

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 29 OCTOBER 1975**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## WEDNESDAY, 29 OCTOBER 1975

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

### PAPERS

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

#### Reports—

Air Pollution Council of Queensland, for the year 1974-75.

Department of Works, for the year 1974-75.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

#### Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1973.

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961-1974.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### 1. INCREASED RAIL FARES AND FREIGHTS

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

(1) Is he aware that the return fare from Wynnum to Brisbane has increased by 100 per cent from 45 cents to 90 cents and from Gaythorne from 32 cents to 60 cents, which is over 40 per cent?

(2) Is he aware that, by abolishing the twelve-monthly, six-monthly and monthly tickets, an additional slug, on top of the extreme fare increases, has been placed on the worker?

(3) Was the House misled in the Budget when it was suggested that rail freights would increase by an average of 40 per cent?

(4) Will he move to restrict the increase to 40 per cent as promised in the Budget and restore the twelve-monthly, six-monthly and monthly tickets?

Answers:—

(1) The present return fare between Wynnum and South Brisbane is 54 cents and therefore the increase is not 100 per cent. It is explained that the opportunity has been taken to rationalise suburban rail fares in that the new charges have been calculated on the basis of the distances travelled. The effect of this adjustment is reflected in the new fare of 90 cents return for travel between Fruitgrove and South Brisbane—a distance of 19 kilometres, the same as from Wynnum—representing an increase of 32 per cent. The return fares from Gaythorne to Central and from Salisbury to South Brisbane, both journeys of 10 kilometres, become 60 cents, increases of 87 per cent and 30 per cent respectively.

(2) Three-monthly season tickets are still available at reduced cost to the traveller. People travelling from suburbs in buses operated by the Brisbane City Council can purchase single tickets only.

(3) No. The statement by the Honourable the Treasurer was to the effect that rail fares and freights would be increased by an average of 40 per cent, and over all this has been adhered to.

(4) No. See answer to (3).

#### 2. CORAL-DREDGING IN MORETON BAY

Mr. Burns, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services—

(1) What areas of Moreton Bay are subject to coral-dredging leases and what companies hold the leases?

(2) What effect will these leases have on Green, Mud and similar islands?

(3) How close to the foreshores are dredges allowed to operate?

(4) Has any study been made on the effect the dredging will have on the oyster and fish populations?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) The honourable member for the area (Mr. W. Lamond) has previously discussed the matter referred to in the question with the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries and myself and, in view of the fact that this matter does not come under my control, I suggest the honourable member redirect his question to that Minister for advice.

#### 3. FUEL SHORTAGE AND GRAIN GROWERS

Mr. McKechnie, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

As grain farmers are justifiably concerned that the current fuel shortage might prevent them from harvesting all of their winter grain crops and because the Government is also relying on revenue from the haulage of grain by the Queensland Railways, will he personally appeal to the leaders of the oil industry by asking them to make special provision to help the grain industry obtain fuel during the existing critical fuel shortage?

Answer:—

I refer the honourable member to the answer provided on 22 October by the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs to a question asked by the honourable member for Balonne about this subject. I prefer to leave the matter in his capable hands.

4. INTERACTION OF ITEMS OF RAILWAY WORKING EXPENDITURE

**Mr. McKechnie**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) What were the major items of expenditure which contributed to the working expenses of \$4,993,705 in 1974-75 attributed to the Warwick-Dirranbandi and Warwick-Wallangarra railway lines and branches?

(2) What was the nature and amount of those expenses which were incurred in areas such as suburban workshops and debited to the sections of line in question?

(3) What amount of the \$60,887,331 working expenses shown for the Brisbane section in 1974-75 is attributable to the Brisbane suburban railway system?

(4) In view of claims that revenue from the haulage of grain assists in the subsidisation of Brisbane suburban travel, will he explain how this is justified if this is the case?

*Answers:—*

(1 to 3) This information is being collated and will be conveyed to the honourable member in due course.

(4) Generally speaking, rail freight traffic subsidises passenger traffic. However, because of the escalating railway operating costs and the level of the grain rates that applied during 1974-75, it cannot be said that the haulage of that commodity subsidised any passenger travel during that year.

5. HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES FOR ABORIGINES AND ISLANDERS, MARYBOROUGH

**Mr. Alison**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries—

(1) What arrears of rent were owing at 30 June on houses owned by the State Government in Maryborough and used exclusively for Aborigines and Islanders?

(2) How much rent has been written off over the last two years as uncollectable and how many tenants have been evicted for non-payment of rent and damage to the houses over this period?

(3) How many houses are being let at present and how much has been spent on the houses over the last two years for repairs and cleaning?

*Answers:—*

(1) \$3,501.88.

(2) No rental write-offs have been effected during the past two years. However, follow-up action is proceeding to recoup these arrears. One tenant has been evicted.

(3) Five homes are presently occupied and \$6,579.42 has been expended on repairs and maintenance during the preceding two years.

6. GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING THROUGH LEO BURNETT

**Mr. Melloy**, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Was the advertising for the Premier's television, radio and newspaper programmes during the last financial year placed through the Leo Burnett Agency and, if so, why was the State Government's Advertising Department bypassed?

(2) Is Leo Burnett the advertising agency for the National Party?

(3) Did Leo Burnett place the advertisements on behalf of the four State Premier's in all Queensland papers last week and were the advertisements charged to the Premier's Department?

(4) Are similar facilities available to the Treasurer to use public money for party advertising?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 4) I have replied previously to a somewhat similar question that the detailed financial administration of a State department is the responsibility of the relevant Minister. I am therefore not aware of the detailed arrangements referred to by the honourable member.

7. ANOMALY IN BRISBANE SUBURBAN WEEKLY RAIL FARE

**Mr. Melloy**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Is he aware that passengers travelling from northern suburban stations to Brunswick Street Station are now required to purchase a weekly ticket to Central Station at a cost additional to that normally charged for travelling to Brunswick Street?

(2) Will he investigate this matter and ensure that these suburban travellers are not penalised in this way?

*Answers:—*

(1) The new scale of fares for multi-trip weekly tickets is based on the distance actually travelled, and in some cases this could mean that the fare to Central from a north-side suburban station is greater than the fare to Brunswick Street. Similar conditions applied under the former scale of fares, but with the rationalisation of distances there could be some variation in the position with the fares from some stations.

(2) Passengers are not being penalised but are being charged according to the distance actually travelled.

8. R-CERTIFICATE FILMS

**Mr. Lane**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

In view of the comments of Mr. D. Draydon in "The Courier-Mail" of 28 October expressing apparent concern regarding the admission of persons under the age of 18 years to R-certificate films—

(1) Which officers have the responsibility of policing this provision of law at the entrance doorways of picture theatres?

(2) Are police officers included with persons who have responsibility in this area?

(3) How many offences against theatre proprietors for neglecting this provision have been reported and how many have been prosecuted?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) A person shall not exhibit a restricted-exhibition picture in a picture theatre when there is present any person who has attained the age of two years and who has not attained the age of 18 years. There is no specific provision for policing the entrances to picture theatres. If a member of the Police Force has reasonable cause to suspect that any person admitted to a picture theatre in which a restricted-exhibition picture is being exhibited or about to be exhibited or has just been exhibited has not attained the age of eighteen years, he may require that person to state his correct age, name and address.

(3) Section 31 of the Censorship of Films Act 1947-1973 requires every member of the Police Force to report any offence in writing to the censor, who shall take such action consistent with the Act as he thinks fit. As the censor is an officer of the Commonwealth, details of offences reported and prosecutions are not immediately available to me.

9. BEETLE CONTROL OF GROUNDSEL

**Mr. Frawley**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service—

(1) Has the introduction of the groundsel beetle to control the groundsel bush proved successful?

(2) Are the beetles available from his department at the request of local authorities and land holders affected by the groundsel bush?

(3) Are these beetles affected by hormone sprays?

