

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 1975

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 1975

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

ATTIRE IN CHAMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Yesterday I advised the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he was not to appear in the House in future as he was then dressed as his dress was not in accordance with Standing Orders, customs and precedents of this House. In fact previous Speakers have ordered members similarly dressed to leave the Chamber immediately. I was a little more tolerant than that with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition but I can assure all members that I will not be as tolerant in future in view of something that has transpired since.

This morning a television station requested permission to televise the House as it assembled. I have no intention of ever unduly restricting the right of the Press or media to fully report the proceedings of this Chamber but I refused this particular request because I was of the opinion that certain members would have seized the opportunity to appear dressed as vaudevillian clowns or such like merely to seek cheap publicity and attempt to turn the proceedings of this Chamber into a farce and a joke.

While I am Speaker, the rules of dress, dignity, decorum and conduct in all matters will be strictly enforced with respect to persons. I believe that, once the dignity of Parliament is eroded, then we can take the first step to a state of affairs that no responsible person desires.

So, ladies and gentlemen, as from now these rules of dress will be, as I said, imposed strictly and without fear or favour.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES,
1974-75**

Mr. SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Deputy Governor transmitting the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1974-75.

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

VOTE ON ACCOUNT, 1976-77

Mr. SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services of the year ending 30 June 1977—

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

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

From the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account, the sum of thirty-three million dollars.

Message referred to Committee of Supply.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Financial Statements of the Public Curator, for the year 1974-75.

Registrar of Friendly Societies.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1974.

Regulations under—

Property Law Act 1974.

Clean Air Act 1963-1972.

Local Government Act 1936-1975.

**GOVERNOR'S SALARY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL****INITIATION**

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Governor's Salary Act 1872-1973 in a certain particular.”

Motion agreed to.

**AURUKUN ASSOCIATES AGREEMENT
BILL****INITIATION**

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill with respect to an agreement between the State of Queensland, Tipperary Corporation, Billiton Aluminium Australia B. V. and Aluminium Pechiney Holdings Pty. Limited and for purposes incidental thereto and consequent thereon.”

Motion agreed to.

**INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND
ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL****THIRD READING**

Bill, on motion of Mr. Campbell, read a third time.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. REPORTED CASES OF CHILD ABUSE

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

(1) How many cases of child abuse have been reported in Queensland from 1 January to date?

(2) Is this an increase on the number reported for the whole of 1974?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) The Department of Children's Services collects statistics on the basis of financial years rather than calendar years and it would not be possible to supply accurate figures to 27 November at short notice, without telephoning around to all the offices of the Department of Children's Services. Under the following two headings listed in the report of the Director, Department of Children's Services, for the year ended 30 June 1974, 136 cases of child abuse were reported—(a) children receiving excessive corporal punishment; and (b) battered baby reports received from hospitals. The figures in each category for the year ended 30 June 1974 were 108 and 28. Figures to the end of June 1975 will be included in the report of the Director, Department of Children's Services, when it is tabled.

2. POLLUTION OF BRISBANE RIVER

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

(1) Is he aware of the report of a fish kill in the Brisbane River in recent weeks?

(2) Have Water Quality Council officers taken samples for analysis?

(3) What was the result of the study?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2 and 3) The Water Quality Council is the responsibility of the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, to whom these questions should be directed.

3. AURUKUN ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY AND MINING LEASE

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

(1) When was Mr. F. Purcell appointed by the Aurukun community to do legal work for them?

(2) Was Mr. Purcell given assurance by the department that he would be included in the negotiations relating to the alumina proposals on land occupied by the community?

(3) Does the proposal for the alumina project contemplate that the Aurukun profit share will be paid into a trust fund to benefit all Queensland Aborigines and not just the Aurukun people?

(4) Did the Premier's Department give an assurance to the Presbyterian Mission Board in June 1973 that the council at Aurukun would be consulted before any discussions were taken on mining projects?

(5) Has the Premier's assurance been kept?

(6) How many meetings have been held with the council at Aurukun relating to this alumina proposal and when did they occur?

Answer:—

(1 to 6) The honourable member will have the opportunity of examining the proposed legislation when it is introduced in this House, notice of which was given yesterday.

4. TIMBER ON SITE OF MAROOCHY SHIRE DAM

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

(1) Did he read the letter in "Queensland Country Life" of 20 November headed "A Gigantic Waste" and apparently referring to the proposed new Maroochy Shire dam to be set in 600 acres of rain forest?

(2) Has this site for the shire dam received State Government approval and, if so, is any saleable timber to be burnt?

(3) Is any unsaleable timber to be allowed to be removed?

(4) If the site is required for water storage, what provision will be made to replace this rain forest?

Answers:—

(1) I read the letter in the "Queensland Country Life" of 20 November and immediately contacted the Conservator of Forests about the matter. It is estimated that up to 400 acres of State forest containing hardwood (both natural grown and plantation) and rain forest areas could be involved if the proposal proceeds.

(2) The position appears to be that until such time as tests now being conducted by the shire council indicate that this is a suitable site for a dam, it is unlikely that forestry final approval would be sought. No saleable timber will be burnt. To ensure that all marketable timber is removed prior to clearing, the department will regulate sale procedures accordingly.

(3) As a final effort to dispose of any timber remaining in the area after logging operations, the department would consider offers from interested users on "lump sum"

or concessional rates for all or part of the timber remaining. This is standard practice in such circumstances.

(4) If this area is lost to timber production, the industry will suffer unless substitute areas can be acquired.

5. A.L.P. CAMPAIGN FUNDS,
LEICHHARDT ELECTORATE

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

(1) Has he been informed that the Mareeba branch of the Australian Labor Party has been publicly advertising in papers circulating in the Leichhardt electorate, urging people who wish to donate any funds for the A.L.P. campaign to leave the money with Mr. Kevin Eales, a barber, of Byrnes Street, Mareeba, who is at present charged before the Mareeba Court with theft?

(2) If so, will he ensure that any money left with Eales for the A.L.P. Leichhardt campaign will be protected against misappropriation by Eales?

(3) Can any action be taken against the A.L.P. for soliciting funds in this manner?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) There is no offence as such of soliciting for donations to political parties. It would be a matter for the Australian Labor Party to ensure that any donations made to its fund are properly accounted for. If anybody is concerned about it and feels they have not been accounted for, investigations can be made. The association of the A.L.P. with thuggery, bashings, threats, boycotts and extremist elements of the Communist Party in this particular election campaign simply is bringing out in the open the A.L.P. in its true colours—an extreme Left-wing party which is prepared to use any measures to gain power even to the extent of overthrowing constitutional authority and the rule of law.

6. TOWN AND COUNTRY PERMANENT
BUILDING SOCIETY

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) Did Town & Country Permanent Building Society, a society registered under the Building Societies Act, sustain an accumulated loss of \$226,000 for 1973-74 and 1974-75?

(2) Did the auditors of the society submit a qualified report to the Registrar of Building Societies regarding the statement of assets and liabilities, the profit and loss account and the method of accounting for these in the annual report and, if so, what action will he take to investigate the matter?

Answers:—

(1) This information has not been made available to the Registrar of Building Societies as the financial accounts for the year ended 30 June 1975 have not been received.

(2) The auditors did not qualify their report on the 1973-74 accounts.

7. GOLD COAST PERMANENT BUILDING
SOCIETY

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) How much did Gold Coast Permanent Building Society pay for the purchase of Rix Building, Nerang Street, Southport, and what was the Valuer-General's unimproved value of the property at the time of purchase?

(2) Was the society taken over before the date of settlement and, if so, by which permanent building society?

(3) Has this permanent building society presented its audited books of account for 1974-75?

(4) What is the property valuation in those accounts and what is the name of the valuer who prepared the value?

(5) If the accounts have not been presented, what is the reason?

Answers:—

(1) This information is not shown in the records of the Registrar of Building Societies.

(2) This information also is not shown.

(3 and 5) This Society's engagements were fully transferred to another building society and, as a consequence, it is nothing more than a shell and not engaged in any operations. As it does not have any membership, it would not be practicable to convene a meeting or to present accounts.

(4) This information is not contained in the records of the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

8. COMMONWEALTH PUBLIC SERVICE
PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETY

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) Were the Commonwealth Public Service Permanent Building Society's financial accounts for the year ended 30 June 1974 not published or presented to members until after June 1975?

(2) Did the 1973-74 annual report indicate that the accounts shown were for the 1974-75 fiscal year?

(3) If this did occur, would it constitute deception and fraud on the part of the directors?

Answers:—

(1) The Commonwealth Public Service Permanent Building Society has failed to lodge with the Registrar an annual report and financial accounts for the year ended 30 June 1974. Staff of the office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs have been undertaking inquiries and an inspection of this society and appropriate further action will be taken as necessary.

(2) The information sought is not recorded in the records of the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

(3) I doubt if what is indicated by the honourable member for Archerfield is correct. However, a full explanation will be sought from the society and the matter assessed as to appropriate further action to be taken.

9. MR. J. F. COPE'S CRITICISM OF THE QUEEN

Dr. Scott-Young, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Has he seen a statement by the former A.L.P. Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Cope, in which he criticised Her Majesty the Queen?

(2) Is there any basis for that attack and is it not a fact that it was Mr. Cope's successor as Speaker who sought to involve Her Majesty in the dismissal of the Whitlam Government in the first place?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) The attacks on Her Majesty the Queen by the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. J. F. Cope, and also by members of the Opposition in this House, which were widely reported in the Press on Tuesday of this week surely constitute a most unwarranted insult to the sovereign. The only reason why Her Majesty became involved in any way in the dismissal of the Whitlam Government was that Mr. Cope's successor as Speaker, Mr. Scholes, wrote to Her Majesty protesting at the Governor-General's action. Her Majesty's reply to Mr. Scholes was correct in every sense. There can be no doubt that under the Constitution the Governor-General has the power to dismiss the Prime Minister in circumstances such as those which prevailed in Australia on 11 November last. This view is supported by the published letters of the Commonwealth Solicitor-General and by leading constitutional authorities throughout the nation. The people should be reminded that if the A.L.P. makes the position of the Governor-General an election issue, and it is successful at the polls—which is highly doubtful—then the A.L.P. will regard this as a mandate to abolish the monarchy, the positions of the Governor-General, the positions of the Governors—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. KNOX: The honourable member for Archerfield has been saying that. He has not hesitated to say it.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members for Rockhampton and Bulimba know the rules of the House. I warn them under Standing Order 123A. I will not tolerate interjections while the Minister is on his feet.

Mr. KNOX: I will repeat it. The people should be reminded that if the A.L.P. makes the position of the Governor-General an election issue (which it is attempting to do), and it is successful at the polls—which is highly doubtful—then the A.L.P. will regard this as a mandate to abolish the monarchy, the position of the Governor-General and the positions of the Governors, the Senate and other democratic institutions which have safeguarded the people's rights in this country for 75 years. When that happens, the way will be open to establish a dictatorship.

The Constitution was specially designed to prevent a dictatorship being created in this country because the founding fathers had come from countries where there had been undue interference by the State in private lives. I believe that the same support prevails in Australia today. The people of Australia still value their freedoms as they did 75 years ago, and there is no way that they would support the A.L.P.'s policy of establishing a socialist republic with Whitlam as dictator.

10. NATURAL DISASTER ACTION COMMITTEE

Mr. Marginson for **Mr. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) Is he aware that a Natural Disaster Action Committee, whose president is Councillor J. F. Deppeler and whose secretary is Mrs. E. R. Dalitz, of 21 Ponds Drive, Lara, Victoria 3212, is soliciting support, financial and otherwise, from local authorities in Queensland?

(2) Has any investigation been carried out into the activities of this committee to determine if its efforts are worth while and, if so, is he prepared to recommend State Government assistance in funding the activities of the committee if it extends its activities into Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) Yes, though the circulars of which I am aware are dated 1974.

(2) I am advised that the committee referred to is an unofficial body, and I would not be prepared to recommend any State Government or local government funding of its activities. The honourable member should be aware that Queensland has its own State Emergency Service.

11. REMOVAL OF WEIGHING SCALES FROM SMALL RAILWAY STATIONS

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

(1) Is he aware that weighing scales have been withdrawn from some suburban and small country railway stations?

(2) If so, has this anything to do with metric conversion and will they be replaced?

(3) If not, how are staff expected to check-weigh, in accordance with instructions and/or regulations, incoming freight and despatch outgoing freight at stations where no scales are provided?

(4) Has due consideration been given to the inconvenience to the public and the attendant difficulties presented to staff by the lack of scales?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) This is an indirect result of metrication, in that a survey arranged because of the need to convert to metric, showed that it was uneconomic to maintain weighing facilities at a number of stations because of the very limited extent to which they were used.

(3) Staff at stations where there are no weighing facilities are not expected to check weight. For outward parcels the regulations provide that the consignor is responsible for declaring the weight.

(4) Over 50 new metric platform scales have been put into service at busy stations, and at all stations where there is sufficient outward traffic the existing imperial scales will be replaced by new metric scales over the next two years. I might add that representations have been made by many Government members for this facility.

12. WHITLAM CLAIM ON LEGAL AID FIRST

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

(1) Is he aware of the claim by Mr. Whitlam in his policy speech that citizens had been given legal aid for the first time as a result of the policies of the former A.L.P. Government?

