we should follow, the ideals we should serve, the attitudes we should take.

Following the events of 7 December last, there can be no doubt that this Parliament has been given a clear and unmistakable directive by the people of Queensland on the principles by which it must be bound.

For the first time in a generation the people of this State could clearly compare the alternatives offered to them. They could compare the socialist system being demonstrated in Canberra with the free-enterprise policies of the National-Liberal coalition in

this State. It was the first opportunity for people of my age to see socialism in action. Can there be anyone who is left with any honest doubt as to the way of life which the people wish to endorse?

It is obvious that the bitter and discredited remnants of socialism in this State refuse to accept this decision; but even they cannot doubt that they have been spurned and rejected, and are despised by the vast majority of people in this State because the true nature of socialism has been revealed for all to see. And well they should be despised.

The socialists came to power in Canberra on glittering promises of a more equal and open Australia. These promises have now been revealed for what they were—part of a glossy propaganda machine, designed as a vehicle to deceive the Australian public, a vehicle on which a coalition of arrogant pseudo-intellectuals and nepotistic opportunists rode to power in Canberra. Yet socialists still have the nerve to stride through this country proclaiming their aims as the abolition of poverty, the achievement of equality, progress for all and peace for the world.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Noble objectives!

Mr. GYGAR: Only objectives; they have never been put into practice.

Instead of prosperity socialism has brought economic ruin to every country that has had the misfortune to be inflicted with this bankrupt and discredited ideology. Let the apologists for socialism show us one country which has prospered under their brainchild. We have even seen our own great country slide into an economic nightmare, burdened, as it is, by this vile ideology.

We have come to realise that socialism rests on one basic premise—that man is not entitled to own anything. Private property is evil, the socialists say and this is why we on this side of the Chamber will never make any compromise or agreement with them. We believe that Abraham Lincoln spoke the truth when he said 110 years ago—

“Property is the fruit of Labour, property is desirable, it is a positive good in the world; that some should grow rich shows that others may become rich and is a just encouragement to industry and enterprise.

Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own will be safe from violence when built”.

These words are just as true today, but socialists will have none of them. They would prefer that we all live in hollow logs to letting a single hard-working individual build himself a house. The people of Australia have come to see that socialism does not mean progress, that it means stagnation, deadening conformity and mediocrity.

The party of which I am a member stands firmly by the right of the individual to build a better life for himself and his children by his own efforts. We stand for real freedom in all its aspects, not the pseudo-freedoms which the hackneyed socialist slogans preach, not the freedom to follow any current whim or fancy no matter what the cost to others. That is anarchy, and no civilization could long survive it.

As Sir Robert Menzies so ably said in 1949—

"The real freedoms are to worship, to think, to speak, to choose, to be ambitious, to be independent, to be industrious, to acquire skill, to seek reward.

"These are the real freedoms for these are of the essence of the nature of man.

"Socialism will have none of them; for unless people do what they are told, work where they are told to work, learn what they are drafted to learn; in a sentence fit obediently into their appointed place, the socialist 'planned state' falls to pieces like the false and shoddy thing it is".

There is a vast unbridgable gap between the members on this side of the Chamber and the socialists, for socialism is a mere fantasy and we are concerned with reality. To them the future is an unreal vision, a product of their imaginations which experience has so often shown can never become a reality. They wish to tear down the product of centuries of experience in the unwarranted hope that this destructive delusion which they support will take its place. For the sake of this delusion they would destroy our entire way of life and turn Australian against Australian in promoting their fraudulent class war hoping that out of the wreckage this socialist millenium will somehow spontaneously spring.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. GYGAR: I am glad that my previous achievements have come to the attention of the honourable member for Archerfield, and that I have obviously got him worried already.

We on this side do not suffer from such delusions because we are committed to reality. For us the future is the present, improved and renovated, and this is the goal we work towards—a better State, a better Australia, a better life built on firm foundations.

Unlike the members of the Opposition we have faith in Australia and Australians. We do not denigrate and disparage their efforts and achievements.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. GYGAR: I was doing hard work when the honourable member opposite was doing hard "Labor".

We believe that the solution to Australian problems can be found in Australia and not in a discredited, century-old alien ideology.

We do not wish to dynamite the whole structure of Australian society, because we consider it is basically just and right for us and our children.

The propaganda machine of the socialists tries to convince us that we should be ashamed of the progress made in Australia during 23 years of Liberal-Country Party Government or deny the progress in this State since 1957. I am proud of those achievements and happy to be associated with a party which helped to bring them about.

The Liberal and Country Parties led this country out of the economic morass of World War II, and quietly, steadily and unremittently built a better life for all Australians. Can anyone deny the vast improvement in standards of living in that time? Can anyone deny that this was a period of prosperity and stability unprecedented in Australian history? We have only to look at what has happened in this country since December 1972 to realise how fortunate we were in that time, and I find it impossible to be ashamed of the Government which "over-seered" our period of greatest progress and prosperity.