*Answers:—*

(1) The groundsel bush beetle (*trirhabda baccharidis*), introduced from the U.S.A. in 1966, has not been as successful as initially anticipated and at this stage

cannot be recommended as a means of control of groundsel bush. Results to date indicate that, in low-lying coastal areas, some localised control may be achieved eight to 10 years after the insect's release, but in other areas appreciable control is not anticipated.

(2) Because of the lengthy time involved before control may be achieved, all liberations of these insects are being made on groundsel bush infested land in co-operation with local authorities.

(3) Hormone sprays affect these beetles indirectly once the destruction of their groundsel food source takes place.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LIQUIDITY PROBLEMS OF BUILDING SOCIETIES

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER**: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Is he aware of reports that some of Queensland's building societies are suffering liquidity problems? What action has been taken by his department or any other Government department to stop the cover-up of fraud and mismanagement which has apparently occurred in at least one society?

**Mr. LEE**: As a responsible Government, we are always prepared to take appropriate action where necessary. If controls on liquidity are needed, we will take whatever action is possible.

SIR COLIN HANNAH AS SUPPORTING SPEAKER AT PUBLIC RALLY IN BRISBANE

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER**: I ask the Premier: In view of the announcement by him that he has invited Malcolm Fraser to speak at a public rally in Brisbane this Friday, the theme of which is to be the bungling, ineptitude and deceit of the Whitlam Government, does he intend to invite Sir Colin Hannah to be the supporting speaker? If not, why not?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN**: One of the best things I could do in support of Malcolm Fraser would be to ask the honourable member for Archerfield to attend the meeting. That probably would be the best support I could get for Malcolm Fraser.

SUGGESTED CLOSURE OF LAVARACK BARRACKS

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER**: I ask the Premier: As he is obviously aware that in the past 18 months there have been many resignations of senior officers from the Australian Army stationed at Lavarack Barracks, Townsville (and the reason must surely be the lack of confidence of Army officers in the defence policies of the present Federal Labor Government) and as the people of North Queensland are concerned at the run-down of the capacity of the Army at Lavarack (the largest Army base in Northern Australia), can he

advise the House if he has any knowledge of a rumour now circulating that Lavarack Barracks is to be closed?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Reports have come in from different sources about the possible closure of Lavarack Barracks in Townsville. I am not aware of a closure as such. The fact is that from time to time the Commonwealth Government has reduced Army strength in different parts of Australia. I can only undertake to inquire from the Commonwealth Government whether the barracks are to be closed or not and to acquaint the honourable member in due course. It would be a tragedy to the Army and to North Queensland, particularly Townsville, if that occurred.

#### FINANCIAL ALLOCATION TO NON-STATE SCHOOLS

**Mr. LANE:** I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Do the increased subsidies made available in the recent State Budget to primary and secondary non-State schools represent a practical endorsement of the Queensland Government's established policy of recognising the right of parents to send their children to a school of their choice and the established place that private schools have in our education system?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** At no time in the history of this Government have we hidden the fact that we have given support to private or denominational schools. Those schools have played a vital part in helping the Education Department in Queensland to overcome many of the problems it has faced, particularly with the rapid growth in population following the war years.

The increases we have provided in this year's Budget represent a continuation of the policy of support we have maintained in the past. They are an indication also that we recognise the considerable extent of increases in costs being experienced by many private and denominational schools today. I have always marvelled at the part that certain religious orders have played in providing high-standard education facilities. Those who provide the facilities are very dedicated to the education of young people and to ensuring that they grow up to be good citizens.

My short answer to the honourable member is: Yes, the increase that we have provided is an indication of our continued support of these schools and of our recognition of the need to provide them with extra funds so that they may survive.

#### DOWNGRADING OF PORT OF MACKAY

**Mr. CASEY:** In asking the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services this question without notice, I refer him to his ministerial statement to the House on 14 October, wherein he indicated that statements by me in the House regarding the downgrading of the port of Mackay were a figment of my

imagination. Is he aware that the Mackay Harbour Board was recently advised by his department that two pilots employed by the Department of Harbours and Marine at Mackay are to be transferred to Hay Point, that the position of harbour master at Mackay is to be downgraded and, furthermore, that any assistance that he would require must come from either Bowen or Hay Point? Will he therefore tell the House if, on 14 October, he did not know what he was doing, as if he did, he deliberately misled the House?

**Mr. NEWBERRY:** Put it on notice.

**Mr. CASEY:** It is obvious that the Minister does not know the answer, so he has answered my question and there is no need to put it on notice.

#### STATE PROSECUTIONS FOR FRAUDULENT UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT CLAIMS

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: Is there any provision in our State legislation which would enable the prosecution, under the Criminal Code or otherwise, of a person or persons using fictitious names and addresses to receive, for example, six unemployment benefit cheques every fortnight?

**Mr. KNOX:** The matter to which the honourable member refers comes under Commonwealth legislation. If there is in fact no appropriate Commonwealth legislation, I am quite sure that there is State legislation that could be availed of. However, I am quite certain that there is adequate authority under Commonwealth legislation to deal with what would ordinarily be regarded as cases of fraud which the honourable member alleges have occurred.

The question gives me an opportunity to say that the announcement by the Federal Minister that there will be no more policing of the defrauding of the employment service of moneys by people not entitled to receive them opens an entirely new operation within the community and encourages people to break the law. It is regrettable that that announcement was made by the Commonwealth Minister a few days ago. I think it is typical of the way in which social service departments in this nation are being administered at the moment that it seems easy for people who are not entitled to benefits to defraud the departments whilst those who are entitled to them have to go through an enormous paper war in order to get their just entitlements.

#### LANGUAGE USED BY A.L.P. LEADERS

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I ask the Premier: Has he read a report of yesterday's street meeting in Rockhampton at which, in front of women and children, Mr. Bob Hawke referred to one interjector as "a silly bastard" and to another as "a nice bastard"?

**Mr. Yewdale:** He was, too.

**Mr. HARTWIG:** The honourable member ought to know; he was there. This follows Mr. Whitlam's reference to the Premier as "a Bible-bashing bastard". Can the Premier inform the House if such terms and language emanating from V.I.P.'s in the A.L.P. in Canberra and in other places are an indication of their attitude to our people and our society generally?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is, of course, typical of the language used by most Labor members in high places. Indeed, I think Mr. Hawke used the same language about the Prime Minister when he sacked Dr. Cairns. I think Jack Egerton used the same language, too, when referring to Dr. Cairns.

**A Government Member:** And Gough used the same language when referring to you.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is right. That is language that is typical of them, and what one would expect from them. Why people vote for them, I just do not know. Some people are tigers for punishment.

#### IRRIGATION AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION RETRENCHMENTS

**Mr. BURNS:** I ask the Minister for Water Resources: Is he aware of the rumours circulating among the workshop staff of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission that 72 men will be laid off on Friday because of lack of funds? Can he give an assurance that this will not happen tomorrow?

**Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT:** I am fully conversant with the problems facing the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission at present as a result of lack of funds. At the same time, I point out to the House that no funds at all have been made available for major State projects this year other than what was known last year. That was the sum of \$2,500,000 for the Bundaberg scheme, and the amount allocated for the Julius Dam. Unless Commonwealth funds are forthcoming, we will unfortunately have to put some men off.

The honourable member can be assured that this matter was raised in Cabinet this week. The Treasurer is considering the position, and if anything can be done to keep men in employment, it certainly will be done. However, as we all know, there are problems ahead, and if I were not honest enough to say that there probably will be some retrenchments, I should not be where I am. Nevertheless, the honourable member can be assured that I am conscious of the need for extra funds, and I will be doing everything possible to obtain them.

#### ALLOWING A TECHNICALLY ALIVE PERSON TO DIE

**Mr. BURNS:** In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I refer to the current newspaper publicity of the unfortunate and

rather distressing case of mercy killing in the courts in America. What is the situation in relation to mercy killing in Queensland? I am not sure whether I should direct this question to the Minister for Health or to the Minister for Justice.