(2) How can that claim be reconciled with the existence of extensive legal aid services in Queensland and other States for many years?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) The claim by Mr. Whitlam in his policy speech that citizens had been given legal aid for the first time as a result of the policies of the A.L.P. is completely and demonstrably false. In Queensland and in every other State extensive legal aid and legal assistance services were in operation long before the unwarranted intrusion of the Commonwealth in

this field. In Queensland, both the State Government through the Public Defender's Office and the Public Curator Office and the legal profession through the Legal Assistance Committee provide legal aid in both criminal and civil matters. The entry of the Commonwealth into this field has not reduced the burden on State services and those maintained by the profession. All that has happened is that unnecessary duplication and confusion have been created. As I have indicated on a number of occasions, if the Commonwealth provides this State with the funds for legal aid we will ensure that they are used efficiently and without wasteful duplication and confusion.

13. MR. L. KEOGH CLAIMING CREDIT FOR PRE-SCHOOLS IN BOWMAN ELECTORATE

Mr. Byrne, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

(1) Is he aware that the now desperate member for Bowman, Mr. Len Keogh, is continuing his deceitful campaign by claiming in his personal pamphlet that the pre-schools in the area were constructed as a result of his direct representations?

(2) Will he set the record straight for the people of Bowman and the members of this House, in that they should not allow themselves to be misled by this man's vain attempts to gain personal credit for fine works by the State, works that were lacking because of his own inabilities?

Answers:—

(1) This claim is a blatant distortion of the facts. Of those pre-schools specifically mentioned in the pamphlet, Belmont, Wynnum North and Cannon Hill were all built out of State Loan Funds. No application was ever made to the Commonwealth for funds for these pre-schools. Carina Pre-school was built with funds provided by the Commonwealth, but I should hasten to add that Mr. Keogh made no representations to my department for this centre to be constructed.

(2) I can assure honourable members and the people of Bowman that the application to the Commonwealth was made by the Queensland Government. Undeniably this application was approved because of the very efficient record of Queensland in providing pre-school facilities rather than any representations Mr. Keogh may claim to have made. I am surprised that Mr. Keogh should publicly seek credit for these amenities when he well knows that they are being provided under a comprehensive policy of the Queensland Government on pre-school education. Mr. Keogh can take no credit whatsoever for this policy or for its implementation.

14. COMPLAINTS AGAINST AUTOMOBILE ENGINE RECONDITIONERS PTY. LTD.

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

As there were five claims made against the firm of Automobile Engine Reconditioners Pty. Ltd. under the Small Claims Tribunals Act during August last, of which four were upheld, how many claims were made against this firm under this Act and how many complaints were received by the Consumer Affairs Bureau?

Answer:—

Particulars of orders made by the Small Claims Tribunal are published in "The Courier-Mail" in accordance with the provisions of section 42 of the Small Claims Tribunals Act, and it is not my intention to supply details of the number of claims lodged with the Small Claims Tribunal against any particular firm unless the circumstances are such that it is considered that the naming of a trader is warranted.

15. PENALTIES FOR TRUANCY

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

(1) Is he aware of the New South Wales Child Welfare Review Legislation Committee report wherein it is stated that parents should pay a sum of money for each day their child is truant from school?

(2) Are any penalties imposed on parents in Queensland who do not give proper supervision to their children to check whether they attend school each day?

(3) Has consideration been given by his department to the New South Wales proposal and, if so, what is the result?

Answers:—

(1) I have seen a Press report about the committee's findings but I have not yet seen the committee's report.

(2) Under the provisions of the Education Act 1964-1974, a parent may be fined for failing to cause his or her child to attend school on each school day, unless some reasonable excuse exists. The Act provides a penalty of up to \$10 for a first offence and of up to \$50 for a second offence.

(3) No consideration has been given to the New South Wales proposal.

16. JURY FEES AND CONDITIONS

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

(1) In view of the concern which has again arisen regarding fees paid to persons called and selected for jury service, will

he undertake to raise these payments so that they are more in line with the wages being lost by such persons?

(2) Is a payment of \$4 per day for appearance at court fair and reasonable?

(3) In view of the complaints in a petition to him about the quality of meals given to jurors, will he investigate the allegations and thus ensure that the meals supplied are of an acceptable standard?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) The Law Reform Commission has examined the question of jury service as to whether or not such service should be regarded as a public duty or as an occupation and, as well as confirming that jury service should be regarded as a public duty, pointed out that individual citizens are called upon to perform this service infrequently. If a juror attending in court is not empanelled and he satisfies the sheriff he has been caused actual financial loss in excess of \$4 per day, provision is made for such a juror to be paid an amount not exceeding \$15 for that day.

(3) Complaints about the quality of meals are occasionally made and all such complaints are investigated. On investigation these complaints are found to be groundless or of little substance but the caterers are always advised of such complaints. It is considered that meals provided generally are adequate and of good quality.

17. TOILET FACILITIES IN SCHOOLS

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) Have representations been made by the Queensland Teachers' Union to him to the effect that many schools in Queensland are below the minimum toilet-facility standards?

(2) Of the 17 schools listed by the Q.T.U. in recent representations as being examples of serious cases of schools lacking proper toilet facilities, how many are listed for improvement this financial year and which schools are they?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) Yes. My Department of Works has the question of toilet accommodation at all schools throughout the State continually under review. Fund allocations from the Whitlam Government with its inflationary policies have seriously affected the progress of the department's works programme generally, including toilet facilities at schools.

18. RAILWAY FREIGHT

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

(1) Has the Railways Department now prescribed a minimum freight consignment of 50 kg?

(2) As this, coupled with the latest freight charges arising from the new State Budget, will impose an unrealistic freight charge on many small packages consigned to country retailers and traders and as it has been alleged that a 7 kg parcel recently consigned to Tully cost \$14 in freight, thus making the retail price of the article prohibitive, will he take steps to relieve such high freight costs on essential supplies consigned by rail?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) Prior to the recent increase in rail charges, the maximum charge for a parcel weighing 1 kg for any distance was 14c. This charge was ridiculously low, particularly in instances where the department was involved in postal expenditure of 18c to advise the consignee of the parcel's arrival. For these reasons, the rates for smaller parcels were substantially increased from 1 November. The stamped rate for a 7 kg parcel, Brisbane to Tully, is now \$2.20 (not \$14.00), compared with \$1.03 previously. On the other hand, the increase in rates for heavier parcels for this distance has been minimal, with the charge for 50 kg increasing only slightly from \$9.35 to \$9.75. The minimum charges for goods traffic also were unrealistically low, and the minimum has now been increased to 50 kg per consignment and the freight charge on such a consignment from Roma Street to Tully would be \$4.91. I might add for the information of all honourable members that instructions are being issued to relevant railway staff that, when parcels are tendered for despatch with freight "to pay" and it is obvious goods rates would be appreciably cheaper, the attention of consignors is to be drawn to this fact. If the consignor continues to elect to despatch the article as parcels traffic, attention is to be drawn to the lower charge that prepaid traffic attracts. Notices are to be displayed at the major sending stations drawing attention to the fact that a surcharge is applied in the instance of parcels forwarded with freight "to pay". It will be pointed out that the maximum liability of the commissioner for ordinary parcels is \$50 and that parcels of greater value may be insured at a rate of 50c per \$100 (or part thereof) declared value up to a maximum of \$1,000 per parcel. Attention will also be drawn to the fact that the freight charges for heavier parcels and for longer distances when conveyed by goods train are cheaper than parcels rates.

19. RAIL ACCESS TO NEW PORT FOR BRISBANE

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

(1) Are plans now being prepared for rail access to the new port at Fisherman Islands?

(2) Are all developments of the rail access to be done in conjunction with the town plan to fit in with the over-all transport system?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) It was recently agreed by the Government to commission a firm of consultants to undertake the design of rail as well as road access to the southern shore of Fisherman Islands.

20. TINBEERWAH FISH HATCHERY

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

(1) Is he now aware that Queenslanders wishing to stock their dams do not have to buy their fish interstate and that the Tinbeerwah Fish Hatchery at Cooroy can supply freshwater jew, spotted barramundi and yellowbelly?

(2) Is he aware that this fish hatchery has supplied fish to New South Wales hatcheries and also to the United States of America?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) I am pleased to note that the Tinbeerwah Fish Hatchery at Cooroy now has fish stock suitable for the restocking of dams, etc., and I can assure the honourable member that every possible help will be given to assist this industry to develop. It is most heartening to see local enterprise progress and I do hope it achieves the success it deserves. Let me add that my Queensland Fisheries Service will co-operate and provide all possible aid as well as refer to the hatchery inquiries for the stock it supplies.

21. STATEMENT ON PINE RIVERS COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES CENTRE

Mr. Akers, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Did he read the grossly misleading and mischievous statement by the A.L.P. candidate for Petrie, Mr. Hungerford, which appeared in the "Telegraph" of 25 November concerning the Community Health Services Centre for the Pine Rivers area?

(2) Are Mr. Hungerford's comments statements of fact?

(3) What is the true position regarding this health centre, as Mr. Hungerford's comment is a disgraceful and blatant act

of innuendo designed to confuse and frighten the citizens of the Pine Rivers area?

Answers:—

(1) Yes, I have read the statement.

(2) No, the comments are not true.

(3) Firstly I would like to thank the Federal member for Petrie, Mr. John Hodges, and the Pine Rivers Shire Council of which the honourable member for Pine Rivers (Mr. Akers) is a councillor, for their support over the last twelve months for the establishment of this centre. The honourable member for Pine Rivers has made continual representations to me on this matter as the State member. Mr. Hungerford's statements are totally untrue and I would point out that the approval of a grant of \$55,215 has been received from the Hospitals and Health Services Commission for the establishment of a Community Health Services Centre at Pine Rivers in the present financial year, 1975-76, following advice by the Queensland Government of a definite need for these services in this area. Advertisements are presently being invited for two community health nurses and when they are appointed and trained they should commence duty in the Pine Rivers Centre in April 1976. The question of obtaining accommodation or the purchase of land in the Pine Rivers area is currently being investigated. The initial staffing of the centre will be two community health nurses and a clerk typist with the addition of a social worker, a home help organiser and two community health aides before the end of June 1976. The operations of the centre will be supervised initially by a medical officer visiting the centre, with the later appointment of a permanent medical officer in charge. I regret that Mr. Hungerford should resort to such tactics in this misleading attempt to obtain the support of the people of the area. There is no truth at all in the statement made by Mr. Hungerford that if a Liberal-National Country Party Government were elected, the proposed health centre would not be established. Honourable members are well aware of the Queensland Government initiatives in this field in leading Australia in the Community Health Programme and I have been assured that, when the Liberal-National Country Party Government is elected on 13 December, the Community Health Programme will be continued and in fact expanded as and when funds are available. I therefore urge all electors of Petrie to ignore this irresponsible and untrue statement by Mr. Hungerford and continue to support Mr. Hodges and Mr. Akers.

22. PROPAGANDA BY MR. HUNGERFORD,
A.L.P. CANDIDATE

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the political propaganda issued by the A.L.P. candidate for Petrie, Mr. Hungerford?

(2) Is the reference to the Governor-General therein as a dictator in contravention of any State laws?

(3) Is this the same Mr. Hungerford who recently threatened violence if the A.L.P. is not returned to power on 13 December?

(4) Did he use his position in the Australian Assistance Plan scheme to inveigle his way into A.L.P. endorsement?

(5) Did he supply the grossly misleading statement for the "Telegraph" of 26 November concerning the Community Health Services Centre for the Pine Rivers area?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) Some of the propaganda being distributed in the Petrie electorate by the A.L.P. candidate, Mr. J. Hungerford, has been brought to my attention, as have his comments concerning His Excellency the Governor-General. I believe it would be fair to say that not only has Mr. Hungerford handled the truth somewhat carelessly in his electoral propaganda; he is also guilty of an inexcusable and cowardly attack on the Governor-General.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You didn't think that six months ago.

Mr. KNOX: Everybody thought it. I did and so did Mr. Whitlam and there were many occasions on which he praised Sir John Kerr's ability as a jurist in this nation and also his great integrity.

Answer (contd.):—

The record of Sir John Kerr as a distinguished Australian was acknowledged and accepted by all political parties and politicians in Australia before 11 November last. It is deplorable that His Excellency should now be subjected to ruthless propaganda and vicious rumours manufactured by the A.L.P. and men such as Mr. Hungerford. I have seen a particularly scurrilous pamphlet urging people to "vote for Hungerford in Petrie and the Labor Senate team", which also refers to "the dictatorship of Kerr, Fraser and Bjelke-Petersen". With respect to the last part of the honourable member's question, I am informed that Mr. Hungerford was employed under the Australian Assistance Plan arrangements prior to this election.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You are trying to get him the sack.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member does not behave himself, he will be getting the sack.

Answer (contd.):—

I am sure that, like so many other A.L.P. candidates, he will be scanning the employment columns after 13 December.

23. A.L.P. ELECTORAL PAMPHLET

Dr. Lockwood, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Is he aware of a political pamphlet which has been widely distributed in letter boxes with a reproduction of a photograph of Mr. Whitlam addressing a crowd of unionists and about to be assassinated by a caricature figure of the Governor-General carrying a knife?