I invite any Australian who has doubts on this to consider the record of the present socialist Government in Canberra. The policies of these hypocrites who campaigned under the banner of "the worker's friends" have brought about the highest unemployment since the great depression, yet do they acknowledge their failure? Never! They are like a pack of wild animals fighting over the stricken carcass of the Australia they brought to its knees. Never has so much blood flowed around the corridors of power in Canberra, as they fight tooth and nail for ascendancy among themselves. Day by day knives thud remorselessly into the backs of so-called friends as the Prime Minister blames his colleagues for the failures which his monstrous ego will not allow to be called his own. The most dangerous title in Australia today is to be called a friend of the Prime Minister. The hand that pats the back often has a knife clutched in its bloody fist. Frank Crean has long since been dragged feet first from the field of political power. Mr. Justice Murphy saw the writing on the wall and ran before he was pushed. The Speaker's chair is still warm from the corpse of Speaker Cope, the latest victim to be sacrificed on the altar of the Prime Minister's ego.

I find it hard to believe that Australia could ever give birth to a Government such as the Whitlam socialist regime. Like most Queenslanders I hope their day of reckoning at the ballot-box will not be long in coming.

There will be hard times ahead while the future Government clears the debris of the socialist shambles, but we will again be able to look forward to the future with confidence and hope, not the fear and trepidation that has become a part of our lives under Whitlam socialism.

Even now there is a light on the horizon for all Australia, and it should be visible even to members of the Opposition, for they look at it every day in this Chamber.

That light comes from Queensland, where this Government is indicating the direction which all Australia will soon be able to take.

We are not perfect by any means, but are firmly pointed towards the future, and I applaud the efforts of our Ministers, the initiatives which they have taken, and the leadership they have given.

I have already mentioned the debt all Australia owes to our Premier. The other members of his Cabinet team are equally worthy of recognition.

In the post of Treasurer, Sir Gordon Chalk has carried out his tasks so well that even his vindictive Opposition can find no issue of substance on which to criticise him. Our State has been fortunate in that in these times of economic chaos the finances of Queensland have been under Sir Gordon's care. He has shown that massive taxation is not needed to support a healthy confident economy, and has smoothed the waves of Canberra's mismanagement.

Our Attorney-General has also shown the way in the field of consumer legislation. Queenslanders can be proud that our State leads not only Australia but also the world in its protection of the "little man". The Small Claims court and the Consumer Affairs Bureau are solid examples of action in these fields, and that is the hallmark of this Government—action, not words.

We have rejected the transparent pious platitudes of the Opposition and substituted positive measures to improve the quality of life in this State. The dedication and energy of the Minister for Justice are legendary, and I am sure all Queenslanders look forward to a continuation and expansion of his policies.

I welcome the proposed legislation that will institute a small debts court to protect the businesses of this State. Unlike our opponents, this Government clearly recognises that private enterprise and individual business initiative have a critical part to play in our society, and are entitled to just protection under the law. We will provide this protection so that honest merchants are not driven out of business by confidence tricksters and defaulters.

The transfer of our Consumer Affairs department to the supervision of the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs will ensure its continued energy, while allowing the Minister for Justice to make a more detailed examination and revision of other aspects of the laws of this State.

The Honourable Fred Campbell will carry out this task well, as he has done in all other aspects of his portfolio. Here, once again, in the administration of this Government's policies on industrial relations and industrial

affairs there is a striking contrast between our practical, realistic policies and half-baked socialist ideology. By the provision of Government Industrial Estates, the Minister has made real progress towards decentralisation of industry, and hence population, in Queensland. This is in striking contrast with the centralism, which is a linchpin of the socialist creed.

The only hold-outs against decentralisation are the socialists. It is fitting that we should remember that the people of Townsville are still waiting for the regional growth centre promised by the Prime Minister more than two years ago in another of his cynical vote-buying exercises.

I congratulate the Minister for Industrial Development on his commitment to decentralisation in this State, and hope the Government will continue and expand this programme, which can only improve the long-term economic and social prospects of every Queenslanders.

The other Ministers are also deserving of recognition for their efforts and achievements, for it is the collective efforts of Cabinet which have been responsible for the progress we have witnessed in this State.

As time progresses and goals are achieved, the emphasis of Government changes into new avenues, and it is to these new avenues that I wish to draw the attention of the House. When the current economic crisis is overcome, I hope that our Government will turn its attention to ensuring that future economic rumblings will not affect Queenslanders as badly as has the present downturn. I suggest that to achieve this result our Government must put high on its list of priorities, firstly, urgent measures to ensure the continued viability of our primary producers and, secondly, a concerted drive towards further decentralisation.

Our men on the land have suffered a disproportionate load of the economic damage brought about by the current recession. Cattle and small-crop returns have fallen to below the cost of production, while the retail prices of meat and vegetables have continued to climb. Justice demands that a searching examination of the processing and marketing industries be carried out with a minimum delay to ensure that the economic burden is more evenly spread. Unless the primary producer is given a fair return for his long hours and arduous labours, our rural industries will collapse. The man on the land has been the sacrificial goat of the present Commonwealth Government, but this State must not forget the debt we all owe the rural sector, and must act immediately to restore a measure of economic justice in this field.