**Dr. EDWARDS:** I am aware of the controversy overseas regarding the case in which the Quinlan family are making an appeal to a court to decide whether the instruments keeping their daughter alive should be switched off. The interest of the public of Queensland and honourable members has, of course, been aroused in this case. I think it is quite in order for me to assure the people of Queensland that, although this could become a problem throughout the nation because of the availability of instruments and machines which keep people alive much longer than, say, a generation ago, within the Queensland hospitals system this problem does not exist. We are well aware of the tragedies and tremendous problems that could result in some cases. As a Government, we make every effort to keep people in as good health as possible, first of all. Secondly, I can assure the honourable member that if these situations do arise, every effort will be made to help the people concerned. No instance of this problem arising in Queensland hospitals has been brought to my attention. I would be pleased if there were little or no public outcry about this issue, because it is an emotional one and is really something that would be best discussed on a private level between the parties concerned. I regret that this case has gone into the courts in America because I feel it will create problems throughout the nation and throughout the world. I feel that some unwise statements will be made about the matter.

#### WYNNUM WEST SCHOOL TOILETS

**Mr. BURNS:** I refer to my question without notice to the Minister for Works and Housing earlier this week about the toilets at the Wynnum West School and his assurance that he would send an officer down to the school to conduct an urgent investigation. Can the Minister give me any information about that investigation?

**Mr. LEE:** I am rather surprised at the Leader of the Opposition. He should well know that, if I promised to send an inspector down to the school, it would be done. I can assure him that the inspector has been down to the school. Not only that, but I have given approval that, where the ground had been lowered and ponding had occurred after rain, these areas be filled so that this ponding will no longer occur. I also gave approval for some other drainage work, so we in the Works Department are on the job as usual.

## MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

PREMIER'S VISIT TO TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS;  
STATEMENT BY MR. GEORGE MYE

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (11.45 a.m.): In view of the repercussions over the last few weeks from the recent visit by the Premier to the Torres Strait islands and in view of his statements in this Chamber yesterday, during the course of which he read out two telegrams, I feel compelled to comment on the situation as it is known to me.

I shall refer particularly to a statement by Mr. George Mye, the representative of the eastern islands group, made in conjunction with 17 island chairmen and individuals resident in the Torres Strait islands and issued on 14 October 1975. I have a copy of that statement in my hand, and it is pertinent to note that, although 18 gentlemen from the Torres Strait islands were involved, the Premier received telegrams from only two of them and read them out in this Chamber yesterday.

I am prepared to table the document from which I shall read, but I do not intend to comment on the body of it, in which those concerned take umbrage at some of the comments that have been made, dissect their opinions of the situation and state what happened. However, I think it is important that both the preamble and the conclusion should be read. After doing that, I shall then comment on it as the A.L.P. spokesman on matters coming within the jurisdiction of the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement.

The document is headed, "Statement issued by Mr. George Mye, Eastern Island Group Representative, and 17 Eastern Island Chairmen and individuals on 14 October 1975", and it states—

"The Combined Councils of the Eastern Islands of the Torres Strait were appalled at the recent political confrontation between the Queensland Premier and the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. As a result of the allegations and accusations made, many of which directly concerned the Eastern Islands an Area Council meeting and a meeting of the Eruberugar Cooperative Association, were held to discuss the attitudes and allegations of the various parties concerned. One fact seems clear. Both parties"—

that means the Premier of Queensland and the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs—

"are eager to find fault with the other but both appear to have skirted the main issue—the people and what they think and feel. Nobody has asked the people of the Torres Straits what is true and not true. They are the ones to know—not distant politicians who made flying 'fact finding visits' to the area and became immediate experts. What follows are the views of the people of the Eastern Group of Torres Strait Islands; what is the truth

as they see it, and also many relevant points which have not yet been raised. In doing so we would make it clear that we do not 'side'—

I emphasise "we do not 'side'"—

"with either the State or the Commonwealth. We are concerned with the presenting the people's viewpoint. We will now answer certain allegations which concern our region."

I do not intend to read that, Mr. Speaker, because time does not permit me to do so. As I said, I will table the document. However, it said in conclusion—

"Many of the Premier's accusations involved the Eastern Islands which he has not visited for nine years. There is no denying mistakes having been made,"—

they are saying that the people of the islands have made mistakes; no doubt politicians also have made many blunders—

"but priceless experience has been gained by the people working for themselves and handling their own affairs. The old Queensland attitude of doing what boss says and accepting what he choose to give is past. Charity is not wanted."

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. JONES:** I am not going to digress and I am not going to argue the issues; I have not got time. When I was in the Torres Strait area with the Premier, Mr. George Mye was the white-haired boy—pardon the pun. To confirm that I refer to a statement in "The Courier-Mail" of Friday, 24 October. It stated—

"A former National Party candidate for the far northern State seat of Cook last night accused the Premier (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) of 'twisted thinking' in his criticism of Torres Strait Islander Mr. George Mye."

Mr. Graham Gordon was the Country Party candidate in 1972. He missed endorsement in 1975 and stood in the election of 1974 as an Independent. That newspaper article continued—

"Mr. Graham Gordon said Mr. Mye twice campaigned for him. . .

"Mr. Mye told him he had voted for him both times.

"Mr. Gordon said: 'It was wrong for the Premier to attack George in this way.'"

Apart from those political implications of the particular situation, I see this spontaneous action—

**Mr. Tenni** interjected.

**Mr. JONES:** I thought it was the honourable member for Cook interjecting until I turned around. I haven't time to digress.

I see this spontaneous action as one of the most significant for the Islanders in a long history of suppression. I bear witness to the significance of that statement as a turning-point and a realisation by the Islanders of another way. I believe it is a forward step for Islanders in self-determination. It is a realisation by those people of what it means to be Queenslanders—if the Government wants it that way—and to be able to stand up for themselves as true Australians and, in the true Australian way of life, speak for themselves. That is very important to those people. If honourable members carefully read the preamble to what I quoted from, they will see that that is what they are saying. It is a new starting point for them. What they are saying, in effect, and we should listen very closely to them, is a typical Australianism. They are saying, "I dips me lid to nobody" because every man is as good as his master.

That statement has taken them a very long way. I say to the Queensland Parliament, "Take heed. It's happened." The realisation has come very slowly. Others have made statements like that, but at least they are making them in concert now. They are not isolating each other, so there will be no victimisation. They will not be berated; they will not be dispossessed; they will not be put in the stockade; they will not be displaced by loss of position, prestige or title; they will not end up with some other injustice such as penal servitude; they will not end up as divers on a pearling lugger as a form of penal servitude. There were others whose names were whispered behind hands. They suffered because they stood on their own two feet and spoke on behalf of their people. I see now that there will be no intimidation, victimisation or degradation; those people are speaking with one voice.

Sure, there were a couple of dissentients. That is to be expected. Two dissentients out of a chairman and 17 island people seems to be a very small minority. I can see that they are gradually progressing. That has been reflected in the events of the last few weeks. They have been momentous. No matter how much subjugation follows, what has been done will not be undone. I say that it is thanks to the Australian Government that those people themselves have taken the turning-point. What was expressed by one of their leaders and 17 other signatories was unpredictable and something that I would not have thought would have come so quickly. They have shown the way. Previously most rebels in the Torres Strait were dealt with unceremoniously. They were put down by means of rebuff or delay. I believe what was previously called insubordination will now be recognised as speaking in the interests of their own people.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Do you notice that the honourable member for Cook is nodding his head in agreement?

**Mr. JONES:** I can well believe that the honourable member for Cook would agree with my comments, as would the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries.

(Time expired.)

#### CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

**Mr. MURRAY** (Clayfield) (11.56 a.m.): I feel compelled to participate in this debate because I believe the great majority of citizens throughout Australia share with me a deep and disturbing feeling of uneasiness over the events that are occurring in Canberra.

In my memory there have been four other crises that have had a most disturbing effect on the people of this nation. The first was the Lang affair around the turn of the 1930's; the second was the abdication of Edward VIII; the third was the immediate events leading up to the declaration of World War II; the fourth was the great crisis of 1949. Each of those crises had a profound effect and influence on the citizens of Australia, and all are still very vivid in my mind.