(2) Will he investigate the Labor Party source and distribution of this document?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The document should be treated in the same way as poison-pen letters from anonymous sources. The lack of humour and imagination as well as the gross distortion of truth indicates the document emanates from those who have a vested interest in destroying the freedom and security of Australia. I do not consider that any investigation is warranted. I would expect that for obvious reasons the authors would not be anxious to reveal their identity. The fact is that the Governor-General restored the democratic process of forcing Parliament to go to the people and also he restored Christmas for Commonwealth public servants, which looked like being abolished because of the refusal of the Whitlam Government to go to the people.

24. FAMILY LAW COURT

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

As the Family Law Bill is long overdue, particularly in the sphere of divorce law reform, will he assure the House that Queensland will proceed with the Family Law Court under the Liberal Government to be elected on 13 December?

Answer:—

The Commonwealth Attorney-General, Senator Ivor Greenwood, Q.C., has announced that the Family Law Act will come into operation on 5 January 1976. Senator Greenwood has also stated that if the Liberal Government is returned to office on 13 December, it would give top priority to setting up the Family Court of Australia.

25. WAITING LIST FOR INTERMEDIATE HOSPITAL BEDS

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

(1) With reference to his statement in "The Courier-Mail" of 24 November that the lengthy waiting list for non-urgent intermediate beds in Brisbane public hospitals was due to the Queensland Government's commitments to support the public hospital system, was Dr. D. O'Connor correct in his assessment that the waiting time to get an intermediate bed was as lengthy as 22 weeks?

(2) Has an infusion of funds from Hospital Medibank, as outlined in the State Budget, alleviated the problem?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) The position is not as Dr. O'Connor stated. I am advised that at the Royal Brisbane Hospital there are 48 intermediate and private beds with a waiting list for non-urgent surgery of approximately 11 to 12 weeks. The next vacancy for operation is on 13 December. For the following Saturday, 20 December, all operating sessions are vacant at the present time.

26. VALUATION OF BOWEN SHIRE

Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey, Valuation, Urban and Regional Affairs—

(1) With regard to the valuation of the Bowen Shire by the Valuer-General's Department, were two different formulas used?

(2) What were the two different formulas?

(3) Was the recession in the beef industry used as an argument to put low valuations on grazing land within the Bowen Shire?

Answers:—

(1) The valuation of the Shire of Bowen, in common with all valuations for rating and taxing purposes made by the Valuer-General, was performed in accordance with the provisions of the Valuation of Land Act 1944-1975, the sections having most relevance being sections 11 and 12. These are somewhat lengthy and, as no doubt the honourable member is familiar with them, I shall not enlarge upon them.

(2) See answer to (1).

(3) All lands in the local authority area were valued as at 31 December 1974 and matters relevant to the valuation of those lands would have been considered by the officers of the Department of the Valuer-General in making the valuation. These would have included the matter mentioned

by the honourable member. I would add that in various public pronouncements regarding the Valuer-General's valuations I have repeatedly stated that every person has the right to, and should, object against a valuation if he considers it to be too high. A large number of landowners in this shire have exercised this right as also has the local authority itself who has objected to certain valuations as being too low. The objections to the valuations have not yet been considered by the Valuer-General and, of course, landowners have the right of appeal to the Land Court against the Valuer-General's decisions. In these circumstances, I do not think it would be proper for me to comment further regarding the valuation of the shire but I would mention that in company with my Cabinet colleague the Minister for Mines and Energy, the Valuer-General and the district valuer for the area, I attended a public meeting at Bowen on the night of Friday, 21 November 1975, in order to discuss generally the principles of valuation and to explain the rights of individuals regarding the valuations made by the Valuer-General. I believe this meeting served a very useful purpose.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

POLITICAL IMPARTIALITY OF TEACHERS

Mr. POWELL: I ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: Has he seen the reference in today's "Courier Mail" to an open letter signed by 150 political science academics who would like to be called teachers? Will he send a memorandum to all teachers in Government-funded educational institutions reminding them of their duty to themselves and to their students to remain impartial in political matters within the precincts of those institutions?

Mr. BIRD: I have seen the letter referred to. I do not think that anybody in this State or elsewhere in Australia will be fooled by the fact that 150 so-called political science academics signed it.

Mr. Lowes: That's all they could get.

Mr. BIRD: I should say that that is correct, and one can imagine what type of people they are.

In answer to the second part of the question, I can say that this matter has been discussed with officers of my department. I feel that only a very small minority among teachers would descend to the level of attempting to indoctrinate young children in the classroom. I can usually identify these people on my visits to schools because they sneak round corners and keep as far from me as they possibly can. If they do have to come forward and be introduced to me, their handshake is akin to grabbing at wet, cold fish. We can imagine the types of people that they are when they attempt to

do this. They are not people of the world who are strong enough to go out into the adult world and put forward their political views there.

SECOND-MORTGAGE HOUSING LOANS

Mr. POWELL: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Has he examined the report in today's "Courier-Mail" in which the Federal Labor spokesman on housing is reported to have stated that \$20,000,000 will be available for second-mortgage loans? Does the Minister approve the encouragement by Labor for young people to over-commit themselves to purchasing a home so that it would be easier for the socialists to take over their homes in the future, and is it by a coincidence that the \$20,000,000 mentioned just happens to be the shortfall of the amount the States received from the Commonwealth this year?

Mr. LEE: I noticed the article in today's "Courier-Mail" to which the honourable member referred. To me it is no coincidence whatsoever that the figure mentioned happens to be the shortfall of what has been given to the States under the Commonwealth Housing Agreement. For the honourable member's information I will quote those figures. They are: Tasmania \$4,000,000, Western Australia \$4,000,000 and Queensland \$12,800,000, a total of \$20,800,000. No doubt the figure mentioned is that which was not received by the States. I have no doubt in my mind that the Whitlam Government knew that an election was imminent and this is why this money was held back. As the honourable member would have noticed in the Press statement, this money is being made available in New South Wales and Victoria, the States Labor is most desperately trying to win. Therefore I say it is no coincidence that this situation has arisen. The other thing that is surprising—or perhaps it is not so surprising—is that the former Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) announced that this money would be made available. It seems strange that the former Minister for Housing (Mr. Riordan) did not make the announcement. Perhaps he has been demoted by Whitlam, as have so many other Ministers.

BIRTH RATE UNDER LABOR

Mr. LANE: I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: Has he seen the latest report of the Australian Bureau of Statistics released this morning in respect of the estimated age distribution of population in Queensland? Has he noted the steady increase of births, both male and female, over a number of years to a peak just prior to the election of the Federal Labor Government and the steady decrease since? As the Minister in charge of the registration of births, can he tell us whether this accords with information he has received from his department?

Mr. KNOX: Yes, it does. The department supplies this information so that it can be compiled in the form in which it appears in the periodical published by the Bureau of Statistics. It is, of course, quite true that in times of economic uncertainty, people postpone building homes. This has occurred recently because of the enormous increase in costs as a result of inflation manufactured by a Labor Government, not imported as claimed. People postpone getting married because of the extra costs and worry about the future and they postpone having families because of their concern about the economic future, and this is one of the barometers by which the economy can be judged. There is no doubt that since December 1972 young people in the community of marriageable and child-bearing age have postponed many things that they would have liked to be able to do, including having families, because of the economic uncertainty of this country since the Labor Party took office. I trust that after 13 December the birth rate will rise.

INDUSTRIAL STOPPAGES IN AUSTRALIA

Mr. LANE: I ask the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs: Has he seen reports in this morning's Press from the International Labour Organisation which indicate Australia's bad record of industrial stoppages? Will he indicate if that report is in accord with the information held by his department?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The report recently published by the International Labour Office reveals that Australia's record of unemployment is among the worst in the world. It is a grave national scandal. This deplorable situation poses a great challenge to the credibility of Mr. Whitlam. The experience in Australia last year is in marked contrast to the deceit and duplicity practised by Mr. Whitlam in his election campaign in 1972. For the record I will quote the full text of a paragraph from the Australian Labor Party policy speech. Mr. Whitlam said—

"My fellow citizens—

"I put these questions to you:

"Do you believe that Australia can afford another three years like the last twenty months? Are you prepared to maintain at the head of your affairs a coalition which has lurched into crisis after crisis, embarrassment piled on embarrassment week after week? Will you accept another three years of waiting for next week's crisis, next week's blunder? Will you again entrust the nation's economy to the men who deliberately, but needlessly, created Australia's worst unemployment for ten years? Or to the same men who have presided over the worst inflation for twenty years?"

I am sure the people of Australia will recognise the duplicity and deceit which the Labor Party practised in its 1972 election campaign, and its subsequent record which completely negates all of its hollow promises. The record has shown the Labor Party's promises

on that occasion to be false, and I am sure that the people of Australia, remembering that, will resoundingly reject the type of propaganda that Mr. Whitlam is putting forth on the occasion of this election.

RURAL POLICIES OF FEDERAL LIBERAL-NATIONAL COUNTRY PARTY GOVERNMENT

Mr. NEAL: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: As he attended a Rural Press Club breakfast at which the Federal Minister in charge of Primary Industries, the Honourable Ian Sinclair—a man who has a deep understanding and knowledge of rural industries—outlined Liberal-National Country Party policy on primary industries, can he advise the House if these policies will assist primary industries and producers that have been severely disadvantaged by the A.L.P. Government's lack of policy?

Mr. SULLIVAN: First of all I express my appreciation to the Rural Press Club for the invitation to breakfast, because it gave me the opportunity to be present when the Honourable Ian Sinclair outlined the rural policy of the Liberal-National Country Party Government.

The Labor Opposition has been strangely silent about any rural policy. I suppose it has good reason to be silent in view of the savage policies it inflicted on the rural sector in the three years the A.L.P. was in Government. As I mentioned yesterday, and on other occasions and at other places, I never thought that the confidence of people in the rural sector—farmers, graziers, business people and rural workers in country towns—could be so shaken as it has been over the last three years. This occurred because of the Labor Government's policies that had been inflicted upon them.

I would think that, when the policies outlined this morning by Ian Sinclair are made known to the rural sector, confidence will return. I will mention only a few points made by him in his speech, which lasted for 30 or 40 minutes. I whole-heartedly agree with him that there has not been enough ministerial involvement in seeking markets for some of our major primary products. He stated that, in his opinion, if there had been more ministerial involvement the beef industry would not have had the problems concerning the E.E.C. and Japan, which are two of our major markets.

Mr. Hinze: You did a good job yourself.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Having had personal experience, I whole-heartedly agree with Mr. Sinclair. When I was in Japan, I learned that the Ministers responsible for beef imports were not aware of the problems confronting the beef industry in Australia. As I have said on other occasions, Japan is looking to Australia as a source of supply for its beef.

Last night the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Doug Anthony, mentioned broadly the National Rural Financial Bank that will be

set up for the rural sector. One thing that will be pleasing to young men in the farming and grazing communities is that, as indicated this morning by Mr. Sinclair, the National Country Party is directing its policy towards the widening of rural reconstruction finance to assist young men to own their farms.

In rural reconstruction today, it is necessary for a man to have a farm that needs to be built up. There are many people—sons of farmers, share farmers and workers in the rural community—who want to own their own farms one day. The details of this scheme will be announced, but broadly the Government will provide finance for the leasing of farms with the option to purchase after 10 years.

Mr. Newbery: At the moment, with the high taxation imposed by the Labor Government, young fellows don't have any chance of buying their own farms.

Mr. SULLIVAN: That is so. Last night Mr. Anthony indicated what his taxation policies will be. Time does not permit me to deal with them.

I was pleased to hear Mr. Sinclair mention also that he has been concerned, as I have been, at the role played by the Agricultural Council under the Labor Government. For many years it was virtually the policy-making body of the Federal Government, but under the Labor Government it was a waste of time. We have found that, in relation to agenda items put by the standing committee to the Ministers for submission to the Agricultural Council, decisions have come out a week before and have been quite contrary to the advice that we would have put to the Government. The rural sector has been hard hit in this respect, too.

Generally speaking, I think the confidence of the rural sector will return. Mr. Sinclair made the point that money is readily available provided wasteful expenditure engaged in by the previous Labor Government is cut. The important thing is that we put back into office the political parties that have the interests of the rural sector at heart. We can then go on from there to rebuild our rural industries.

ELECTION SIGN ON BUILDING UNDER CONSTRUCTION AT ROYAL BRISBANE HOSPITAL

Mr. LOWES: I ask the Minister for Health: Is he aware of a large A.L.P. election sign on a high-rise building under construction at the Royal Brisbane Hospital? Does he intend to take action to have the sign removed if it was placed on the building without authority?

Dr. EDWARDS: I am aware of the existence of the sign. It was brought to my notice yesterday. The hospitals board had already taken action, having issued instructions to the building contractor that the sign had been erected without authority and the employees should remove it immediately. I am informed that it is still in the

same position as it was yesterday, and action has been taken again this morning to have it removed. It is there without authority, and I have issued instructions that no election sign of any political party shall be erected on any hospital construction—indeed on any hospital property.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES BY COMMONWEALTH DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING

Mr. TURNER: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Can he give the Parliament details of the allocations to Queensland per head of population by the Commonwealth Department of Housing during the financial years 1974-75 and 1975-76, and will he indicate how those figures compare with the amounts granted to all other States?