The second area I wish to emphasise is decentralisation. There can be little doubt that the population and industries of this State will continue to grow in the coming years. We must act now to avoid the mistakes of the southern States and ensure that our south-eastern corner does not become

crammed with people and industry while the rest of Queensland remains relatively uninhabited.

We must insure against the sprawling ghettos of suburbia which stretch for miles around Sydney and Melbourne, and the vast plains of factories in their industrial complexes. Queensland is blessed with a coastline which lends itself to the development of many ports, each of them closer to our overseas markets than our southern neighbours. These, combined with an abundance of natural resources, lend these areas to development as centres of industry and commerce.

By the development of our northern centres we will be ensuring that a deadening urban sprawl does not creep over our south-eastern corner. Experience has shown that smaller communities are less likely to have environmental problems, slums are less likely to develop and the quality of life of the inhabitants is measurably better.

Through decentralisation, we can achieve a more balanced development of our natural resources and improve the social standards of our State into the next century, but the Government must take the lead. Only by dispersing strong elements of our administration and leaders in the decision-making process of Government can we demonstrate our commitment to decentralisation.

Recent advances in communication have largely overcome the so-called tyranny of distance, and thus the administration of our State should not suffer greatly. But even if there were minor administrative disadvantages in this, it is a small price to pay for the benefits which would accrue. This is a golden opportunity which I urge our Government to seize with both hands.

The eyes of Queensland, and Australia, will be firmly fixed on this Government over the next three years, for we are in a unique situation. This Government has the largest majority in State history, the youngest Parliament in the Commonwealth and the greatest opportunity to lead this State on to prosperity that any administration could ever hope to have. For years to come people will talk of the 1974 State election in the same terms as they now remember the 1949 Federal election.

We are living through historic times; but looking around at the quality and dedication of my colleagues, I am confident that the future of Queensland rests in safe hands. My hope is that when history comes to judge this Parliament it will determine that we lived up to our potential. I look forward with confidence to the accomplishments of this unique Parliament and to the continued prosperity and progress of this State, under our present leadership.

Mr. HALES (Ipswich West) (8.49 p.m.): Firstly, I express my sincere appreciation to the members of the Assembly for the courtesy they have extended to me in giving me an opportunity to make my maiden speech at

this stage of the Address-in-Reply debate. I associate the electors of Ipswich West in my expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

My thoughts are divided between the convention of what I term lengthy, maiden speeches and my earnest desire to see this Government embark quickly and decisively on necessary legislation. My maiden speech will therefore be finalised well within the normal period allowed.

I express my sincere appreciation to the electors of Ipswich West who have given me an opportunity to serve in this Assembly. I also express my appreciation to my hard-working, dedicated campaign committee, without whose generous assistance I, perhaps, would not be present here tonight. As a member of Parliament, and perhaps more importantly as a citizen of Ipswich, I express concern at the unemployment in my city, where 1,454 males and 1,114 females are out of work. In the textile industry alone 800 persons have been retrenched. I believe that in a basic industrial city such as Ipswich, with a population of 65,000, these unemployment figures give need for grave concern. I might add that 140 persons are employed in Ipswich under the R.E.D. scheme, and another 299 are receiving special readjustment assistance because of loss of work as a result of Federal Government tariff policies. The people being assisted under the latter scheme are receiving pay for up to six months. Therefore, the total number receiving Federal Government hand-outs is 3,007. I am not talking about 5 per cent unemployment in Ipswich. That figure of 3,000 must represent between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of the work-force. Any action now by the Federal Government would be akin to closing the gate after the horse has bolted.

I wish personally to thank this Government for awarding contracts to an Ipswich firm to manufacture rolling-stock. Those contracts were worth more than \$2,000,000. In the Wulkuraka estate established by the Department of Industrial Development, five industries have been established and another company has agreed to site its factory there. That is all to the good of employment in Ipswich; but it is my firm belief that in today's difficult economic period if further Government incentives are not forthcoming, either from the State or Federal Government, to bring decentralisation of industry to provincial cities, country areas will experience more unemployment. I suggest to the Queensland Government that careful consideration be given to a pay-roll tax holiday as an incentive to the establishment of labour-intensive industry in provincial cities. A scheme such as that, in conjunction with the phasing out of road taxes over the next three years, would certainly bring desperately needed employment to those areas.

On the subject of employment in the coal-mining industry on the West Moreton field, it was with some trepidation and regret

that I read the Queensland Coal Board report of 1974 stating that demands from the West Moreton coalfields of 60,000 tonnes per week during 1975 will reduce to 36,000 tonnes per week after December 1975. It is common knowledge that a series of disasters has overcome the Ipswich coal-mining industry in the past two years, namely the Box Flat disaster and the floods in January 1974, which caused the shut-down of many mines. However, the ingenuity of our industry has brought production back to a point where I am led to believe no Central Queensland coal is presently being transported to Swanbank.