Since 1949, when the people of Australia audibly breathed sighs of relief after demonstrating their conviction at the polls, Australia has had a remarkably serene and stable political scene. Within the last year or so, however, it has fallen apart and now is virtually shattered. We may as well face realities and acknowledge the fact that on the political scene there are now two new and potent forces, which have been so fostered and encouraged by the A.L.P. as to be now running almost out of control.

The first is the trade union movement. Last year, while attending the overseas C.P.A. convention, I had an opportunity to discuss with both Labour and Conservative members in the United Kingdom the problems that arose there in this field. All members, who were extremely worried about them, asserted that elected Government in the United Kingdom could not now effectively govern without first clearing its major decisions with the trade union council. All were despondent about it and agreed that, by default, each side, when it had been in power, had allowed this situation to develop and to reach the stage where there is virtually no turning back. Their warning to me was loud and clear—"For God's sake, don't let this happen in your young, developing, virile country of Australia."

After reading of Hayden's clearing his Budget with Hawke before delivering it to the nation and even before delivering it to his own caucus, thereby breaking one of the oldest and strongest conventions of Westminster—and doing so without even a blush—I wonder whether it is not now already too late for Australia.



The second of these forces, and certainly a potent one, is the Commonwealth Government's highly skilled propaganda machine. What was once a trickle is now virtually a flood. The Commonwealth Government, at public expense, maintains in one form or another a large and well-paid public relations pack, who without any doubt at all are highly successful.

I do not believe there could be one member of this House who would be so naive, stupid or dishonest as to assert, publicly or anywhere, that the Opposition in Canberra is acting in an unconstitutional manner by deferring or rejecting Supply.

**Mr. Porter:** Not one authority.

**Mr. MURRAY:** Not one. The Opposition is acting absolutely properly. The Constitution is crystal clear on this matter. I can understand it, so I am sure most others would understand it.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. MURRAY:** Didn't Mr. Whitlam try to use the Senate in this way when he was in Opposition? Of course he did! The honourable member for Bulimba knows that very well. There is no principle whatsoever involved in Mr. Whitlam's attitude.

I shall now read a few statements taken from Federal "Hansard". On 18 June 1970, Senator Murphy, the then Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, said—

"The Senate is entitled and expected to exercise resolutely but with discretion its power to refuse its concurrence to any financial measure, including a Tax Bill. There are no limitations on the Senate in the use of its constitutional powers, except the limitations imposed by discretion and reason."

In the same debate Mr. Whitlam in the House of Representatives said—

"This Bill will be defeated in another place. The Government should then resign."

A little later in 1970, Mr. Whitlam opposed the Budget of that year. His words and intentions were quite clear—

"Let us take this Budget and the Government which produced it to the people themselves. The Parliament has already voted Supply to the end of November. By that time, there can be an election for both Houses. An election therefore would cause no disruption. The only thing that will cause disruption is the continuance of the Government."

Reading again from "Hansard", we find that Mr. Whitlam also said at that time—

"Let me make it clear at the outset that our opposition to this Budget is not mere formality. We intend to press our opposition by all available means on

all related measures in both Houses. If the motion is defeated, we will vote against the Bills here and in the Senate. Our purpose is to destroy the Government which has sponsored it."

Finally, how will Mr. Whitlam ever live with these words which, again, are taken from "Hansard"—

"We all know that in British parliaments the tradition is that if a Money Bill is defeated . . . the government goes to the people to seek their endorsement of its policies."?

It is quite extraordinary that the highly skilled public relations boys in Canberra are turning the situation around despite all that has been said and all that we know. In fact, they are feeding the ravenous sources of the Press, TV and radio, which are lapping it up and disgorging it to the public in dishonest forms. They are making out that Fraser has made a massive miscalculation and is wrecking the Constitution. And they are being reasonably successful. But more insidiously clever than that is the fact that they are almost succeeding in making it appear that Whitlam is innocent and Fraser is power hungry—the one who wants to grasp power by any means whatsoever. Every observer who has been reasonably rational agrees that Fraser acted only after Whitlam sacked Connor. That provided the final evidence that Whitlam was no longer fit to govern the country, or capable of doing so.

The highly skilled public relations boys paid by the Commonwealth Government have almost succeeded in convincing the nation that Fraser is on trial. Yet it is Whitlam who is in the dock—not Fraser; it is Whitlam who must justify his actions—not Fraser. If Whitlam possessed even elementary standards of public morality, he would have resigned and sought a vote of confidence from the electors. No matter what the cost, Whitlam is determined that he will cling to office. Therefore Fraser has only one constitutional course open to him to force the Government to face the judgment of the people. And the people have demonstrated, not only in public opinion polls, but also in different elections across the nation that they will not tolerate this present Whitlam-led A.L.P.

We in this Parliament of Queensland, within what is left of our federation, have a very clear duty to do anything in our power—I repeat, "Anything in our power"—to destroy this immoral, scandalous Government in Canberra if only because of recent actions, but, more positively than that, because the whole history of the Federal A.L.P. shows that it is not fit to govern and must be got rid of by any possible means.

STATEMENT BY MR. GEORGE MYE ON  
TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS

**Mr. DEERAL** (Cook) (12.5 p.m.): I rise to clarify a few aspects of the subject that was mentioned by the honourable member for Cairns—a subject that I am interested in, and a subject that always worries me, not because I am a coloured person but because in my electorate I represent the majority of the Aboriginal and Islander people.

**Government Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. DEERAL:** I agree with some of the things that were said by the honourable member for Cairns: I agree that the Aboriginal and Islander people are being used for political purposes, and have been used for years now. We have felt that we have been the meat in the sandwich. Sometimes when I sit in this House listening to subjects that are brought to the notice of honourable members, I feel like the meat in the sandwich.

What I want to clarify this morning is this: the telegram that the Premier has received has come from the right sources—it has come from the true representatives—because we are only talking about three groups of islands. First are the Eastern Islands, which Mr. George Mye represents. As was mentioned by the honourable member, when Mr. George Mye voted for Mr. Graham Gordon it was true because, if it came from Mr. Mye, he was brain-washed after becoming a member of the N.A.C.C. I knew Mr. Mye when he was the true representative of the Eastern Islands people when Mr. Lui was the representative of the Central Islands and Mr. Nona was the representative of the Western Islands.

When we toured there with the new Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement (Mr. Wharton)—and I know that honourable members know this—a statement was made by my friend the honourable member for Cairns. He agreed there because he heard with his own ears and saw with his own eyes on that tour. And members of both the Liberal Party and the National Party accompanied us on that trip, and we all heard. It is not what the Queensland Government wants; it is not what the Premier wants; it is what the people want.

This thing was put across when the Premier and I went to Saibai and the other islands on this last trip. The leaders of the islands said, "Look, Mr. Premier, it is not what you want and what you say; it is what we want and what we say." It is true, and I am glad, that the people are coming out and speaking. And we must listen to them. I want co-operation and I would like to see it.

I am a dark man, and when we went to the islands and when the Premier spoke, Mr. Mye was hiding behind a shed. He even hid from me. Mr. Mye and I were friends,

as I said, but this time he was hiding behind a coconut tree. He has the ability; he would be a good leader of the Islander people if he would use common sense, whether it is for the Aboriginal and Islander people or only the Islander people.

Confusion has set in since money was handed out, since the tractors and the trailers were put on different islands.

Confusion has set in on Palm Island. We do not hear anything of Palm Island any more. Why? Because we have leaders there who have common sense and want to co-operate with the Government and the local government. The honourable member for Townsville West will support me in that statement. There is co-operation now, but there was not when Mr. Freddie Clay was there. He was using our people, our committee and the Federal Government for the radicals. I have heard that one of the so-called freedom fighters for the Aboriginal people involved in yesterday's incident that was reported in today's paper has two convictions. I have a lot of time for Denis Walker. Why? Because he could make a good leader. But he will not use common sense.

**Mr. Hinze:** Would you say that the member for Cairns did not know what he was talking about a while ago?

**Mr. Jones:** He just told me he agreed with what I said.

**Mr. Hinze:** No, he didn't.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member for Cook is making a speech, and I propose to hear it.