Mr. LEE: Following the statement of the member for Rockhampton that the Queensland Housing Commission had fiddled the books—the sort of untruthful statement that he usually makes in this House—I took out some figures because I felt that Queenslanders and Australians should know the true position. I am very pleased that the honourable member for Warrego had the intelligence and the decency to ask this question. The figures taken out over the two financial years negate the suggestion made by the member for Rockhampton that the books have been fiddled by either the Queensland Housing Commission or the Queensland Government.

The Commonwealth's contribution for housing to Tasmania was \$118 per head of population. The contribution to South Australia was \$91. The average for all of Australia was \$55 per head, but for Queensland it was only \$37. The honourable member for Warrego will note that the two Labor States received \$118 and \$91—many, many dollars more than Queensland. That is an indication of what the Whitlam Government has been doing to Queensland year after year, and in the election on 13 December the Queensland people will show him what they think about that treatment. For the information of the honourable member for Rockhampton, we asked for \$80,000,000 for the Queensland Housing Commission and got only \$31,800,000. Shame on them!

At 12 noon, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—SIXTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY

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

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1975-76

EDUCATION AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES CHIEF OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Debate resumed from 25 November (see p. 2241) on Mr. Bird's motion—

"That \$5,688,027 be granted for 'Department of Education—Chief Office'."

Hon. V. J. BIRD (Burdekin—Minister for Education and Cultural Activities) (12.1 p.m.): In the first place, I should like to thank those speakers who have so far participated in the debate and have made complimentary remarks on my stewardship or have offered their well wishes to me for a successful Ministry. On my part I would like to give to members on both sides of the Chamber my assurance that I shall continue my efforts to arrive at a grassroots understanding of my portfolio, and a proper and balanced appreciation of the problems of education in order that I might better plan for the department's more efficient functioning.

There is no doubt that one of my department's major problems at present is the lack of capital finance to undertake all of the necessary and urgent works. As I pointed out earlier, this situation has been exacerbated by the effects of inflation. I am appreciative that most members, while being conscious of the needs in their electorates, did have an understanding of the capital restraints under which my department is operating. The suggestion made by the member for Landsborough concerning the use of Consolidated Revenue funds for capital works is one to which I have already given some consideration. It seems to me, in these unusual times, that the classical notion that future generations should equally share the responsibility for capital expenditure with present generations, may be in need of some revision. The idea is worth further exploration.

I was confused by the remarks of the member for Cairns about Yarrabah. A new classroom block costing \$188,000 was approved in September, as was a new home science complex for \$59,000. In addition, teacher accommodation is being provided. Both the member for Rockhampton, in his capacity as shadow Minister, and I had quite a lot to say about Commonwealth financial contributions to education. Let me repeat that I have no desire to denigrate Commonwealth funding in this regard, but as one who recognises the need for proper planning I must, in duty, emphasise the damage that has been caused by its abandoning, even temporarily, triennial budgeting and rejecting much of the advice of its own expert committees.

I must, in fairness, also point out that the member for Rockhampton, in his reference to increased Commonwealth expenditure on advanced education, failed to mention that when the Commonwealth assumed full financial responsibility for the financing of tertiary

education it made a corresponding reduction in the general revenue grants to the States. Under no circumstances, therefore, did the increased payment represent the real increases made in that area. I shall refer to this in more detail later this afternoon.

I listened with great interest to the main points made by the speakers on Tuesday night. It seems to me that a number of recurrent themes emerged from the points made by the members. Some of the views expressed gave me considerable concern, particularly the misconceptions under which a number of members seemed to labour. Other views highlighted the need for my department to speed up its action. The major themes that I elicited from members' speeches can be categorised as follows:—

Claims about declining standards and an expressed desire to return to the so-called "good old days".

Conflicting views on religious and sex education.

The need for increased community involvement in education.

A concern that increased expenditure on education is not yielding appropriate benefits.

A belief that institutes of higher education are making little or no contribution to society.

The number of speakers who talked about educational standards and postulated that there had, in fact, been a serious decline, particularly in standards of performance in the three R's, worried me greatly. For my part, as I move around schools and talk with children, I am firmly convinced that the primary school child of today speaks far better and relates to adults far better than did most of my contemporaries when we were of that age. I am amazed at the range of subjects on which the primary child can converse confidently. How, then, does one relate this subjective impression with the remarks made by members that children can't read, can't write, can't spell, and can't calculate?

When one moves from subjective and anecdotal judgments to objective and data-based judgments, one finds that research offers little or no evidence that standards have fallen. Certainly, employers of clerical and unskilled labour may well recognise some decline in standards. What they fail to recognise, however, is that the populations that they are comparing are different. The clerk-typist of 20 years ago

is the doctor, therapist or teacher of today. Greatly improved educational facilities and greatly increased holding power of our schools have, of course, meant that the brighter students have greater opportunities for educational fulfilment. But even correcting for this factor, it seems to me that so many critics of the present outputs from our schools have blind spots when they look back on the performance of the past. Have they forgotten the failures in the school situation who sat, year after year, doing nothing in the classroom, being placed in grades with children well outside their own age range or just dropping out of school, long before they had even completed the primary grades? Where was this wonderful Utopia where all children learnt to read well and write beautifully, to calculate correctly and to think logically? Certainly an examination of the reports of inspectors of schools written over the 100 years that my department has operated has revealed no evidence of these times.

The debate on standards is not, of course, confined to Queensland—not even to this day and age. A survey of both the popular Press and the educational journals shows its universality. The July 1975 issue of a leading journal put out by the British Department of Science, "Trends in Education", in fact, devotes much of that issue to the question of educational standards today. In summing up the debate, an Oxford scholar had this to say—

"On one side of the field will congregate those who demand a return to the old ways. Their challenge is that national standards have fallen disastrously, that we have become cognitively as well as morally soft. Primary schools have abandoned structure for spontaneity, reading for projects, multiplication tables for sand trays. The disappearance of the 11 plus has robbed those schools of any objective at which to aim, and the sense of work and pressure collapses. In the secondary sector disciplined subjects yield to ill-defined integrated courses, crisply organised streams are replaced by shapeless classes of mixed abilities, uniform is replaced by jeans (or worse). Romantic egalitarians seek to overturn the examination system, the concept of failure (and, therefore, of success) is eliminated, unstandardised school-based assessments replace the clear results awarded by examining boards linked with universities. Truancy becomes uncontrollable, teachers

are attacked or go on strike, specialisation in the sixth form collapses. The evils of such a system are magnified when its products are finally corrupted by colleges of education, which practise sociology and perpetuate the very illiteracy they should eliminate.

"The opposing camp is no less dogmatic and brash. Its inhabitants recall the iniquities of a divisive system, splitting children into grammar and modern schools at the age of eleven. They attack any learning by rote, make sport of the irrelevance to many children of much of the traditional curriculum, look back with horror on a system of payment by results, linked to inspection and a rigid application of standards (numbered one to seven). It is profoundly dangerous for the educational system when these two sets of exaggerations are taken seriously."

In their addresses the members for Rockhampton, Isis, Mourilyan, Balonne and Townsville South raised various issues related to either sex education or religious education. The range of opinions expressed by members reflects the range of opinions that exists within the community in this area. It seems to me that there is general agreement with the approach that we have adopted in providing new initiatives in the area of religious education.

Equally it seems to me that there is an urgent need that we develop new initiatives in the area of sex education. Certainly, the majority of opinions favoured the introduction of the kinds of programme developed by the father-son, mother-daughter, family-life type movements. However, there was a recognition that serious gaps exist. I intend, therefore, in the new year to give this matter increased attention within my department.

Today, more and more people realise that we are not making complete and effective use of the highly expensive facilities that we have provided for educational purposes. Many members suggest the opening up of school facilities and resources for greater community use. A number of members favoured greater community involvement in both the curriculum of schools and in the after-hours use of their facilities. I heartily endorse these proposals at the level of principle. I am happy to report that there is probably far greater use outside school hours of school facilities than many members realise. I admit, however, that much more

remains to be done before what appears eminently sensible can happen. Many issues of responsibility, security and maintenance need to be resolved. My department is conscious of the trend towards greater community involvement and of the benefits inherent in this approach. This resolution is being carefully studied.

In talking today about educational expenditures at both State and Commonwealth levels, there is no dispute that expenditure is high indeed. Not so evident however, are the qualitative improvements resulting from such expenditure. One of the needs within the educational arena today is the development of indicators of educational performances that are meaningful to the general public so that they can see what return results from their tax dollar. My department is conscious of the share of State expenditure it receives. It is also conscious of its responsibility and accountability to demonstrate whether that investment is worth while.

Just as it is the fashion today to denigrate standards of achievement in our primary and secondary schools, so it is also the fashion to claim that institutes of higher education are nothing but custodial homes for radicals and incompetents. No doubt, elements of truth exist in such accusations. No doubt, public funds support numbers of academics whose objectives are different from general society objectives. True as this may be, however, it should not hide the continuing truth that much benefit to all areas of present-day society eventuates from the teaching activities and the research of serious academics. We place our society at risk when we make ill-informed generalisations. I am prepared to be at the forefront of those who recognise the value to society of good university scholarship and research. I am also, of course, prepared to be at the forefront of those who condemn all who masquerade in the guise of academics while planning to overthrow the true values of our civilisations.

Nothing I have said gainsays the fact that I believe there is lots of room for improvement in our system. I share the worries of the members for Mourilyan and Bundaberg when I come across children who have inadequate literacy skills. I agree with the members for Rockhampton and Isis that more specialist teachers are needed, more counselling is needed and that teacher education courses should prepare future teachers better to teach the three R's.

I dispute the member for Bundaberg's contention that pre-school education is not really worth while and I correct the member for Mourilyan's impression that pre-schools cater only for children of the related primary school. I do not believe any increase in sex, violence and intemperance bears a direct relation to increased education and I retain a hope and faith that education is a force for good. I look forward to a continuance of constructive suggestions from members in the remainder of this debate.

Mr. GIBBS (Albert) (12.15 p.m.): In supporting the Estimates introduced by the Minister, I wish to deal specifically with three aspects of education—the existing schools in the electorate of Albert; the need for some new schools in the electorate; and the need for future planning so that the land which will be required for schools in the electorate can be purchased.

The Albert electorate is one of the largest growth centres in Queensland, so the situation there must be watched carefully. In some instances it has already been left too late to purchase at a reasonable price the land needed by the Education Department. Although it is very easy to say that, if one studies in the light of increases in costs and inflation the Estimates for the Department of Works, which is charged with the responsibility of purchasing land and building new schools, it is difficult to imagine how the Minister, his department and the Government can achieve all that they wish to achieve.

It is significant that the Budget allocation for education has increased from \$230,000,000 to more than \$329,000,000, or by 42.8 per cent. Although part of that increase is due to the expansion of the education system, undoubtedly much of it is due to inflation and the higher wages now being paid.

It is expected that 1,850 new teachers will come from teachers' training colleges this year, and an additional 500 teacher aides will be appointed. In addition, there will be a continuation of the State's pre-school policy.

The Government is playing a very important role by providing assistance to non-State schools. Many church schools throughout Queensland and Australia are doing a wonderful job in assisting to educate children, and they must be given support that will enable them to continue their good work. As honourable members know, private schools are experiencing a decline in revenue and are facing increased costs. Possibly this is a

result of the policies of the former Labor Government, which allowed the economy to get completely out of hand. A few years ago the annual escalation in costs was 7½ per cent, and people were terrified of what would happen. Since then the figure has increased to 20 per cent, which, of course, has had an effect throughout the school system.

It is pleasing to see that allowances for conveying children to school have been increased and that payments made to school transport operators, many of whom were working on very poor profit margins and barely making a go of it, have been increased substantially.

Increased allowances to smaller schools for janitor-groundsman and increased allowances for students are also very welcome. It is very pleasing to see that students will continue to receive support from the State Government. Many statements have been made by representatives of the sacked Federal Labor Government that students would not continue to receive their allowances and that a Liberal-National Country Party Government, if elected on 13 December, would cut out those allowances. I am pleased that the facts are now being brought out and that it is being made quite clear where everyone stands on this matter.

The subsidy on high school assembly halls has been increased from \$60,000 to \$84,000 on high school swimming pools from \$36,000 to \$50,000, on primary school activities buildings from \$25,000 to \$35,000, and on primary school swimming pools from \$30,000 to \$42,000. This will encourage parents and citizens associations and the community generally to participate in assisting to provide some of the amenities that it may not be possible for the Government to provide at present.

A new high school is needed fairly urgently in the Hollywell-Paradise Point-Coombabah area of the Albert electorate. Some land has been made available there for a primary school, but the Government must make sure that, in the long term, the land is really suitable for the scheme envisaged by the Works Department and the Education Department.

Recently I asked a question in the House about a high school for the Beenleigh area. In reply, the Minister stated that the Springwood High School would be built in, I think, the 1976-77 financial year. To some degree that will relieve the MacGregor area, but will do very little to relieve the Beenleigh

area. It may flatten out enrolments, but only for a very short period. I ask the Minister to ensure that those high schools do not grow too big. I believe that once they get over the 1,000-1,200 mark they cannot provide the best standard of education. Land should be urgently obtained either on the north or south of Beenleigh for the construction of a high school in the near future.