I mention my trepidation because, if production is lowered to 36,000 tonnes per week, further retrenchments must occur in this Ipswich industry. However, two rays of hope shine through: State Cabinet's decision to engage a consultant company, Mineplan Pty. Ltd., to assess the future economic viability of the West Moreton coal-mining industry and the Press statement issued by the Moreton Shire Council to the effect that correspondence from the Minister for Mines (Mr. Camm) suggested that the council disallow a proposed subdivision over large coal reserves.

There are at least 400,000,000 tonnes of coal reserves in the West Moreton field. In today's world-wide economic crisis it would be shameful, in my opinion, if this coal-mining industry, which is so close to essential infrastructure, were allowed to decline and men were retrenched. Considering that Swanbank Power House has an economic life of 20 years, only 37,000,000 tonnes will be used in that time for power generation, leaving in excess of 360,000,000 tonnes in the West Moreton field untouched. Surely an alternative must be available. The coal-mine owners of Ipswich need guaranteed orders for the future. No company will spend millions of dollars without some reasonable likelihood of a return.

During my lifetime I have been an electrician, newsagent, businessman and real estate agent. I hope that the expertise I have gained in these fields will help me to contribute to debates in this Assembly. As a member of the National Party I am proud to state that within its platform is the basic principle that development of the individual as well as the community will be encouraged, promoting advanced efficiencies and technologies with the minimum of restriction for the common good. I believe in the competitive free-enterprise system based on private investment and personal effort in which the profit motive is accepted as a necessary part of the system. I believe that socialism is damaging and has the effect of nullifying the incentive of private enterprise, which we so desperately need in Australia today.

My entry into State Parliament will not represent a lessening of my interest in national affairs but rather a broadening of it. An American Congressman said during the Declaration of Independence that "George III

had erected a multitude of new offices and sent thither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." There seems to be a parallel today. Instead of George III, it is the Federal A.L.P. Government that seems to have eaten the substance out of Australian private enterprise.

The centralist ideas are wrong. When will our Federal Government learn that many controls by Government will only produce iniquities, shortages, unemployment and, ultimately, more inflation? When will we again see our private enterprise inspired with confidence to continue its earlier progress towards making Australia prosperous? Private enterprise will only shake itself out of its doldrums when we return a Liberal-National Party Government in Canberra—a Government private enterprise can trust. Despite the Federal Government's policy somersaults, private enterprise cannot and will not trust the A.L.P. Federal Government.

In the long term, if Australians want a free-enterprise system, we will have to fight to retain that system. I am speaking of a free-enterprise system of competition, and by "competition" I mean that businesses must compete successfully against not only firms in this country but also firms in similar industries in other countries.

Recently a columnist wrote a remarkably perceptive piece in which he argued that we have been meandering mindlessly towards serfdom. The growing power of the central Government affects society the way hemlock affected Socrates. Numbing begins in the extremities and moves inexorably until it extinguishes the spark of life. Unless warned, a society, unlike Socrates, does not know it is dying until it is too weak to care.

As individuals, if we wish to retain our free-enterprise system, we will have to stand up and fight for it. The Premier has said that democracy breaks down when good men do nothing. It therefore behoves the individual who believes in free enterprise to make his attitude known to the community at large.

I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to an important piece of legislation which was reintroduced in Federal Parliament by Dr. Cairns. It is the national investment fund legislation which allows the Australian Industries Development Corporation to compete with life offices and non-life insurance superannuation funds in marshalling the community's savings. Since 1973, the Federal Government has increased taxes paid by insurance policyholders by 250 per cent and by Budget action in 1974 took another bite of \$25,000,000 from policyholders. Certainly the insurance industry is alarmed at these moves. But the more important ramification is the long-term result of the private sector's capacity to marshal funds for investment.

Life offices and insurance offices are the only uncommitted flexible source of long-term finance available to the private sector's

economy. With the exception of foreign investors now operating under rigid controls, the life offices are the largest single source of finance available to private enterprise. In fact, the Federal Government's action to take over many of the existing functions of the private insurance industry would result in greater starvation of funds to private enterprise in Australia. No alternative Federal Government measures have been announced towards substitute funding. It seems to me just another nail in the coffin of private enterprise and the Federal Government's action should be fought as vigorously as possible.

The electorate of Ipswich West contains nine primary schools. Many of them desperately need attention by the Department of Works. I am pleased to say that I have received correspondence today from the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities saying that a works programme will be implemented in many of the schools in the next three years.

I should also like to draw attention to the desperate need for library blocks at the Leichhardt and Brassall State Schools, and an assembly hall at Ipswich State High School, which the parents and citizens' association can partly afford to fund. I also urge the Government to give early consideration to the installation of adequate lighting in all schools, as during dull days it is impossible for students to work in unlighted areas.

As a real estate agent, I have seen over the last two years shortages, inflation, extremely high interest rates, and a credit squeeze affecting the real estate industry. Unfortunately, many businesses have failed, and others are still failing. There has been bankruptcy after bankruptcy. The building industry is still at a low ebb, and although there is light at the end of the tunnel with general banking liquidity easing, it seems to me that the home-building industry will recover only when there is a general lowering of interest rates. I personally commend the Government on its raising to \$18,000 loans available at 5½ per cent through terminating building societies. As an outside interested party, I applaud the Government's stand on freehold land tenure.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You would have to. You are a real estate developer.