**Mr. DEERAL:** The point that I really want to make is that my people are being confused. They are being confused not only by the things that are happening from the outside but because some of our own people, and some white people too, are getting onto the band wagon for their own benefit. I hope that these things will cease. If Mr. Mye reads what I have said, I hope that he will use common sense.

CLOSURE OF IRVINEBANK STATE TREATMENT  
WORKS

**Mr. HANSON** (Port Curtis) (12.12 p.m.): I have in my electorate a situation of very grave concern, which is shortly to be the subject of an application to the Mining Warden's Court. Naturally, on an occasion such as this it would be expected that I would concentrate on promoting the interests of my electorate. I have done a considerable amount of work in this area in the past, and I hope that there is a very successful outcome in the Warden's Court which is, I understand, to be constituted very shortly to consider the Bracewell mining operation and its effect on the decent and dedicated farmers of that area. However, as shadow Minister for Mines, I must bring forward another

matter, one that is exercising the minds of the people who reside in a northern town because it affects their livelihood. Recently in this Chamber several members have referred to the anxiety being felt by the people of this community. The honourable members for Cook and Barron River, and others, have made representations to the Minister for Mines and Energy, I understand, and to the Premier to overcome some of the difficulties in the present very tense situation.

About the middle of September, in a statement to the media, the Minister for Mines and Energy spoke of the repairs that were urgently needed at the Irvinebank State Treatment Works, and the reported closure of that works for four months. In answer to questions asked by the honourable member for Cook, the Minister said that the closure was necessary but he gave no indication concerning the future stockpile supply. He said that the tin miners in the region would have to make alternative arrangements. Naturally, when the plant comes back on stream, there will be a reduction from three shifts to one shift only, thereby adding considerably to the costs of ore treatment.

Irvinebank is a small town, whose population includes workers in the Loloma enterprise. They, together with those who work at and supply the State Treatment Works, make up the entire community. The mine has operated from the 1870's, and it has contributed over \$400,000,000 worth of tin at current world prices. It is therefore a very significant producer indeed, and one is naturally alarmed, dismayed and surprised that the members whom I have mentioned have received no result from the submissions that they have made to the Minister for Mines and Energy and the Premier.

The entire population of Irvinebank are in a state of very severe depression, not knowing what will happen to them. The children at school are being affected, there is a general air of tension in the town and many people are seriously thinking of leaving the community. The largest ore producer who supplies the State works has already packed up and left the community. Despite the fact that more than half the period mentioned by the Minister for Mines and Energy has gone by, we are being told that there have not been very many positive improvements in the delivery of materials for the upgrading of this isolated facility, which would take a considerable time. Apparently—

Mr. Hales interjected.

Mr. HANSON: The Minister has been asked to do certain things. I know that the honourable member is on the Minister's committee, but he must be surprised at the ineptitude, the lethargy and the general don't-care attitude of the Government. Apparently the Premier and the Minister for Mines and Energy seem intent on killing this community. They do not care two hoots about the producers. Apparently they would rather see them go broke first, by suggesting that they

should stay on in the community. But there has been no acceleration of attempts to upgrade the treatment works and make them viable.

Honourable members must be able to see that the people will go broke and that they will have to leave their homes. Are they in favour of the Government's attitude towards the closure of this enterprise? It would not surprise me at all if they were. But let them go out and tell the people in that community that they are in favour of closing the works. Let them go out and tell the people that they are in favour of the attitude of the Minister for Mines and Energy and the Premier and that they do not care two hoots about the people. Admittedly the State Treatment Works has not shown great profits. The Government has carried this enterprise over a long period, but at the same time I do not believe that a cut-off period should suddenly be fixed, forcing these people into a state of depression, a state of trauma and a state of anxiety, not knowing what their futures will be.

We realise that at the present time there is a world recession not only in tin prices but in many base metal prices. However, there is a shortfall of some 20 per cent in the Malaysian sector and, naturally, with an increase in fuel prices, the prospects for the tin-mining industry in this country are bright. I do not believe that the Irvinebank area has really been touched. We all know that in the early days of base metal mining in this State people in many areas did not go very deep to recover the metal. There are very few areas in Irvinebank where there has been deep mining. I believe that the future of this area will lie, as it does in most of the mining areas throughout the length and breadth of this State, in lode mining as opposed to alluvial mining. We will soon see the day when alluvial deposits are worked out, and it is very necessary that future work be oriented towards lode mining.

The State Treatment Works provides a very valuable service for the small producer, to the point where last year's production was some 108 tons. A geologist from the Bureau of Mineral Resources and a senior geologist with Loloma Mining both state that there is a considerable future for this locality. I believe that as Irvinebank is the centre of a huge mineral-bearing area, the Queensland Government could carry out research in a small way on extraction methods and so assist the producers in that region.

We are working on the theme that most alluvial deposits will soon be exhausted and that the lode deposits will come into their own. This must be based on the premise that the low-grade ores in the mines of today could be the higher-grade ores of tomorrow. In 1972, world reserves of tin metal were estimated by the International Tin Mining Council to be close on 5,000,000 tonnes, which will last for only 25 years on the projected price-and-consumption basis presently

existing, and alternative areas must be looked at. This particular area on the Herberton field could eventually come into its own, because the discovery of new lodes on the field is quite a possibility. As I said earlier, the history of mining on every field in this State indicates that mines have not gone to any great depth, and in many instances no great amount of money was spent and no technical equipment was employed.

In regard to the projected improvements, the Minister indicated that patterns for rod-mill liners are being made, and that liner bolts had arrived but no advice had been received as to delivery time on the liners; that the pre-screening device had been built and was about to be installed. As to the fourth table decking—unofficial advice has been received that it has been approved, but the management of the State Treatment Works are still awaiting official advice. They have not yet received any advice about the Vanner table belt, and no word has yet been received by them as to whether or not they will be able to stockpile ore in future near the hoppers.

As I said earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the producers are very disturbed. It is up to Government members to show some intestinal fortitude and get right into the Minister and the Premier and demand justice for the people of the area and ensure that they are not left in the lurch, left dying on the branch, left without future prospects for a livelihood for their wives and children.

(Time expired).

#### CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (12.22 p.m.): I wish to reinforce to this House a solemn and an urgent warning that has already been eloquently sounded by my colleague the honourable member for Clayfield.

It should be noted that in every country in which, over the last 50 years, parliamentary democracy has been superseded, the event has always been preceded by a careful moulding of public opinion in order to give some justification to temporarily replacing democracy with authoritarianism, and in the tragic event, of course, temporary has always proved to be permanent.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to ask ourselves: is this in fact happening here today? Are we in Australia already past the point of no return? Is it already too late to say, "It could not really happen here"? Are there in fact men in Australia who are pathologically obsessed with power for power's sake, who are proclaiming almost daily imminent disaster, anarchy and disruption, in order to justify their extreme action to protect themselves against this spurious threat? Is there a scenario for an Australian monolithic take-over already written—one that will suspend the constitution, with all its civil liberties and individual safeguards? Is the production of that script already well under way, or is this so much

alarmist nonsense? But, on the other hand, perhaps, it is, as I believe, a sober recognition of the incontestable facts of the last 10 days.

We have a situation in Canberra in which a Prime Minister, using all the sophistry at his command, all the elaborate paraphernalia of expensive propaganda machinery, is trying to avoid facing the people—his masters—at a general election.

Mr. Jensen: Too smart for you.

Mr. PORTER: That is Labor psychology for you, Mr. Deputy Speaker! Defeat the people, defy their will—that is smartness! It will be much smarter of the honourable member, in the long term, to recognise what democracy is all about; that is, obeying the will of the people.

We have a Prime Minister and his Ministers diligently fomenting confusion, alarm and fear. No-one, no matter what his political bias, can fail to have noted over the last 10 days this blood-in-the-streets atmosphere which is being sedulously generated by A.L.P. spokesmen and apologists. It began last Tuesday, 14 October, with Mr. Whitlam's Minister for Labor and Immigration (Senator James McClelland), who said—

"It would seem that some elements in the conservative parties are almost prepared to incite civil war."