Land was recently purchased in the Queensland Housing Commission growth area at Eagleby. That was very good to see because the construction of a school there will provide great relief to the Beenleigh Primary School in the short term.

Recently I was advised that a dental clinic will be built at the Labrador Primary School. It is good to see the progress that the Education Department is making.

There is need for a school on the eastern side of the highway at Loganholme. I believe that the department is looking for land in Bryants Road. The matter has been under consideration since 1973, but no finality has been reached to this stage. It should be hurried up or we might just miss out on suitable land. Although growth is fairly slow at present, I believe that it could be another growth area that could overtake the system.

We have a need for pre-schools at Beenleigh, Nerang and Woongoolba. As soon as possible we would like a pre-school in the areas without one. I suppose that desire would apply throughout Queensland. The Government's 1972 election promise on pre-schools has been kept. It is good to see the way pre-schools are working and the quality of the buildings that have been provided for young people at the start of their school life.

We have problems in many schools in my electorate where E.C.s are still in use. E.C.s are not good enough any more. We need a fast approach to their replacement with septic systems.

I thank the Minister for visiting part of my area. He attended the Beenleigh High School speech night and I thank him for the job he did there. It was a really enjoyable night. It was good to see the Minister chat for a while with people instead of hurrying off as soon as the proceedings finished. That was very much appreciated by the people of Beenleigh.

We have two assembly halls in the Southport area, one at the Musgrave Hill School and another at the Southport High School.

Their value has proved to be greater than was expected in the early days. Of course, problems have arisen in paying off the halls because of the high interest rates.

Problems are experienced at the Pimpama School with the old earth closets. Right next door there is an environmental area, and 10,000 students have gone through that area this year. This creates a problem with the existing toilet facilities.

A request has been made for a septic system for the school at Cedar Creek. I should say that all of the 18 to 20 schools in my area have one problem or another. I suppose that could be said of every school. If there were not problems, it would probably mean that we had overspent. While we have growth and are expanding the education system, I am sure we will always be looking for something extra for schools, but there are some obvious things in all schools that could be corrected with very little effort. Many of them are small things, but they are very annoying. For example, the Southport High School is having trouble about furniture. Some of its furniture is 15 years old. Something should be done to overcome these small problems in the various schools.

An undertaking has been given to examine the noise factor at the Coomera School. A problem has arisen at the Loganholme State School, which is one of the oldest schools in Queensland. It is undergoing redevelopment and a new school is in the course of construction. Unfortunately the land on which it is located is rather lowlying and needs to be built up. Of course, the Works Department does not have sufficient money. I sincerely hope that its allocations will be increased; if they are not, it will be unable to achieve everything that it is endeavouring to do.

The Minister for Works and Housing, like the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities, is naturally doing his best. Those two Ministers are new Ministers, and they have taken to their jobs with great gusto. They are implementing new ideas. I have received the greatest co-operation possible from them as well as from their respective departments. The successive Regional Directors of Education in my area—the present Regional Director is Mr. Jukes—have also been of tremendous assistance. They are doing a wonderful job under somewhat difficult circumstances.

Unfortunately, some schools in my electorate do not have sufficient playground areas to cater for future population growth. I suggest that, if land cannot be purchased at the present time, a circle should be put on the map around the areas that are needed. Unless something like that is done, the Government will be called upon to spend large sums of money on the acquisition of land in later years.

The Minister is also responsible for cultural activities. It is pleasing to see a greater number of Queenslanders taking a keen interest in such activities. This is encouraged, of course, by the Minister's department, which is making worth-while subsidies available to cultural organisations. An interest in culture and art is of great assistance in helping persons to mature, so it is pleasing to note the very great extent to which school-children are showing an interest in these activities. This was demonstrated recently at the speech nights of the Beenleigh State High School and the Southport State High School. The performances of school-children who participate in plays and music are of an extremely high standard.

An institute of advanced education is planned for Southport. I hope that it will come to fruition as soon as possible. When completed, it will be a great asset to the electorates of Albert, South Coast and Surfers Paradise. I do not know how far the "catchment" area of the institute will extend, but its completion will enable a large number of students to obtain their tertiary education locally. I hope that the provision of the institute will not be delayed by the shortage of money somewhere along the line.

The Minister is responsible, too, for kindergartens. It is good to see that, in addition to pre-schools, kindergartens are continuing to receive financial support from the Government. The Minister is giving worth-while support to the Creche and Kindergarten Association, which, over the years, has done a wonderful job.

About 16 years ago I was associated with the Labrador kindergarten, which at that time received a subsidy of only about £50 a year. Subsequently it was raised to £250 annually. Today the subsidy is at a realistic level and, in addition, portion of the wages of the kindergarten staff is paid by the Government.

The Labrador kindergarten, which we organised and built in a week-end, has been one of the most successful undertakings

that I have ever been associated with. I was the chairman for many years after it was built.

The approach the Minister has taken to the building of opportunity schools is commendable. It is good to see people being trained as special teachers to cope with children with learning difficulties. We need more and more of those teachers, but as always the problem is money. We can only proceed on the basis of the funds available to allow the training of personnel for this type of work.

The services provided by the Adult Education Branch are very important. Through adult education, people are able to extend their studies and take advantage of opportunities that perhaps were not open to them in their earlier school life. All types of people come to me about their desire to further their education at some level or other to get further qualifications. The Adult Education Branch facilitates their desire for further study.

I am pleased with the quality of teachers in my area and the dedication of the majority of them to their job with our young people. The other night 400 children were dressed up at the Biggera Waters fancy-dress ball. Over 1,500 people were there, and 90 per cent of the teachers attended, helping the kids and enjoying the night with them. I am always happy about the dedication that I see throughout the teaching service. Teachers receive a lot of criticism, but here and now I say how pleased I am with their responsible actions. I have been advised that some new principals are coming to my area. I am disappointed to lose some of those who are leaving the area. However, I have checked on the quality and leadership of those being transferred to my area and I am pleased with them all.

I ask three things of the Minister. The department should look very closely at forward planning for schools in the electorate of Albert which, with the North Coast, is one of the fastest growth areas in Queensland. I will be co-operating very closely with the department to see that we keep pace with development. I will be keeping my eye on the growth areas within my electorate.

The Woongoolba School is recognised as one of the very good schools in Queensland. The headmaster, Mr. Bob Tolmay, is to be congratulated on the way in which he has performed his duties. I think his school is

now being held up by the Education Department as one deserving of special recognition for its past achievements. It has a wonderful background. It is still in a rural area. I hope that some of the work required there is in fact done.

Finally, I wish to speak about small schools. For a long time the policy was to close small schools with low enrolments. Unless the attendance gets down to a ridiculously low level, I am against the closure of any small school. All efforts should be made to keep open small schools such as those at Carbrook and Cedar Creek.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (12.35 p.m.): I am pleased to address myself to the Estimates of the new Minister for Education and Cultural Activities. Judging by departmental reports, I think he is doing a good job. It is not the job of the Opposition to praise him but to criticise him. However, we must acknowledge that when a Minister does his job, even though we disagree with him, he is entitled to recognition for the work that he does. In this case, the Minister's departmental officers are of the opinion that he is doing a good job. Let us hope that he can do even better.

Perhaps his job would not be so easy if it were not for the assistance that the Australian Labor Party has given to this State, particularly over the past two years, in educational grants and other financial assistance, notably for tertiary education courses and contributions to libraries.

The honourable member for Rockhampton detailed some of the financial assistance that the Commonwealth Government has given to the State to promote educational facilities for our children. It is important that the Federal Government comes to the party in education and also in other avenues because, after all, it has the money. At the same time, the State departments have to prove that they can adequately control the assistance given to them and that they are in a position to use the money judiciously. It is not money to be wasted. The taxpayers contribute this finance to State Governments, which have to be able to use it capably.

I want to make some reference to the availability of sporting facilities in our State primary and secondary schools. I do not think that the public are fully aware of the extent to which these playing fields can be used. There is a shortage of sporting fields,

particularly in the metropolitan area. There is always the cry that we do not have enough sports space for the community. Far greater use could be made of State school sporting ovals. Certainly there must be protection against vandalism, which is prevalent today, and the organisations that seek to use these facilities should preserve the areas and police the facilities. If they use them, a responsibility rests on them to ensure that they are not abused. If the people could be educated to do this, and if we let it be known much more widely that the facilities are there for their use under certain conditions, a good contribution would be made in the provision of sporting facilities for the community.

Mr. Lester: Isn't this partly done at some country schools now?

Mr. MELLOY: I would not know very much about country schools but I imagine it would be done because usually the school ovals are in pretty good condition. The honourable member would know the position in his electorate better than I would. I hope that the people are using them to the fullest extent.

The establishment of school dental clinics has been a tremendous advance. It has been talked about for many years. When Dr. Noble was Minister for Health, he advocated this procedure and, as shadow Minister for Health, I have been pushing it for years. It is a wonderful contribution to the dental health of the community. School dental clinics are being built in school grounds. Some eight years ago I went to Tasmania and inspected most of the school dental clinics there. They were performing a very remarkable service to the community. I commend this Government on its move. I shall have to stop this or I will get the sack. But the Government has proceeded to establish school dental clinics along the lines that I have always advocated. Previous Ministers for Health also proposed such a scheme but it did not seem to get off the ground until recently. Other States such as New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have introduced this service and Queensland has naturally followed.

The school for the training of dental therapists is doing a fine job and the dental therapists or auxiliaries, or whatever they are called, are carrying out a service to the public that would not otherwise be provided. They are limited, of course, to performing only the basics of dentistry, but they give basic treatment to children and lay the

foundation for good dental health in adult life. These girls are to be commended on the job that they are doing.

Commendation is also due to the women who man school tuckshops. They are virtually slaves—there are never enough women available to assist—and they do a very fine job in providing food for children at reasonable cost. They have, of course, departed from selling only food such as the Oslo lunch, which was originally the basis of tuckshop operations. School tuckshops now sell pies, pasties and sandwiches of all types. I am rather doubtful about the nutritional value of some of the food now being sold in schools, but this is something that cannot really be rigidly controlled. Those who work in tuckshops are keen to help their schools and they cannot be too restricted in what they sell because tuckshops are a source of revenue for school committees.

There is no denying the worth of the work of school committees. Committee workers are perhaps the greatest unpaid public servants in the State, and the amount of work that they do for schools is almost beyond description. Indeed, most of the amenities now to be found in schools would not be there if it were not for the work carried out by parents and citizens' associations. Their fund-raising activities are very considerable and they provide, with the help of subsidies, some of the basic needs of education that could well be the sole responsibility of the Education Department. However, "in the light of funds available," as the Minister would say, I do not suppose that schools would acquire them unless their parents and citizens' associations contributed at least 50 per cent of their cost. In some cases they contribute the entire 100 per cent.

Mr. Bird: I think you will agree that some of them would be disappointed if we provided everything and left them with no incentive to work.

Mr. MELLOY: I do not go along with that statement. I think that they would still have much to do. Although most of the time of parents and citizens' associations is taken up in raising money, they do a considerable amount of work around schools. Working bees are a very important part of parents and citizens' association activities and they do a lot of work that would otherwise have to be done by the Works Department.

I also have some comments to make on school furniture. Certainly great improvements have been made in the type of furniture

provided over the last five to 10 years. Furniture of a more modern type is now being placed in classrooms and no longer do we see the old style of desk with the hole for the ink-well, which is not needed these days. But there are still some schools that are badly off for furniture. I have a couple in my area that are not enjoying the best of conditions. I have spoken to the Minister on this matter. I am hopeful that in the near future we will be able to provide desks, seats and tables for these schools. In one of the schools the furniture is 30 or 40 years old and it is high time improvements were made. I am sure the Minister will agree with me about that.

I think there is a great need for more flexibility in the division between academic and manual courses in our high schools. Things change from year to year. A lad who starts off doing an academic course will find that perhaps this year, compared with when he started, things have changed and he does not see the opportunities at the end of an academic course that he thought would be there. I think there should be provision for changes in midstream, sort of thing, from an academic to a manual trade course for those who think this is desirable.

In the Press on Saturday morning, particularly in "The Courier-Mail", I saw 20 or 30 advertisements for bricklayers, carpenters and carpenters' labourers. Apparently there is a dearth of skilled labour in this area. I do not think the opportunities that should be available are there for apprenticeships in those areas. A lot of builders are not prepared to take on apprentices. They let a lot of their work out to subcontractors and the subcontractors are not prepared to take on apprentices. That attitude makes it very difficult for young lads to secure apprenticeships in the building trade.

I think provision should be made for the training of young people in these areas, starting off in secondary school. It would, of course, be necessary to reach agreement with the unions. Perhaps by means of a trade-training course we could make up the leeway in the shortage of bricklayers, carpenters and carpenters' labourers that is apparent in the community today. There will always be a future for the building industry because, apart from our primary industries, the building industry is the basis of our economy. I say this because there are so many industries dependent on the success of the building industry for their

existence. I think if we are to make up the leeway, we should introduce extended courses, not just preliminary courses of this nature, to enable young people to go right through and become qualified bricklayers or whatever.