Mr. HALES: The honourable member has no brains if he does not understand what is going on in Canberra today. He is just devoid of knowledge. He is just plain ignorant.

It is my belief that every Australian has the basic desire to own his own home in unrestricted freehold tenure rather than in any form of leasehold tenure. To my mind, that is a basic, undeniable right that should be afforded all Australians, irrespective of the State or territory in which they reside.

In conclusion—I see my role in this House as that of a grass-roots politician who sincerely wishes to serve the people of Ipswich West to the best of his ability. I will at all times be directed by my conscience and my party platform. I realise that conflicts will arise from varying viewpoints and decisions, but I expect that all members will work harmoniously for the general betterment of all Queenslanders and all Australians. I trust therefore that the experience and expertise gained by me so far in life will prove in some small degree beneficial to the community.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (9.3 p.m.): First and foremost, I should like to say how pleased I am to have been again elected as the member for Callide and to know that the constituents of that electorate have placed their faith in me to represent them for a further term in Parliament.

I should like to associate my constituents with the message of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his Opening Speech, and I also congratulate the honourable members for Mourilyan and Salisbury on their very well-presented contributions. It was rather unique in this Parliament to have two very fine ladies moving and seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

I should like to go further and thank the very strong National Party branches in my electorate which assisted me very much. My electorate council, the campaign committee, the chairman (Mr. George Robertson) and the secretary (Mr. Jim Keleher) greatly assisted me in winning approximately 70 per cent of the votes in Callide.

When nominations were called, there was a great to-do about the A.L.P.'s getting rid of the member for Callide by putting two A.L.P. candidates into the field. I might say that the National Party gained some advantage in other electorates where it reciprocated by running two National Party candidates against an A.L.P. candidate, but the A.L.P. certainly did not gain any advantage in Callide. Where the National Party was successful, the A.L.P. failed miserably. As a matter of fact, the A.L.P. vote decreased by about 700 at the recent election. If Gough Whitlam had taken part in the campaign in my electorate, it would have decreased even further.

I take this opportunity of congratulating new members of this Assembly. Their election is as good as a breath of fresh air. Let us be realistic about it. These new members will have a very important role to play in the administration of the State in the future and thus they will have an effect on Queensland's destiny.

Speaking of the probable outcome of the election, I said in a speech on 15 October last year, during the Budget debate, that if the Government went to the polls on 7 December—and at that time I was the only

one in the National Party who was really keen on going to the polls—half the Opposition members would not be re-elected.

Mr. Casey: Do you say that the Premier took your advice?

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes, I would say so. That is dead right. He did take my advice, as he has taken it on many other occasions.

As it turned out, I was being a little bit kind to the Opposition when I said that 50 per cent of its members would not be in the Chamber after the election; in fact, 66½ per cent did not return. Of course, their defeat was aided and abetted by a fellow called Gough Whitlam. He did a tremendous job for the Government of Queensland. As a matter of fact, I was sorry that he was not able to spend more time in the State. He really campaigned well for the National and Liberal Parties in Queensland.

I turn now to a couple of important issues. The first is the predicament in which the beef industry in this State—in fact, in Australia—has been placed by the implementation of socialist policies in Canberra. It is frightening and difficult to believe that a little over 18 months ago bullock beef was bringing about 40 to 45c a lb. and today it is bringing 10c a lb.

Here we have a classic example of political interference in the private industry sector. There is no doubt that it is due only to political interference. Gough said, "Let's get the price of meat down." The Commonwealth Government almost glowed over the fact that the latest Consumer Price Index figures indicated that the cost of living had decreased because of the reduction in beef prices. That was very good. I will admit that, at its limit, the price of meat was getting rather high. However, I am afraid that the other end of the line has been reached and meat is almost at giveaway prices.

It is interesting to note that in July 1973 saleryard prices at auction were quoted at 90.2c a kilo; 15 months later, in October 1974, they were quoted at 35.6c a kilo. So Mr. Whitlam had done his job in getting the price of meat down—to the producer.

Let us look at the retail price—what the worker and the average consumer has to pay for his beef. Let me quote from a booklet put out by the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics in Canberra. In July 1973 beef cost 217c a kilo. In October 1974 the price was down 17 per cent on that figure of 217c a kilo. While the price to the producer has dropped over 100 per cent, the cost has dropped only 17 per cent in the butcher shop.

I have not heard the A.L.P. or Mr. Whitlam, who was keen to get the price of meat down, saying that the price of beef in the butcher shop was too high. In effect, Mr. Whitlam was not concerned about the price of meat to the consumer. I do not think he is now, either; he is not worried

about that. While the producers are on their knees the consumer still has to pay through the nose.

Cattle numbers in Australia have increased. There has been an upward trend over the last eight years, rising to 30,900,000 head in the year ended March 1974. On current trends cattle and calf slaughterings in 1974 were estimated to total 6,700,000 head. Beef and veal production was estimated at 1,230,000 tonnes in that year. In 1973 total slaughterings were 8,200,000 head and production was 1,500,000 tonnes.