Civil war! He went on to say—

"After all if the Governor-General, who is the viceroy of the Queen . . ."

Mark that—not the "Governor-General of the Queen" but the "viceroy of the Queen", which is a phrase used a lot by Mr. Whitlam and his senior men these days.

". . . were to accept advice from the Prime Minister that we were to call a half-Senate election, we would then be confronted with practically a revolt by the States against the Queen's representative.

"Now if they're prepared to launch something like that, they're giving the green light to all the extremists in our community.

"It could finish up as a war . . ."

"The responsibility for chaos would rest squarely on the shoulders of 'political primitives' like the Queensland Premier, (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) . . ."

"Why shouldn't someone be tempted in a given situation to decide that a couple of bullets can settle the constitutional problem?"

Two days later he was joined by Mr. Dunstan, the Labor Premier of South Australia. Honourable members opposite talk so glibly about democracy. Mr. Dunstan was the

Labor Premier who retained government on a minority of votes and minority of seats. Mr. Dunstan also got into the act and he said—

“The people will eventually take matters into their own hands if Australia’s constitutional democracy breaks down because of Liberal tactics.”

He went on to say—

“These people are so far defying normal constitutional practice and will bring constitutional, democratic government into ruin in this country.

“If people go on this way, refusing to carry out proper constitutional functions, it will lead to where people will take things into their own hands.”

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. PORTER: These are all things on record said by the colleagues of the honourable member. The same day Mr. Steele Hall, who is very much in the A.L.P. camp these days, said that the Opposition was looking forward to chaos and the Liberal Party was about to cause it. Just prior to the week-end that professional growler and scowler on television, Mr. Hawke, speaking to a rally outside the Houses of Parliament in Canberra said that unions should stop industry until the Senate backed down. What were his actual words? Let me not treat him badly; I will get his exact words. “The Australian” reported—

“Mr. Hawke told a big demonstration outside Parliament House yesterday that if the Opposition pressed ahead then ‘the Australian trade union movement may very well think about withholding supplies from them.’”

Does the honourable member who interjected earlier really believe that that is part of the democratic process—the trade union movement to use its muscle to force an elected Parliament to bow to its whims and dictates?

Then we had the orchestration of this “road to anarchy” composition reaching its crescendo when that quondam Liberal, now the darling of the A.L.P., Mr. John Gorton, really got into the act. He said—

“There could be fighting in the streets as a result of the political crisis.

“It will destroy democracy . . .”

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. PORTER: The honourable member asks whether I like him. Let him go back over my record. I never did regard him as a suitable person to lead the Liberal Party and I said so in this House time and time again. Mr. Gorton said—

“It will destroy democracy and mean an end to our system of government.

“There might be riots, and strikes, there might be fighting in the streets.”

Nobody can have failed to note the deliberate and massive injection of violence into any rally conducted by the Liberal-National Party throughout Australia by the A.L.P. It is part of the pattern to suggest that something is happening which is inevitable and which must be met. I lay odds that at the big rally that we will be having on Friday at the Festival Hall, the Labor heavies will be present. The thugs will be out trying to cause as much trouble, as much violence and as much civil disorder as possible in order to build up the story that a situation is developing which must be met by extreme measures.

Are we to regard this verbal onslaught as being meaningless? Are we to dismiss it merely as hysteria from frantic men who see their power slipping away from them? Or are we to see it as so much deliberate preparation, so much careful softening up and brain-washing? Are we truly being readied for what, three years ago, all of us would have seen as being totally impossible? Is a massive crisis being contrived with all this talk of disaster, rioting and bloodshed?

Can Mr. Whitlam really do what incipient dictators, using precisely the same methods as those we now see being used in Australia, did in other countries? Can he, by some device, suspend—on a temporary basis, perhaps—this country’s constitutional processes? I think many people will be appalled to learn that he can.

Mr. Whitlam has a variety of options open to him. For example, by our adoption of the Statute of Westminster he can take advantage of the provision that a determination made by the United Kingdom Parliament must take effect in a dominion, provided, of course, the dominion first required it and that the determination was made with the consent of the dominion. All that Mr. Whitlam has to do is ask the United Kingdom to act so as to suspend our Constitution, and under the request or on the consent—under the advice-and-consent basis now implicit in the statute—the United Kingdom Government and Parliament would have to act. Don’t imagine that this is not possible under our Constitution; don’t believe that its processes cannot be suspended. Think back to what happened in the shearers’ strike at the beginning of the century.

That is not the only avenue open to a power-hungry demagogue who is determined at all costs to avoid facing the people. Section 119 of the Constitution—the “domestic violence” provision—paves the way for the Commonwealth to step in. Is this being considered as a possible springboard for the sudden assumption of extraordinary powers to deal with a fictional threat of anarchy?

There is also section 63 of the Defence Act—the “special powers” section—which provides that the Governor-General may, subject to the provisions of that Act, do all matters and things deemed by him to be

necessary or desirable for the effective defence and protection of the Commonwealth or of any State.

Let us take that a little further. In view of that provision, we now understand why Mr. Whitlam has been talking about the Governor-General's role and why he has been saying, "The Governor-General will accept my advice. He will do what I tell him." We understand the chilling significance and meaning of Mr. Whitlam's use of the term "viceroy".

(Time expired.)

#### CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

**Dr. CRAWFORD** (Wavell) (12.33 p.m.): I am sure that all Australians are worried by the present constitutional crisis and that every concerned member of the community would like to see it brought to an end at the earliest possible time. As the crisis is now in its 14th day, I believe certain aspects of it are worthy of mention.

It is worth pointing out initially that our Constitution and the function of law in this country are not really comparable with those of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. For example, the Supreme Court of the United States of America is superior in jurisdiction to all State courts. If the Supreme Court hands down a decision—judges are appointed to it, incidentally, by the President of the United States—that decision is binding on all the States. Such a situation does not apply in Australia, where every State is autonomous in its own right, possessing its own legal protection under the Constitution. I believe that the States would not have accepted the Constitution in 1901 if it had not contained such protection.

The former Attorney-General in the Federal Labor Government, Mr. Justice Murphy, wanted to bring into this country a system of superior or supreme courts similar to that pertaining in the United States. He wanted to do this purely for the purpose of changing our constitutional methods and of enabling the Commonwealth's power to be concentrated in Canberra so that it could override decisions made by State Legislatures and courts.

Mr. Whitlam also has attempted by *de facto* means—by making speeches overseas and engaging in other snide tricks—to change the Constitution. He suggested that the defence powers be seized in a *de facto* manner, and he has repeatedly affirmed his belief that he wants to abolish not only the Senate powers, but also, in effect, the Senate itself. In the Senate we have a very important bulwark against erosion of the constitutional powers of the individual States and we must preserve and maintain it. Abolition of the Senate would be the last thing I should like to see.

Federal Labor, of course, now cries aloud because of the Opposition's move to invoke the purely constitutional power of the Senate. Federal Labor is in no way worried about upholding the Constitution; its only concern is that it now has only a 35 per cent rating across the country in the Gallup Polls. If the subject were not so serious, the constant squealing of the Federal Government about constitutional matters would be amusing. There is no doubt that the Senate has specific constitutional powers, and that it can use these powers. If it were not so serious, it would be amusing to hear the Federal Government making so much noise about a constitutional situation when every precedent has been flouted by it over the years since it came to power in its efforts to change or skirt around the Constitution and overcome its restrictions. I could mention the Gair affair, the Cairns affair, the Crean affair, the Murphy affair and the Connor affair.

**Mr. Porter:** And the Morosi affair.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** And the Morosi affair, as the honourable member says.

And in recent days we have heard about the Hayden affair. In the last two or three weeks Mr. Hayden has sent letters to pensioners in his electorate stating that because of the activities of the Opposition they are not going to receive their full entitlements. We also know that he has been leaking Budget details to Mr. Hawke.

**Mr. Porter:** As a director of an oil company, Hawke would be in a position to make money out of that.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** That is true.