The value of tertiary education is now becoming doubtful. Many people are obtaining degrees of Bachelor of Arts and then not finding an outlet for their abilities. I do not know that there is much of a future for people who take academic courses. There is for some, of course, because we must have our scientists—there is no doubt about that—but there must be a leavening or a sifting of those who go through to tertiary education. We must make sure that there are opportunities for them. We find now that people complete a course at the university and then find that their future is most doubtful. This emphasises the need for extensive trade-training, not basic training but extensive full-time trade-training courses for young men.

I think girls will be a problem for ever. We know a great argument is going on about the opportunities for women in commerce and other fields, but those who have the ability to enter the professions will always find opportunities for themselves. However, we cannot rely on girls. We never know when they are going to slip off and get married. How can we train a girl for a career when we do not know how long she will keep at it? I believe that the honourable member for Salisbury is to follow me in the debate. She might care to comment on that.

In my opinion, the greatest emphasis must be placed on the future of young lads, who will be the backbone of industry in the future. I make due allowance for the women who come into industry, commerce and the professions, but basically I believe that a women's place is in the home. I suppose that is a provocative statement, too.

That brings me to the question of sex education in schools, and it is a question to which I have never been able to get a clear answer. Just what is the sex education envisaged? What are the children to be taught? If so much sex education is necessary now, I am amazed that humanity has managed to survive so long and that the population of the world has increased as it has.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Do you think that instinct is more important than education?

Mr. MELLOY: I do not know whether it is more important, but certainly it has sufficed in the past. I do not know what children are to be taught. I am sure that it is not necessary to teach them how to do it, when to do it or where to do it. What are they to be taught in the schools? The act itself is governed by the circumstances and by the passions of the young people, concerned. One cannot stand beside them all night and say, "No, don't do that."

Mr. Lamont: Don't knock it. We might send you back for a refresher course.

Mr. MELLOY: I do not need one.

Mrs. Kyburz: Are you Victorian in your attitude?

Mr. MELLOY: No. The honourable member speaks about the Victorian era. I point out for her benefit that people certainly did not need sex education in those days. I just do not know what the children are to be taught. I did not need sex education at school. Perhaps we had many examples of it in school, but we did not have any practical or theoretical education in the subject.

Mr. Lane: What is the policy of your party on State aid to non-State schools?

Mr. MELLOY: Oh, shut up!

Mr. Lane: Are you prepared to answer? Don't you have a policy?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MELLOY: The children can be warned of the dangers of venereal disease—they can be warned of their economic responsibilities—but nobody in the world is going to stop sex; nobody is going to tell children when it is going to happen; nobody will be there to tell them that they should not do it at any particular time. As I said earlier, the environment and the circumstances in which young people find themselves will be the governing factor. That is the natural way of things. I should be very pleased if somebody could define for me a sex education course in State schools.

As my time is almost up, Mr. Hewitt, I think I had better finish on that note, because I am sure other honourable members will have contributions to make on the same subject.

Mrs. KYBURZ (Salisbury) (12.54 p.m.): Before giving my plaudits to the Minister, I should like to deal with what the honourable member for Nudgee said and promptly

define for him sex education—(a) because it is greatly lacking in the education system at present and (b) because I am a little saddened to think that the honourable member has such antiquated ideas about it.

A sex education course does not cover only the biological functions of sex or, as the honourable member for Nudgee so crudely put it, how and when people should do it. A course in human relationships is taught to the children. It is a course in which children learn to interact with each other, with their parents and with the society in which they live. It is not only sex. In fact that is a misnomer. It is a human relationships course. It is now beginning even in grade 1. Grade 1 textbooks pose the questions: "Who is my mummy? Who is my daddy? Where did I come from?" It begins there. There are still some girls in high school who believe that babies come right out of a mother's navel. With that sort of ignorance about we have to start somewhere.

I thank the Minister for his understanding in a very sensitive portfolio and for the fact that obviously he is going to make changes even though in the Education Department changes come extraordinarily slowly.

The Minister has been into my electorate. Recently he gave a very interesting evening discussion on community involvement in education. He has proved himself to be a very understanding gentleman in matters affecting parents, teachers and parents and citizens' associations. Of course, my electorate has some vast educational problems. There are some extremely capable men and women in the Education Department, although that department is heavily weighted on the male side, for some reason or other which I have never learnt.

I would make a few suggestions and perhaps a few criticisms on some aspects of education. Previous speakers have praised certain aspects of the education system— aspects which entirely deserve their praise.

I am particularly concerned about the fact that there are very large schools in my electorate. Other honourable members tend to bring up that problem from time to time. Those large schools are causing concern to parents and teachers. The Queensland Teachers' Union is involving itself more in disruptive attitudes, but I think that stems from the fact that the teachers are concerned about the size of their schools. One primary school has an enrolment of nearly 1,600

students, which is extraordinarily large. I do not think it reflects lack of planning on the part of the Education Department but rather lack of planning on the part of the Queensland Housing Commission. It has tended to plonk houses down, particularly in Woodridge and Kingston, where no services at all have been available. That meant no schools, no public transport, etc.

I have discussed the matter with some of the head-teachers and have proposed that, as we do with pre-schools, we should be using primary schools for two shifts. That is done in pre-schools because they are built to accommodate only so many children. Of course, there is a happier environment with a small group of children. Morning and afternoon sessions are provided in pre-schools. We could be doing that in primary schools and, in that way, making more use of the capital expenditure, playgrounds, etc. In fact we would be doubling the use of our resources. It would help to amortise the capital expenditure on school buildings and, in fact, amortise the experience of the teachers. It can work; it does work in other countries. It works in nearly all of the Asian countries, where the resources are simply not available to put into school buildings.

School buildings are vastly expensive. Some members of the public do not understand what it costs to set up a new school. They will regale their members with telephone calls, letters and screams for new schools here, there and everywhere, without realising that if a school is put in one situation it is not put in another. Therefore the planning of where schools go is a very sensitive area.

The size of the schools in my electorate, particularly in the southern end of it, is now being paid a great deal of attention. That is indicated by the fact that many teacher aides have been provided. The Woodridge State School has 15 teacher aides, and the head-teacher and his staff are falling over themselves trying to find a use for them.

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

Mrs. KYBURZ: Before lunch I had said that it was a matter of concern to me that there were not many females in the administrative section of the Education Department and in schools. This is partly the fault of the department itself, but mostly the fault of the women in the teaching service. From my own experience I know that women tend to opt in and opt out of teaching, so to speak, as it suits them. Of course, family

responsibilities prevail as does the fact that women in general refuse to move around the State.

The percentages of females in different fields of teaching are quite interesting. For example, in pre-schools 98.2 per cent of teachers are females; in primary schools, 59.8 per cent; in special education, 65 per cent; and in secondary education, 49.1 per cent. The total mean is 56.2 per cent. In other words, 56.2 per cent of all teachers in Queensland are females. The figures speak for themselves.

Although each school functions as an autonomous body, the administration in some schools, particularly in some of the schools in which I have taught, has been top-heavy. There are deputies who should be teaching, and very capable head-teachers in relatively small schools with enrolments of from 400 to 500 pupils. Such a head-teacher is capable of administering the school, particularly now that clerk-typists are employed at schools. Not enough deputies take on classroom responsibilities, such as teaching and guiding first-year and second-year teachers.

The system of promotion and incentives needs revision. The allowance that is paid to teachers who go into the Far West also needs revision, because problems are associated with getting teachers to move out to the western areas of the State.

I am concerned at the disillusionment among first-year and second-year teachers as they enter schools. This disillusionment is caused, firstly, by the situation prevailing at teachers' colleges, or colleges of advanced education. In college the student teacher tends to sit through three years of polly-waffle lectures. I am told that, before I received my training, one year's training accomplished as much as three years' training now does. Few teachers in the service would disagree with me.

I am concerned at the fact that in teachers' college, as in university and in secondary schools, the students are not taught but instructed, and the jump, or the gap, between high school and teachers' college is a vast one. The freedom in teachers' college is so great that many student teachers do not accommodate themselves well to it. I realise that the concern for the educational standard of teachers is quite great. Registration has proved to be of great value not only to teachers but also to the department. I have kept up my registration; one really never knows what will happen.

I am also concerned at the disillusionment among first-year and second-year teachers at the attitudes prevailing in some schools. At one end of the scale there are head-teachers—invariably they are men—who are quite understanding and relatively young in outlook and are quite capable of tendering advice and constructive criticism. However, at the other end of the scale there are head-teachers who, although not particularly good classroom teachers, possess sufficient administrative ability and length of service to be able to push their way to the top. Some head-teachers are destructive in their criticism, and the practices they engage in against young teachers are costing the State the loss of many young teachers.

I move on to the subject of pre-school education. I am concerned that many children who should be going to pre-school are not and that many who should not be there are in fact attending. Perhaps we should have a "means test" of emotional fitness and ability to communicate for entry to pre-school at the present time. I understand that by the end of this year the pre-school programme will be 64 per cent complete. The children of many families in which communication is lacking and in which emotional involvement in the upbringing of the children is lacking are the ones who should be going to pre-school. Pre-school is a place for remodelling not only the IQ but also the emotional outlook of a child.

The at-risk register has been mentioned by a number of other members. I believe it is a wonderful idea. In the first and second grades at school we can see the children who have emotional and education problems. We can even pick the areas in which they are suffering. That is the time to do something about them. As I have said before, we are not teaching for the very bright children. We are not exploiting that resource of brain power that is definitely there.

It is generally accepted that in the primary school the teacher uses the talk-and-chalk method and in the secondary and tertiary stages we instruct. That is perhaps where a lot of parents fail to understand what is going on in the schools, and a lot of pupils fail to understand the system of the secondary school. After all, between grade 7 and grade 8 there really is no delineation apart from the fact that the student moves into a high school. The idea of a first-year centre in a high school is a very good one, as it can innovate between the two. It can use the two methods.

The teaching of infants is vastly under-rated. It is in the infant school that the basis of good education is laid down in each pupil. It is in the infant school also that we teach the pupils values—values which will stay with them throughout their lives. At that stage, too, we have to lay a foundation for language, arts and mathematics abilities. I think that the salary scale begins at the wrong end, when we compare infant teachers with university lecturers.

The greater degree of specialist education that we now see is most heartening. I refer in particular to migrant education, remedial reading and speech therapists. There is now a migrant education centre in the city, which has a wide consequential use for many migrant children who live in and around Brisbane.

The regional guidance centre at Mt. Gravatt will also be of great use to my electorate, particularly in the southern end. I am very greatly concerned, though, for the future of adult migrant education, particularly what used to be referred to as in situ education—that is, education on the factory floor. I have been acquainted with many cases of women who have been sacked from factories because of their lack of language ability—women who have degrees from universities abroad. Last week in my electorate I heard of a case of a lad who was sacked because he lacked English ability. He was 17 years of age. It was a very, very sad case. I spoke to the manager, who said that the official reason was something else. I knew what the real reason was. I think that is a tragedy, particularly for the migrants, because they are suffering emotionally as well as economically.

Many previous speakers in this debate have discussed the various aspects of sex education and religious education. I will not go into the latter one further, except to say that my feeling is that it must be a comparative education. Other religions must be compared with Christianity to give children a broad knowledge of the world which surrounds them.

The so-called declining standards in education, I feel, are not a result of the school system or of teaching. That is perhaps a sweeping statement to make, in view of what other members have said. I do not feel really that standards are declining. I feel we are simply viewing education from a different angle. I am also concerned with the

fact that parental and social apathy contribute to so-called declining standards, and so does television. In fact, there is a direct ratio between the hours of television viewing and the educational achievements of the children.

Audiovisual equipment cannot take the place of chalk and talk, as many teachers are finding; nor does it help in furthering the direct, respectful relationship between pupil and teacher. Some schools and p. and c. associations place too much emphasis on buying or replacing equipment, instead of on the emotional well-being of the pupils.

The open area classrooms in some schools are causing teachers concern. The open area method of teaching is interesting, but it needs teachers who are capable of innovation and can fit in well together. As all honourable members would realise nearly every teacher has a different way of teaching and likes to use his own methods.

It is interesting to note that in some parts of the world the education authorities are reverting to the single classroom structure. I do not know whether we will follow that in the future. I have met many teachers who adapt very well to the open area system. In fact, I have enjoyed it immensely. But it can depend on many factors, not least of which is the emotional stability or instability of the teacher.

Now, as never before, we are educating our young children in emotional well-being and rounded personality. In the past, if they learned arithmetic, reading and writing, we were happy with their education. That is no longer enough. The honourable members who have criticised pupils' lack of spelling ability have probably no teaching background; besides which they are not seeing the vast range of experiences of the young children in our society. Pupils are now learning and reading about other countries in the world. They are now learning and reading about the way in which other children and adults live their lives. They are now experiencing exploratory methods in science which once upon a time they probably would not have had time to pursue.

The curriculum is so vast that it is extraordinarily difficult to get through the teaching of each subject in a year. Every teacher will say that there is just too much in each subject, particularly mathematics. An understanding head-teacher will say, "Teach what you can but make sure that you do a sprinkling of everything." There is not in

fact a drop in standards in our schools today. It is just that we have not been able to educate the middle-age group of our society to recognise that the standards we now require are different. As I said, we are educating children for a well-rounded personality.