The interesting thing is the estimated quantity of beef and veal that is being consumed on the Australian domestic market. That increased from 514,000 tonnes in 1972-73 to 532,000 tonnes in 1973-74. In the calendar year 1974 home consumption of beef was expected to reach 650,000 tonnes.

Cattle are being purchased from the producer based on export prices. As I said on a television programme last night, we need a commission of inquiry into the beef industry. There is something radically wrong within that industry. Nowhere in the world can cheap meat be purchased. The cheapest meat I saw overseas was in Yokohama, where Australian brisket was selling at \$2 a lb. There is no doubt that as producers we are going broke.

Recently in Rockhampton Dr. Everingham, in reply to my assertion that the import of canned meat was on the increase, said, "It is a shame that the beef prices are being used for political purposes." That would be the statement of the century. Look at what the same Dr. Everingham's colleagues in Canberra have done to the rural sector of the nation.

Even before the Labor Party had appointed its Federal Cabinet, Mr. Whitlam and Mr. Barnard decided to revalue the dollar. Subsequent revaluations have cost the rural sector a minimum of \$800,000,000 and more probably \$1,000 million. We can see that revaluation has brought the primary producer to his knees.

The rural sector was faced with a loss of \$20,000,000 by way of reduced income tax concessions, \$58,000,000 as the result of the removal of the superphosphate bounty, \$10,000,000 by way of plant and equipment, \$28,000,000 arising from loss of the fuel subsidy, \$12,000,000 by way of reduced depreciation allowances and \$80,000,000 as the result of increased interest rates. Never before had interest rates risen to such a high level.

Next the Federal Labor Government drove the final nail into the dairy industry's coffin by taking away from it the butter and cheese bounty as well as the free-milk scheme for schools. As a result the industry was faced with an additional cost of \$33,000,000. Furthermore the Federal Government reduced the education allowance. And Dr. Everingham says he does not want to see

politics introduced into the beef prices issue! No wonder he doesn't want to see politics brought into it. I can assure him that his party's politics and policies have reduced the primary producer to the role of a mere peasant.

Mr. Yewdale: He gave you some on the tinned beef, though.

Mr. HARTWIG: Let me deal with tinned meat imports.

Mr. Wright: Don't get stirred up.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member for Rockhampton would be the greatest "20c each way" politician in the Chamber. He would not even know a bull from a cow, so fancy him trying to buy into this subject.

In 1972-73 total imports of canned meat into Australia amounted to the insignificant quantity of 40 tons. In the following year the figure had risen to 300 tons, an increase of 700 per cent. These figures have been made available by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. They show what the Federal Labor Government in Canberra has done to the man on the land.

Under a Federal Liberal-Country Party Government canned meat imports were allowed only from France and Italy. Under the Labor Government, however, it has been imported from Argentina, Brazil, France, Italy, Paraguay and other countries.

Worse, however, is the fact that at the present time fresh chilled meat is being imported from New Zealand. In 1972-73 the quantity so imported amounted to 71 tons; in the following year it had risen to 317 tons. I do not have the 1974-75 figures, but as recently as last week I saw in a butcher shop within a 50-mile radius of Brisbane a full rump branded "Product of New Zealand". It had been imported by the Federal Labor Government. Let the honourable members for Rockhampton and Rockhampton North tell that to their unionists.

Let us look at what happened in the same period to our beef exports to all destinations. In 1973 we exported 600,000 tonnes of beef to all destinations. In 1974 exports fell to 339,000 tonnes. In the same period imports of canned meat—it is probably horse meat or buffalo meat, from Argentina, Brazil and other places—increased by 600 or 700 per cent. In 1973-74 about 700 per cent more synthetic meat was imported to Australia than in 1972-73.

Mr. Lee: By the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes, and this is the Government that the honourable member for Rockhampton is trying to defend. Lord love us, but for a couple of hundred votes, he would not be in the Chamber!

In 1972-73, \$3,112,000 worth of canned and bottled vegetables were imported under our Government. In 1973-74, the value of

imports of these items increased to \$8,571,000. In 12 months there was an increase of over \$5,000,000 in the value of canned vegetables imported from cheap-labour countries. The honourable member should stand up to defend the workers now.

Mr. Wright: Can I take a point of order?

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes. The honourable member may take a point of order, but he should stand up to defend the workers in this country. Labor is bringing these goods from places like Taiwan and Malaysia. Tinned prawns are brought to Australia from Malaysia. From Taiwan we import such items as sweet corn, tomatoes, beans and mushrooms—all grown in human excreta.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is right. The Opposition's "mob" is bringing this stuff into the country in ever-increasing quantities. They do not like to hear about it. I urge them to tell their union friends and militant leaders about it; tell them that the Federal Government is unloading 700 per cent more tinned meat and other items imported from cheap-labour countries. They don't like hearing the truth. If they want to know a little more let me give them some home truth from the editorial of the January edition of "The Queensland Dairy Farmer", which reads—

"You would be better off in North Vietnam. Among the ever-increasing flow of Ministerial statements from Canberra there was one issued recently from the office of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Senator Don Willesee, that received very little publicity. The Minister said this:

"Australia will give \$2,000,000 worth of commodity aid to North Vietnam this year."