Mr. Hayden leaked information to Mr. Hawke, particularly, in order to get his imprimatur or approval of Budget activities. Has anything like this happened in Australia before? About 10, 15 or 20 years ago such a disclosure would have automatically caused a Treasurer to resign.

The Watergate analogy is really quite startling when we consider the series of activities that have occurred in this country in the past few months. The only real difference is that Nixon's offsidiers in the United States—Erllichman and others—were goaled for their activities, whereas Connor and co. were only demoted and relegated to the back benches.

A solution must be found to this constitutional crisis. I have no doubt that the lawyers advising the present Federal Government are very busy looking at the various alternatives which the honourable member for Toowong mentioned. However, I believe that there are only two possible alternatives in the solution of this present constitutional crisis. The first is that Mr. Whitlam could be defeated on the floor of the House by defection of his own members. If he continues to lead as he has, heaping abuse on Messrs. Cairns and

Connor, that is a definite possibility. The mandate about which we hear so much from him involves a majority of only three—excluding Mr. Gorton, who would probably vote for him at the moment. But some solution must be found. If certain members of the Labor Party are not sufficiently good citizens to realise that they must take that type of action on the floor of the House of Representatives, the second alternative is for the Governor-General Sir John Kerr, to act. He also has specific powers under the Constitution.

A reasonable solution to this whole matter would be for the Governor-General to announce now that he will be calling an election on some set date next year, say, in April or May. That would permit every political party to campaign as it wished for a few months. It would have to involve a double dissolution with the House of Representatives going to the country. That would allow the Prime Minister to test his Budget in the next three or four months to see if it had a possible chance of working. It would also completely preclude any claim that his Budget was not given a chance to work.

This is a workable solution and I believe it is one which would be acceptable to all parties—to the Opposition and to the majority of the Labor Party. But whether Mr. Whitlam, with his personal acquisition of power and his personal desire to keep power, at all costs to the country, would be prepared to act in that constitutional way or to acquiesce in the Governor-General's acting in that constitutional way remains to be seen.

It should be possible to issue a challenge to him either to advise the Governor-General along those lines or to accept the advice of the Governor-General if he made a decision to act in that way. This would be one method of completely removing the threat of anarchy in our country and of bringing about a solution to a constitutional crisis which is of the greatest significance. If, however, it is felt by the Federal Labor organisation that anarchy is to be encouraged for political ends, this solution would not be possible. The ball is in Mr. Whitlam's court, and through him, and separately from him, in Sir John Kerr's court to act in a responsible fashion. There is no other solution.

#### INTEGRITY OF THE PRIME MINISTER

**Mr. JENSEN** (Bundaberg) (12.41 p.m.): My matter of public interest today deals with the Prime Minister of Australia, the Honourable Gough Whitlam. Today, the honourable member for Clayfield practically reiterated the speech made last week by the honourable member for Toowong because he received no publicity. Today, the honourable member for Toowong has spoken in a stronger vein to try to get that publicity.

In Mr. Whitlam we have a man of honesty, integrity and purpose for the welfare of Australia. His honesty is as outstanding as his ability. He is head and shoulders over Mr. Fraser and any other member of the Opposition. At no time has he been afraid to stand up for honesty and decency.

He said to his Cabinet—

"I have made it clear throughout the life of this Government that there is one standard which, if departed from, must carry the heaviest penalty. It is a principle on which the integrity of Parliament itself depends. There was, I believe, a departure from that principle."

The departure referred to Mr. Connor. The Prime Minister also said—

"Yesterday I received from solicitors in Melbourne a copy of a statutory declaration signed by Mr. Khemlani" (who is the wop that was brought over at the instigation of the Liberals) "and copies of a number of telex messages between Mr. Khemlani's office in London and the office of the Minister for Minerals and Energy. In my judgment these messages did constitute 'communications of substance' between the Minister and Mr. Khemlani.

"I was therefore driven to conclude that I had been misled . . ."

**Mr. BYRNE:** I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to Mr. Speaker's decision a few days ago in relation to the reading of speeches. The honourable member for Bundaberg has not taken his eyes from his notes.

Honourable Members interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! When a point of order is being taken, I expect the Chamber to listen in silence.

The honourable member for Bundaberg should not be overdependent on copious notes.

**Mr. JENSEN:** I do not want my time wasted by idiots. I am quoting what Mr. Whitlam said.

**Mr. BYRNE:** I rise to a point of order. I find the remark or the insinuation of the honourable member for Bundaberg that I am an idiot offensive and I ask that he withdraw it.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bundaberg will withdraw it.

**Mr. JENSEN:** I withdraw it.

I have heard insinuations in this House that Mr. Whitlam was implicated in what Mr. Connor did. Mr. Whitlam was not implicated in anything Mr. Connor did after

20 May. The statement made by the Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) which he presented to Caucus and Parliament reads—

"I repeat for public information what has already been made clear by protracted debate in both Houses of Federal Parliament.

"My authority to pursue the question of loan raisings was revoked on 20 May last to enable a \$100 million Australian Government Loan to be raised in the United States.

"I have never proceeded on any basis other than that authority. I have persistently abided by the decision of 20 May, and have rejected any endeavours to further involve me in loan raising matters. I have since 20 May made clear that anyone interested in loan matters should deal with the Treasurer."

He gave that statement to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister, because he is a man of integrity, had to do what he did. He said, "This Parliament is going to be run on honest lines." He is one of the most honest and sensible men who have ever been in this country.

Fraser called him either a liar or a fool. I would say that Fraser is a real Australian mug. He is the one who brought Khemlani back to Australia, and the Opposition have called him to appear before the Senate to prove anything that he can prove. It has been shown in the last two days that the Liberal Opposition are cracking fast. They have now forgotten Khemlani, this wop whom they brought from overseas in an attempt to incriminate Whitlam and kill the Federal Government that is doing the right thing. They brought this wop back after he had left Australia for Singapore and told more lies there. The Opposition thought he had some material that would be of value to them, so they brought him back. He had, he said, six cases of documents. They went through them but found that they were nothing but rubbish.

**A Government Member:** How do you know?

**Mr. JENSEN:** Today's "Telegraph" contains this item—

"The Opposition in the Senate gave notice that it would move for a select committee to investigate the Government's overseas loans affair."

The Opposition now wants a select committee. It does not want Khemlani to go before the Senate.

Whitlam has made it clear that he is governing this country with honesty and integrity. If anyone lies to Whitlam, whether it be Cairns, Connor, Crean or anybody else, he is out. And that is what a Prime Minister or Premier should do. He should not allow a Cabinet Minister to lie to Parliament or

to the people. Whitlam has stood by his statement and he has been as honest as he should be.

The Liberal Party threw out Snedden, McMahon and Gorton for certain things that they did. But Whitlam stands up and is not afraid to sack even his Deputy Prime Minister, his next in line and one who was well regarded throughout Australia by both the trade union movement and manufacturers. They thought that Cairns was a pretty strong man; but Whitlam is the strongest person that the Australian Parliament has ever had.

This is now being admitted, and the Opposition are cracking. They are now trotting out the Hayden affair. They are clutching at any straw that comes sweeping down the river. They will do anything to try to destroy Whitlam and his honesty and integrity. But that is one thing that they will never succeed in, because he is a man of principle.

We have not had much of principle from Fraser. He said that he would not destroy the Parliament before it had run its term; but he has turned around and made the biggest mistake of his life. He will go the way of his predecessors—Snedden, McMahon and Gorton. He is as incompetent as they were, and Whitlam shines head and shoulders above the incompetents of the Liberal Party, who brought a wop into this country in an attempt to discredit him.

Whitlam will not be discredited by anybody. He is one man who is sincere in the game of governing Australia, and he is making himself felt throughout the Liberal movement. He is showing how to govern with honesty and decency. He is the one and only man who has ever stood up and stated that this country has got to be governed by certain principles, and if they are departed from the heaviest penalty must be paid. That is why these Ministers paid the heaviest penalty, being sacked from Cabinet. There might be some members of the Queensland Cabinet who should be sacked too, but we do not know. But if the Premier of any State acts in the way Mr. Whitlam has acted we can be sure that his State will be governed very adequately, sincerely and honestly.