The Minister has been most understanding in his attempt to settle the textbook question which flared up early in the year. I was interested to read his comments. The fact of the matter is that there are some quite Right-wing radical groups in our community that are getting too much say. It is as simple as that. Teachers are capable of choosing the right textbooks, and so, too, are head-teachers and the department. They realise the problem and the financial consequences of continually buying textbooks.

As for the content, teachers and the Education Department once again are quite capable of setting the standards. The people who complain are nearly always women. I say that in a derogatory sense because it is usually the women who feel that they have to stand up for the morals in our community, and the morals they are standing up for are not the morals that we would uphold in any case.

I compliment the Minister on his handling of his portfolio, although far be it from me to compliment. I realise that a back-bencher would rarely criticise or praise the Minister. It is a very difficult portfolio and the Minister is doing an exemplary job so far as innovation is concerned.

Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (2.29 p.m.): I congratulate the Minister for Education on his appointment. He knows me well enough to realise that I do not congratulate him just to curry favour with him. If any back-bencher is game to criticise Ministers, it is me, so whenever I congratulate a Minister, I mean it sincerely. The Minister has proved that he is a strong Minister and I predict a pretty fair future for him as Minister for Education.

Mr. Wright: You are having five bob each way.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I would rather be spoken of highly by the Minister than by the honourable member. I do not give a hoot about the honourable member's opinion. He can read it out if he likes and if he does, I will walk across there and lay him down in the aisle.

While I am on my feet, let me say that education in this State has been used for many years by the A.L.P. to put across some of its dirty, rotten, filthy, socialist propaganda. I am going to tell of the way in which some teachers in my electorate are standing up in high schools and telling pupils to vote for the A.L.P. That has to be stopped—in any party, not just the A.L.P. I will criticise the National Party, the D.L.P., the Liberal Party or any other party whose members would attempt to inflict political propaganda on school-children. I go to high schools and primary schools and I never mention one word of politics. I do not have to, because I can talk to the young people about other things. I do not have to talk about politics, and I criticise any teacher who would do such a thing.

I received a complaint on Monday from a woman with a child at one of the Redcliffe schools who said that a female teacher stopped her class and said, "Now we'll talk about politics." I am not going to mention any names. The principal of the school concerned is a good person and I do not think that he knew anything about it. This teacher then confined the entire lesson to politics and concluded by telling the students to influence their parents to vote for the A.L.P. in the coming election.

This has definitely been propagated by Costello, from the Queensland Teachers' Union, who has done little but make derogatory statements about this Government ever since he was elected to his office. He is one of the worst persons ever to be at the head of a union, and if the teachers use their heads they will get rid of him as soon as possible. He is a complete idiot. All that he has done is disrupt education in this State, together with Dr. D'Urso and some others of similar type. Dr. D'Urso should be deported for some of the rotten, stupid things that he and his Council for Democracy in State Schools have tried to do.

Mr. Wright: Oh, come on!

Mr. FRAWLEY: You don't know what the hell you are talking about. You are one of his stooges in Parliament. You and Wood, from Toowoomba, pushed D'Urso's barrow day after day.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: When D'Urso was a teacher at a school, the others were damned glad to get rid of him because of the things that he used to do in his classroom. He was a filthy, unkempt teacher and it is just as well that he did get out of the school.

I have read the annual report of the department and I can see where many improvements have been made. All who had anything to do with education before this Government came to office in 1957 know how education was carried out under the A.L.P. The A.L.P. did nothing for education because it did not want the people to become educated so that they would be able to see through some of its rotten unusual policies. Since 1957 education has taken a turn for the better.

I commend the Education Department on the provision of teacher aides. I know many teacher aides and I have seen the good work that they do in assisting teachers in schools. I agree that school principals should be allowed to select their own teacher aides. They live in the district and they know the people who apply for these positions.

Mr. Wright: They do that now.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I know. Why don't you shut up and let me finish—or I'll tell how you hypnotise women.

Mr. Wright: I'll look into your eyes.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I'd like to blacken your eyes.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: There is no doubt that, under the pretence of trying to improve education, much of the money of the Queensland Teachers' Union has been wasted by pushing the barrow of the A.L.P., and the man who has received a great deal of support from socialists and Communists is Costello.

Mr. Wright: Why don't you go outside and say that? You're a brave fellow here.

Mr. FRAWLEY: If you keep that up—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! Persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr. FRAWLEY: . . . I'll go outside with you. I might be 20 years older than you, but I'll flatten you.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will address the Chair.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Miller. I am getting fed up with this bloke. Ever since I entered this Parliament he has done nothing but denigrate Ministers and use his dirty, rotten, filthy propaganda.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member does not have to take interjections from the honourable member for Rockhampton. I ask him to address the Chair.

Mr. FRAWLEY: When he was a school-teacher he found out which religion was predominant in the area that he was in. At one time he was a Baptist, another time a Catholic and another time an Anglican. He's a rotten liar. The best thing that ever happened to education was his election to Parliament. I'm fed up with some of the filthy, rotten things that he tries to put over in this Parliament.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has made an unparliamentary remark and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I withdraw it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I will not allow the honourable member to call another member a liar.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Well, I'll withdraw it.

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. What the honourable member has said is totally untrue. I find it objectionable and I ask for a personal apology.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton has taken exception to what the honourable member for Murrumba said. He asks for a withdrawal and apology.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will withdraw it, but there is no way in the world I will apologise to him.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There will be no qualifications; the honourable member will apologise.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will withdraw, but I won't apologise.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must apologise.

Mr. FRAWLEY: No; I refuse. I am not going to apologise to him and that is definite.

Mr. Moore: You don't have to apologise. Standing Orders do not mention an apology.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not going to apologise, and that is all there is to it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will carry on. I have sought the advice of the Clerk of the Parliament and the honourable member does not have to apologise to another member.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I withdraw; I have already said that.

Getting back to school-teachers, I say that they should concern themselves with ethical practices and not attempt at any stage—I say this of all teachers of all political beliefs; I am not confining my remarks to the A.L.P.—to indoctrinate any school-children with their political beliefs, and I mean all of them. It would suit them better to take some of the children outside the school after hours and engage in some extra curricular activity such as sport. That is another thing I have noticed; most teachers cannot wait to get out of the door at 3 o'clock. They don't give a hoot about the children after school.

Mr. Wright: What a shocking thing to say!

Mr. FRAWLEY: Oh, shut up! I will say it at any time I like and the honourable member will not stop me. It is about time some of these fellows copped a bit of their own back.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: Since I entered this Chamber I have been amazed at the low standard of debate introduced by A.L.P. members. There is no doubt about that.

While I am on the subject of schools—there is no doubt that parents and citizens' associations are used many times by the A.L.P. as political platforms. I have that problem in my electorate right now. A.L.P. members get up at parents and citizens' meetings and tell the people how worried they should be about different things that are going to happen at the school. On the occasions I have contacted the principals about these things, I have been told they are a pack of lies.

I would like to say something about demountables. I believe that demountable classrooms are quite reasonable provided that the teacher is prepared to teach in them.

I can see nothing wrong with them. They are reasonably comfortable. I can recall a number of schools—

Mr. Wright: You want them to teach in tents.

Mr. FRAWLEY: If a teacher is any good, he can teach in a tent. It depends on the ability of the teacher. I am sick of some of these teachers whingeing about wanting carpets on the classroom floor when they do not have carpets even in their own homes. Some of them are jumped-up little skites, and the honourable member is one of them.

Mr. Wright: You despise school-teachers.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Miller): Order! Further interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not despise school-teachers at all, but I despise those who, under the guise of helping children, try to get across their A.L.P. propaganda. They are the ones I despise—not teachers who are members of the A.L.P. but teachers who try to propound their A.L.P. doctrines to the children—and I will continue to oppose them.

Getting back to demountable classrooms— as I said before, I can see nothing wrong with them. I think when demountables are placed in a school, it is for a reason. They are temporary classrooms and I believe that teachers and parents and citizens' association should realise this.

Mr. Moore: Members of Parliament use them.

Mr. FRAWLEY: That's right, there are demountables down here in the grounds of Parliament House and there is nothing wrong with them.

Mr. Tenni: It is only socialist teachers who scream about the demountables. All the other teachers, and that is 95 per cent of the total, haven't said a word about them.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I know socialist teachers who do not complain about them; it is only the rotten ones who do. Carrying on about education—pre-schools are one of the greatest things ever introduced by this or any other Government. There is no doubt that this Government has to take a lot of the credit for providing pre-schools. In my electorate of Murrumba there is a pre-school at Deception Bay and it was one of the first built in Murrumba. It was built in an area that

really needed a pre-school and I thank Mr. Ashby and Mr. Tainton of the pre-school section for some of the things they have done for pre-schooling in my electorate.

The Woodford Pre-school was the next to be opened. It opened about six months behind schedule, but that certainly was not the fault of the Education Department. That was the fault of the contractor, who dilly-dallied and took a hell of a long time to finish the pre-school, but eventually it was completed.

There is another big pre-school in my electorate at Kippa-Ring, which is only a short distance from where I live, and it is well used by the people in that area.

I hope that in Caboolture the Education Department, the Works Department and the Caboolture Shire Council settle some of their differences over the land for the pre-school, which I understand is the subject of an exchange between the Education Department and the council. I think this occurred back in 1972. I was in on this exchange. Portion of the land of the primary school grounds was to be given to the council in exchange for other land adjacent to the school. Since then, the Education Department has negotiated with the council to buy back some of the land which was exchanged to build a pre-school in George Street, Caboolture. I hope whatever differences there are will be resolved because the council blames the Education Department or the Lands Department or whoever is interested in buying the land, and they in turn switch it back to the council. I do not know who is holding it up. I know that the parents and citizens' association at the Caboolture primary school is very concerned that a town the size of Caboolture has not a pre-school. There is a kindergarten run by the Apex Club, and very well run. It is as good as a pre-school and is completely free of debt; but there is no official pre-school in Caboolture. I hope that one will be built there. If it is not ready for 1976, I certainly hope it will be ready for the beginning of the 1977 school year.

I wish to deal now with teachers at pre-schools. Personally, I do not have any problems with teachers at pre-schools. In fact, I do not have problems with teachers at any schools, because I go and speak to them man to man. However, I have noticed that some pre-school teachers do not want to co-operate with the parents. They must be made to realise that they are teaching children in an entirely different environment from the ordinary school environment. Pre-school education demands more co-operation

between teachers and parents than any other form of education, and the further one goes out into the country the more co-operation there has to be. I do not intend to mention the pre-school about which I am speaking, but if the situation remains as it is and the teacher does not co-operate a little more with the parents, I shall raise the matter on the floor of the Chamber. My attitude is that one should say things straight out. I do not intend to write letters to the Education Department about the matter. I have already spoken on the telephone to someone in the department and told him what I believe should be done. I did not suggest a transfer; I do not believe that that is the answer. In my opinion, pre-school teachers should be instructed to be a little bit more co-operative with the mothers of the children they are teaching.

The new primary school at Redcliffe West, on the corner of Hercules Road and Anzac Avenue, is well under way. I have been advised that it will be ready for the beginning of the next school year. What concerns me is that the school is being built on what used to be a small-crops farm and the ground requires a fair bit of levelling. I do not think all the work should be left to the parents and citizens' association of a new school. Although, strictly speaking, this matter does not come within the Minister's portfolio, at least he could say something to the Minister for Works and Housing about it. In my opinion, the playing field at the new school at Redcliffe West should be put into a fairly reasonable condition for the first day of the school year. The school will have a fairly large enrolment in 1976—perhaps a larger enrolment than most new schools. The Redcliffe City Council opposed its being placed in the area, but I believe it is in the best possible position. I said before the land was purchased that this was the best place for a primary school, and I have not changed my opinion.

There are about 25 schools in my electorate, most of which have fairly good playing fields. A good playing field is a great advantage to a school. Children do not attend school only to be taught academic subjects. They must also be taught something about sport, which plays an important part in building a young person's character. In my opinion, sport is essential in any school, and I hope to see the day when it is part of the curriculum. I do not

mean simply going out and doing a few physical jerks; I mean teaching children a particular sport.

Most physical education teachers today are competent, but they do not have an adequate knowledge of every sport. I suppose one cannot expect them to. It certainly would be rare to find a physical education teacher who was proficient in cricket, football, tennis, athletics, swimming and other sports. But I think that the Education Department should do all it can to ensure that physical education teachers have a fairly good grounding in all types of sport. I have noticed that, although most physical education teachers are fairly proficient in team games, they do not seem to have great knowledge of athletics. It is one of the dominant sports in schools, and that is borne out by the fact that the associated schools, State secondary schools and G.P.S. schools all hold championships. There is no doubt that it plays an important part in all schools.

Mr. Kaus: They do a good job in teaching sport.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Of course they do. I am not saying that they do not do a good job. They do not receive the training that will enable them to coach children in all sports. It is not the fault of the physical education teachers. I know many physical education teachers who haven't a clue about certain sports but who are doing their best. They are trying to make themselves proficient in those sports. In my opinion, the physical education teachers' course should include greater training in some sports. They should be given the ability to coach children in a number of sports. The children first come in contact with sport at primary school. At many primary schools in my electorate there are teachers who happen to be qualified in one sport.