I remind Opposition members that that is \$2,000,000 worth of aid when their fellow unionists are losing their jobs—\$2,000,000 to the Viet Cong, to the Communists in North Vietnam. That is the truth.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: That \$2,000,000 should be going to displaced workers. The editorial in "The Queensland Dairy Farmer" continues—

"This is not the first gift to Communist North Vietnam. The first was announced by the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, on 21st September 1973, and this followed establishment of diplomatic relations with North Vietnam in that year.

"But that is not all. Senator Willesee said that in addition to providing commodity aid the Labour Government was continuing to develop the possibilities of providing project and training aid to North Vietnam. He was hopeful that the first group of North Vietnam students would begin studying in Australian training institutions in the current financial year.

"And there is still more. Following discussions with the North Vietnamese authorities it was planned to send a team of Australian agricultural experts to North Vietnam—in amongst the Commos—"this year to carry out a feasibility study of an agricultural project."

Cop that one! An agricultural project in North Vietnam! These are the comrades of the A.L.P.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: What is left of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARTWIG: Contrast that benevolent attitude to North Vietnam with the Australian Labor Government's treatment of the man on the land in this country. No wonder they have been labelled anti-rural.

The beef industry is one of the greatest export earners in this nation. It has been reduced to shreds by the political interference of the Whitlam Government in Canberra.

Opposition Members: No!

Mr. HARTWIG: The member for Rockhampton would not even use the A.L.P. in his advertisement in the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin". That is how he felt about the A.L.P. He would not use it. I have the ad in my possession.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! An honourable member is rising to a point of order.

Mr. HARTWIG: Very well.

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

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes there is, Mr. Speaker. I was waiting to use the microphone.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order if it is not taken at the appropriate time.

Mr. WRIGHT: The microphone was not on and you have corrected me for this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will remain in his seat while I am on my feet. He had the opportunity and did not take it. He was star-gazing around the gallery. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Callide will continue.

Mr. HARTWIG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I did not give my point of order, so I don't see how you could have ruled. I did not speak as the microphone was not on. As the Hansard reporters will confirm, they then turned it on for me. My point of order was that I did not at any time leave the words "A.L.P." out of my advertisements. I think that should be clearly recorded.

Mr. SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the honourable member for Rockhampton and all other honourable members to the fact that it is not a beauty competition looking for the microphones to come on. Honourable members will take their points of order at the appropriate time or I will not hear them.

Mr. HARTWIG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will not argue with the Chair; otherwise I will deal with him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. HARTWIG: I wish to mention again the canned meat being imported into Australia from Argentina. In "The Morning Bulletin" Dr. Everingham was reported as saying that he had occasion to throw out certain lots which did not meet with our health regulations. It must be borne in mind that Australia is importing this canned meat from countries in which foot and mouth disease is prevalent, when countries such as the United States of America are very reluctant to deal with them.

Mr. Gunn: At one stage they wouldn't.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is so.

We have from Dr. Everingham, the Federal Minister for Health, the admission that he has had to reject certain quantities of tinned meat imported into this country because they did not meet certain requirements. What are we to believe? We have based the value of our export trade on our country's being kept free of foot and mouth disease.

My attention has been drawn to a newspaper item under the heading "Industry has to repay loss on beef to U.S.S.R." Our nation's beef producers are bankrupt. They cannot be expected to continue with the prices they are presently receiving for beef. However, after the Australian Government contracted to sell 40,000 tonnes of Australian beef to the U.S.S.R., it decided to prop the deal up by lending the Australian Meat Board \$3,000,000. I emphasise that it is a loan. No-one has stated what the interest rate on the \$3,000,000 would be. I shall now quote what Mr. Wilson said.

An Opposition Member: Who is he?

Mr. HARTWIG: Chairman of the Australian National Cattlemen's Council. He said—

"The council was of the opinion that the loss should have been paid directly by the Australian Government because of the extremely depressed nature of the market."

Senator Wriedt said—

"... the loan would be repayable over a period by an increase in the slaughter levy. He gave an assurance that the levy would not be increased until the beef market had fully recovered."

That is like many other promises. I challenge A.L.P. members opposite to say what it costs this country to fork out the dole at this particular time. I would say it amounts to \$14,000,000 a month. That is what it is costing the Australian taxpayer. But when it comes to a mere \$3,000,000 to assist in the sale of beef to a foreign country, the Government lends the money to the industry and makes it repayable at its own rate of interest. We all know what it is. It is not the 2½ per cent the Queensland Government offered; it is 11.5 per cent.

Mr. Yewdale: The United Graziers' Association asked for it.

Mr. HARTWIG: Whether it asked for it or not, what sort of men have we in politics?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members on the Opposition benches to contain themselves and desist from making persistent interjections, otherwise I shall deal with them.

Mr. HARTWIG: It lent \$3,000,000 to one of the greatest export-earners this country has known. This is what the socialist Government in Canberra thinks of the beef industry in this nation. It is a shocking indictment of A.L.P. policy for the rural sector.