#### CRITICISM OF A.L.P.; NEW BRIDGE ACROSS HAYES INLET

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumba) (12.51 p.m.): There is no doubt about it, the honourable member for Bundaberg must have thought he was auditioning for the part of a clown at a circus or trying to take over as a comedian on one of the television channels. Fancy rising here and defending Whitlam. Whitlam must be the worst, rottenest and foulest Prime Minister that this country has even been unfortunate enough to have foisted upon it. If he did not know about some of the rotten, filthy deals that went on down South he is incompetent. He did know about it! I do not believe for one moment that Whitlam did not know. He knew about the



racket that Dr. Cairns's son was involved in and he knew about the oil deal with Khemlani. I venture to suggest that a fair bit of the commission paid on that deal would have found its way into Whitlam's pockets, or those of some of his cohorts; don't worry about that.

What about the latest deal he was involved in, the ACTU-Solo petrol deal where they got Scuter, the secretary of the Australian Council of Trade Unions to take the kick for it? Bob Hawke was out of the country. As I said before, he ought to be called "Chicken Hawke" for being so gutless as to get out of the country and let Souter take the kick. How many fellows have taken the kick? Cairns and Connor took the kick for the Prime Minister. He got rid of Crean. Junie Morosi was tied up with bringing in illegal Filipino immigrants, or her mother was, and hiring them out to people in Sydney at a lousy rate of pay. At any rate, it involved a kick-back to her. They were all involved in this. Murphy was in it, too. They are the greatest mob of racketeers I have ever seen.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the absence of the honourable member for Rockhampton. Honourable members know where he is today—up in Rockhampton fawning, toadying and grovelling around Bob Hawke and polishing his boots. He is attending a meeting in Rockhampton some time today. The honourable member for Rockhampton is up there trying to stir up a riot tomorrow, so that the Premier cannot be heard. In his hatred for the Premier, he has taken time off from this Parliament to go up to Rockhampton to incite the people to riot.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: He is up there to start it. Look, there is only one A.L.P. man in the Chamber—one A.L.P. man listening to this very important debate!

Mr. Jensen: One of us could take all of you on.

Mr. FRAWLEY: The honourable member for Rockhampton is up there now because he was told by the Left-wing and Communist bosses of the Q.C.E. to go up there and do all he could to disrupt the Premier's meeting. Honourable members all know that they are frightened of the Premier because he is a man who tells the truth and they do not want the truth told at any price.

Mr. Tenni interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not know whether the honourable member for Rockhampton is a member of the Communist Party—I honestly don't know—but there is no doubt that he is financed by them. I have something important to say here today but I was impelled to rise and refute some of the stupid, ridiculous statements made by the honourable member for Bundaberg. I could not resist

the opportunity to put him on the right track and I also felt it was important to point out that the honourable member for Rockhampton has failed in his duty to his constituents by absenting himself today to take part in a meeting in Rockhampton and try to incite a riot. That is all he is trying to do—get a whole mob of strong-arm heavies up there to incite a riot tomorrow.

Mr. Akers interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I know that he wouldn't give a boot. I want to make an important appeal in this House today for a new bridge across Hayes Inlet from Redcliffe to Sandgate. Redcliffe is a city of 41,000 people. The honourable member for Redcliffe (Mr. Speaker), made an appeal in 1960 for a new bridge across Hayes Inlet. He has done so ever since. There are only two routes from the Redcliffe Peninsula to Brisbane—one across the Hornibrook Highway and the other around through Petrie and Lawnton. The route across the bridge is only 26 km but the route through Petrie is 35 km.

Mr. Jensen: What is that in miles?

Mr. FRAWLEY: About 16 miles and 25 miles. I am not too well up on this kilometre business, but it is about 16 miles via the Hornibrook Highway and 25 miles through Petrie. About 75 to 80 per cent of Redcliffe people use the Hornibrook Highway to travel from Redcliffe to Brisbane.

Redcliffe could be classed as a dormitory city because most workers who live there work outside its boundaries. In fact, about 80 per cent of Redcliffe's work-force work outside the city, and of that 80 per cent, a good 65 to 70 per cent use the Hornibrook Highway to travel to and from work, principally to Brisbane.

Ten years ago Redcliffe had a population of 27,000. They were mainly retired people and people on holiday. But since then many young people have settled in Redcliffe and brought their families there because they realise the advantages that the city of Redcliffe has over other cities. Being near the sea, it does not have any smog or foul air—except when the A.L.P. members get up and spout things at election time. Another big attraction at Redcliffe is the all-day shopping on Saturday. Many people who live in Brisbane use the Hornibrook Highway on Saturday to travel to Redcliffe to do their shopping.

Incidentally, Redcliffe has no parking meters. During the six years that I was an elected alderman of the Redcliffe City Council, I was one of the few who opposed parking meters and succeeded in keeping them out of Redcliffe. I sincerely trust that the present aldermen of the Redcliffe City Council will continue that policy. There is regulated parking in the area, but, as far as I am concerned, there certainly will not be any parking meters in Redcliffe.

Since the 10c toll on the Hornibrook Highway was lifted on 4 October, there has been a large increase in the volume of traffic using the bridge. I can speak with authority on this because I live in Elizabeth Avenue. It used to be called the North Coast Road, and it was the direct link with the Bruce Highway. Many trucks are now using Elizabeth Avenue and going through Old Bay Road and Deception Bay to avoid the weighbridge at Burpengary. I am absolutely certain that there has been a definite increase in traffic over the Hornibrook Highway. I will not take any contradiction, because I know what I am talking about.

**Mr. Melloy:** You had better get a new bridge before this one falls down.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** There is no danger of the bridge falling down.

Just before the 1972 election, Mr. Jack Houston, who was then Leader of the Opposition, came to Redcliffe and attempted to mislead the people of Redcliffe by saying that if the A.L.P. were elected it would immediately remove the toll from the bridge. The A.L.P. knew damn well that, because of the agreement with the Hornibrook Highway Company, it could not do that. Mr. Houston also said that an A.L.P. Government would build a four-lane highway to Redcliffe. That was completely untrue. It could not do that.

I have to be fair and admit that the Liberal candidate who opposed the present Speaker of this Assembly in the 1972 election—I was also opposed by a Liberal candidate, but I am not complaining about that—criticised the State Government, his own colleagues and everybody else because a new highway had not been built to Redcliffe. Everyone tries to jump on the band wagon of the Hornibrook Highway.

A transportation study was carried out in 1967 by Rankine and Hill. It was paid for partly by the Redcliffe City Council and partly by the Main Roads Department. Between 1967 and the present day, traffic on the Hornibrook Highway has increased to such an extent that at least 14,000 vehicles now cross the bridge daily, and that does not include Government vehicles, Redcliffe City Council vehicles, ambulances and so on. At week-ends, more than 20,000 vehicles cross the highway daily on Saturday and Sunday. That transportation study was made on the basis of projecting into the future to 1987, and it was estimated that by 1987 22,000 vehicles would cross the highway daily during the week and 46,000 daily at the week-ends. It was estimated that two lanes of pavement with a width of 20 ft. and a pedestrian walk-way could not possibly carry that amount of traffic.

A four-lane bridge must be built very soon. When a breakdown occurs on the existing two-lane bridge, invariably the driver of the vehicle walks away from it. The nearest garage is only about 400 metres from the northern end of the bridge, but the bridge itself is about 1½ miles long. If a vehicle

breaks down, usually the driver gets a lift to the nearest garage. There are no breakdown facilities on the bridge. I have asked in this Chamber whether the Hornibrook Highway Company would put telephones on the bridge

**Mr. Moore:** Why don't they put an air cushion, or something of that sort, at certain places on the bridge? It could be put on the bumper-bar and the vehicle could then be pushed off the bridge.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** They should be able to open the rails and tip the vehicle over into Hayes Inlet. That would stop the trouble.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! Under the provisions of the sessional order previously agreed upon by the House, the time allotted for the Matters of Public Interest debate has now expired.

The House adjourned at 1.1 p.m.

---