Let me go further. Recently, 5,000 men were threatened with unemployment because of a crisis in the car industry. Gough Whitlam called all his Cabinet Ministers together. He said to General Motors-Holden's, "Don't sack these men whatever you do; or we will close you down. We will do anything." Only a few months before he was inviting Japanese car-manufacturing firms to come to this nation.

Already, a conservative estimate is that 15,000 people have lost their jobs because of the crash in the beef industry. Did Whitlam, Crean, Wriedt, and all their cohorts in Canberra get up and say, "Let us do something positive to assist the beef industry in this country?" Not a word! They offered a mere \$20,000,000 at 11.5 per cent and a person had to prove he was viable before he was able to get any of the money.

Unless the Australian Government is removed from Canberra, we will have a food famine in this country. Let there be no mistake about it. It is Whitlam's policy to import food into this nation. He does not give a damn or two hoots for the people on the land. It is here in black and white. The Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics gives the figures showing that the Federal Government is not concerned about what we produce in Australia. It would sooner import food from a cheap-labour country. We have been blessed over the years with Governments that have been sympathetic to people in country areas.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Not to the workers.

Mr. HARTWIG: "Not to the workers"—that would be the statement of the year! The honourable member is not concerned about the 15,000 people who have lost their jobs as a result of the slump in the beef industry. There is an indication of the intelligence of Opposition members. No wonder there are only 11 left. I hope that after the next election there will be none. It would then be peaceful. They have the mentality of their colleagues in Canberra who are trying to administer the affairs of this nation and who are strangling the great beef industry.

This policy will have repercussions within a very short time. The honourable member for Rockhampton is aware that the average meat-worker knows full well that if the beef industry goes broke, as is happening now, he will lose his job. Those who have invested millions of dollars in abattoirs and other killing facilities throughout the nation will also suffer.

It is interesting to contrast the attitude of the Commonwealth Government with the attitude of the Government in Japan. In that country, the Government appreciates the work of the primary sector. It panders to primary industry because it knows full well that there are 140,000,000 people in Japan and they live not on fuel or fresh air but on what comes from the soil. In Japan there is a realisation of the value of those who produce the nation's foodstuffs, because within a week they could strangle 140,000,000 people. Let us contrast that attitude with what is happening here.

As I said before, it is time that the Australian Government came out and, at the very least, offered the beef producers of this nation, the business people and those who are suffering as a result of depressed prices, at least \$100,000,000. And that is a conservative figure.

Mr. Jensen: Rubbish!

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member says "Rubbish!" All Opposition members know that there are children who are at present not being fully educated because their parents cannot afford to send them to secondary schools.

Mr. Jones: They could send them to State schools.

Mr. HARTWIG: It would be 200 or 300 miles from some properties in the West to the nearest State school. No wonder there is maladministration by the Labor Party when one of its members makes such a statement. The honourable member for Cairns just would not know the situation.

Let us take the case of a man with 500 head of cattle. His would not be a large grazing property. At a value of \$25 a head, which would be a reasonable estimate, he has an asset worth \$12,500. Many people in

such a position owe \$30,000 to \$40,000. Through no fault of their own, they came in on the crest of the wave. Only two or three years ago the beef industry looked rosy. Those now in the industry cannot afford the interest on the money they owe.

From 500 head, the most that can be turned off is 20 per cent. It is more likely to be only 18 per cent, but let us give the person concerned the benefit of the doubt and say that he could sell 100 a year. Taking an average price of \$40 a head today, his net income would be about \$4,000.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: He would be lucky to get \$40 a head, too.

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes. I am giving him the benefit of the doubt.

The interest on \$30,000 is \$3,000 a year. If the loan is over 15 or 20 years, he would have to pay another \$2,000 in redemption, making a total of \$5,000. It would cost him at least \$8,000 a year to live and to administer the property. His expenses would total \$13,000 a year; his net income would not reach \$4,000 a year. Therein lies a tale. Although the figures are hypothetical, they would be fairly accurate in the majority of cases, whether the landowner is big or small.

At Yeppoon recently, Mr. Arthur Bassingthwaite told the people attending the conference there that hundreds of thousands of cattle in the Gulf country would die because it would not pay producers to market their cattle in Cairns or Townsville.

Mr. Jensen: What about what they said after the flood? They said it would take 10 years to recover.

Mr. HARTWIG: Listen to the honourable member for Bundaberg!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARTWIG: It would not pay them to market their cattle at Cairns or Townsville. How many cattle are being marketed? Let us look at the cost of a pair of shoes, bridle reins, or a saddle. Today, a saddle would cost about \$250. At Yeppoon, Mr. Bassingthwaite said that meatworks in North Queensland are burying the hides of cattle they kill now. They are not worth salting down, because of the handling costs.

The only lucrative market that is available today—if one could call it lucrative—is for fat cattle. The greatest threat to the industry at present is drought, and I hope and pray that good seasons continue. If they do, it will at least give landowners an opportunity to keep their beasts at grass until the hoped for improvement in the market takes place.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Melloy, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 9.44 p.m.