Mr. Wright: Is this a private conversation, or can anybody join in?

Mr. FRAWLEY: Just because I happen to be looking across at the honourable member for Mansfield does not mean that I am not addressing the Chairman.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not cross-eyed, either. I can look where I like as long as I address the Chairman.

Mr. Wright: Don't speak about your colleague like that. It's a shocking thing to say! He can't help that.

Mr. FRAWLEY: There is always a straw that cracks the camel's back, and the honourable member for Rockhampton is going very close to doing that.

Mr. Wright: You've been cracked for a long time. I am very concerned about religious instruction in schools.

Mr. Moore: He'd be good at it. He's a lay preacher.

Mr. FRAWLEY: He is one bloke who shouldn't be allowed to instruct anybody on religious matters. I wouldn't let him do it. He would say that incest was the right thing to do. His party wants to legalise incest in the Australian Capital Territory. It wants to legalise homosexuality. We have to be very careful about any socialist teacher giving religious education. Religious instruction can be twisted to suit the mind of the particular person giving it. I commend the Minister on the group of people he has got together to go into the matter of religious instruction.

Mr. Wright interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! I remind the honourable member for Rockhampton that I will not tolerate persistent interjections.

Mr. FRAWLEY: What is the penalty for a member walking across and flattening another one? Can you tell me what it is, Mr. Miller? It might be worth while.

Mr. Wright: About four weeks in hospital.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am 20 years older than that damned pervert, and there is no way in the world he can do me any time he likes to try. I'm fed up with him.

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. The language used by the honourable member is highly objectionable to me. I ask that he refrain from that—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton takes exception to the words used by the honourable member for Murrumba. He asks that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I withdraw them. He should have taken care when he was playing around with another man's wife in Rockhampton—

Mr. WRIGHT: I again rise to a point of order. I ask for a withdrawal of that.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member takes exception to the words used by the honourable member for Murrumba and asks for their withdrawal.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I withdraw them. It is a shocking thing when you have to withdraw the truth, but never mind—

Mr. MELLOY: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is abusing the privileges of the Assembly. I do not think he should be allowed to continue in that strain. He has been going on that way ever since he started.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will continue with his speech, but I ask him to keep to the Estimates under discussion.

Mr. FRAWLEY: We heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition praise the Federal Government for what it has done for education in this State. It has made grants to this State and so it should. Whose money is coming back for education? It is money belonging to the people of Queensland—money they have paid in taxes. Before the Federal A.L.P. Government was in power, Queensland never had any problems about money for education or anything else. That money was made available by way of Federal grants. That commenced right back in 1942, when the Federal Government took over the States' taxing powers. Grants have been made to this State regardless of the political party in power. The State A.L.P. Government in those days received its grants for education and everything else without any strings being attached to them. Only since 1972 have strings been attached to grants made to the Queensland Government for education and other purposes.

The libraries that are being provided in schools are proving of great benefit to pupils. A fortnight ago the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs opened the library at the Kallangur Primary School. With an enrolment of about 1,000 pupils, that school merited a library. Recently the Minister for Primary Industries opened the library at the Woodford Primary School, which has a high-school top, and the Minister for Education opened another one at the Kippa-Ring High School. This is indicative of the concern of the Government and of the public servants in charge of the Education Department. It shows that education has come a long way since 1957. I certainly congratulate

the Minister and his officers. I am not going to attempt to name particular persons. The Education Department in this State may not be 100 per cent perfect. If it were I would be suspicious, because nobody is perfect, but at least the department is doing its best for education in this State. Any criticism of that department is certainly not warranted.

(Time expired.)

Mr. KATTER (Flinders) (2.50 p.m.): I congratulate the Education Department. From my reading of the various education systems throughout the world today, it would appear that the Education Department in Queensland is up with and possibly ahead of any other teaching system in the world.

That is a very strong claim to make, and I make it after lengthy discussions with many people who have obtained masters' degrees in various faculties in other countries, particularly the United States of America. The only criticism that is levelled at the Queensland education system is that it is so progressive that it has reached an advanced experimental stage; in other words, possibly it is too progressive.

It is fashionable for a lot of people in southern States to criticise Queensland. It is referred to as the deep North and the backward State. Even though our forward-thinking education system is not a tribute to the work of members of Parliament, I think we can take some pride in the fact that we have had sufficient intelligence to examine the proposals put forward by the administrators in the Education Department and to let them have their head. I congratulate them on showing such intelligence and intellectual capacity as to put us ahead probably of all other institutionalised education systems in the world. As I have said, the only criticism that is levelled at us is that possibly we have gone too far.

Now that a Federal election is near—we must reflect on the value of education. Of all areas of increased expenditure by the late Federal Government, education came second.

The average Australian has a working life—I use the term in its broadest sense—of 54 years, from 6 to 60 years of age. In Queensland the average person spends 20 of those 54 years in learning institutions. We must ask ourselves: should people spend half of their working lives preparing for their working lives? I feel we have gone far too far. By the time many of us have finished our

preparations for our working life, we will be too old to enjoy it. The situation has got out of hand. We must reassess the value of the education that is given to our children.

Mr. Moore: You couldn't be more correct; you couldn't be more spot on.

Mr. KATTER: I thank the member for his compliment.

Education is a productive field, one that is producing knowledge. However, even though more time is spent in teaching children than before, I doubt whether children are learning more than before. We must question the value of the years spent in school.

Society is controlled mainly by people without a tertiary education, and most of the important positions in the community, particularly in productive fields, are held by people without tertiary education. I do not wish to give specific examples, but I would be pleased to do so if anyone wishes to take up this matter with me later on. If we looked back a decade or two, we would probably find that leaders in those days did not have secondary education, either. Why have we got this situation? How has this terrible monster come upon us? How has it sneaked up on us and grabbed half of our lives and half of the lives of our children? Where has it come from?

Let me instance two areas in Queensland—the field of real estate agents and the field of insurance agents. Both are looking at ways of closing their callings. When they do, they cease to be agents—or “salesmen” as they are called. They then become professional men. Their status in society rises. They close off entry into the profession, and immediately the price they can charge for their services increases dramatically. The people entering those callings will be “far better educated”. Therefore they will enjoy a far higher social status in our society. These are the reasons. They are not altruistic. They are not reasons that have been made for the betterment of society. They are reasons of greed, selfishness and self-aggrandisement. These are the reasons why the real estate institute is demanding a tertiary level of education. These are the reasons why the insurance agents are demanding a tertiary level of education. If we go back a decade, we find it was the same with pharmacists. If we go back two decades before that, we find it was the same with

doctors and every other calling and profession that has been set up and that requires a tertiary education.

I am afraid that many of us in this place must accept responsibility as accessories after the fact because we have repeatedly agreed to positions being set up that can be filled only by people with secondary or tertiary education. It is irrelevant whether these people have the ability. It is irrelevant whether they have the knowledge. It is irrelevant whether they are the people who should be sitting in those positions of power. The only thing that is relevant is whether somewhere in their lifetime they have failed an examination—and they are crucified for the rest of their days on account of it. These are the questions we must be asking ourselves and these are the judgments we must pass in the future about the education system.

In Australia at the moment we are reasonably well off. Some 5 per cent of the population is not working at the present moment, yet we seem to be enjoying a production of goods and services which, though not as good as it was, is only 1.8 per cent less this year than it was last year. So it appears that we can afford to have fewer people working. It appears that we can afford to allow those working to work for fewer hours. Consequently, if we do cut back the length of time spent on formal education, we will throw people onto the employment market-place, where there is simply no work offering.

So we must look at the education system and see how we can change it. When I say "education", I am not talking about it in the accepted sense. It could be called "education", and it should most certainly be handled by the Education Department; but its concept is a long, long way from reading, writing and arithmetic, which was the original concept of education. I am speaking of all people today. I am speaking for the youth of Queensland, because they are the ones at the receiving end of the professions and the educated classes and the various other people in our society who have a vested interest in maintaining the education requirements needed to fulfil positions of importance in our society.

I regret to say that I have not had time to compile the statistics today, but if my memory serves me correctly—and I ask someone to correct me if I am wrong—something like 80 per cent of the youth of America have had some sort of drug experience. Something like 80 per cent! Something like 40 per cent regularly use drugs in the United States. Let us add to that number the drop-outs—the people who become anti-social, refuse to live in society and retreat to some sort of farm on the dole—and the people who actually go right through the education system, yet are still immature when they enter society. They go out as intellectual cripples. They go out as people who are not able to mix

and converse with other people in society. That is probably the most dangerous category of all. The education system is not only not doing good for the youth of Australia, but it is actually destroying whatever it is in people that makes them great, makes them individuals and gives them integrity as individuals.

If I were to go back and quote the thing that most made people feel uptight—if I may use that colloquial expression—in my days in secondary school and in tertiary institutions, it was lack of ability to contribute something. All of those people, who were under such tremendous pressure when they were at boarding school or university, went out working during the holidays—the thing that was done then—and they became very mature. They became people who were normal and were able to mix healthily with other people in society and they had a healthy attitude towards society.

If we reflect upon the idiosyncrasies of the socialist concept of Government, I do not think many honourable members would doubt seriously that socialism is the most stupid form of human endeavour, yet so many people are coming out of the education institutions—the overwhelmingly majority of them—believing fervently in this concept. The reason is that they have not attained maturity. They do not realise that a person cannot learn everything; that someone has to be out there even if he is only pressing buttons on a machine. Someone has to press the buttons at one end to get the goods and services at the other. Someone has to actually work, and learning is just not sufficient. Accumulation of knowledge will not produce a loaf of bread. But it can help.

The major definitive factor that is against and antieducation at the moment is the fact that the education system gives the individual—the youth of Australia—no ability to produce anything of value for society—his fellow man. The statistics covering people at university or secondary institutions who worked during their holidays would prove that what I am saying is correct. It was most certainly a tenet of faith when I was at the university.

Let me move on to the sort of areas that I am talking about. Here I must pay great tribute to the education institution. I must pay great tribute to certain ramifications of the Radford report because Radford was driving very hard in this direction. It is regrettable that, because of the conservatism of certain high-school head-masters and the fear of the unknown, the recommendations by Radford have not been taken to their logical conclusions in the system. I have seen instances where this has occurred.

I went to the Richmond Hill High School in Charters Towers. There was a 12-year-old chap there—one of the students. The head-master said, "I know that you are a bit anti formal education but I would like you to have a yarn with this lad." He called the lad in and said, "What have you been doing for the last two weeks?" He said,

"Sir, I have been doing a contract study on diamonds," He said, "Was it your own idea?" The lad said, "Yes. We were allowed to study anything we like and I chose diamonds." The head-master asked him to go away and get his book. He came back with his book. He was not a particularly gifted child. He was near the top of his class, but was not exceptional.

He explained to me how diamonds were formed. He went into the whole geological history of the formation of diamonds and explained to me molecular structure. He explained how they could be made by synthetic methods and explained to me the covalent bonding theory. This was a child of 12. But he had been given his head. He was doing something that he was interested in. He was given the help and assistance of his teachers. He went out and sought the knowledge for himself. It was a very rewarding experience for the child and for society because he was a happy student who will be a happy citizen of society. I throw that in as one possibility.

Now the second possibility. These are minor things in one sense but they are important. I remember saying in a discussion that I was having with a high school teacher in Cloncurry, my home town, "I hate the thought of my child going to school next year." The teacher said, "Why?" I said, "Because you ram into children information that they will never use throughout their lives. That time could be used to allow the children to acquire voluntarily information that would be of value later." He said, "I don't do that." I said, "Tell me what you taught today." He said, "In the last two periods we had chess and a discussion on the cinema and politics." I said, "You're joking!" He said, "No, I'm not."

It turned out that he had a class of junior students who were finishing school that year and he could see no reason for ramming into them all sorts of useless information that obviously they would never use again. He had therefore taught along the lines that I have indicated, and in this way his pupils were voluntarily coming to an appreciation of some of the finer things of life. I pay a great tribute to that teacher who acted on his own initiative.

I plead with the Education Department to consider some of the concepts that are now being put forward. There is, for instance, the concept of spare periods in which the teacher could perhaps bring someone from outside to address the students. Many of the children in western schools are not going to be doctors, lawyers or architects. We must provide for those who will be continuing their education, but we must remember that the vast majority will in adult life be shearing sheep, riding horses, mustering cattle, driving trains or engaging in some similar type of work. They must be educated for what they will do later.

Spare periods could be used, for instance, to bring to the school a grazier or engine driver to talk about his work. They could be used for whatever purpose the teacher decided. The teacher to whom I have referred decided on chess and a discussion on the cinema. I put that suggestion forward as one proposal.

I have another proposal to put forward very forcefully. Everyone in society today works a prescribed spread of hours; there are few who do not work either a 35 or 40 hour week. One of the major groups not working a limited number of hours a week is the youth of this country. They have to work an unlimited number of hours. They have to compete against every other child because, unless they are near the top of the class, all the doors to advancement will be closed to them. They have no relief from work when they go home at 5 o'clock. They have to take out their books and start to study again.

It appears that no Opposition member is interested in education; all the Opposition benches are empty. The Teachers' Union publishes large advertisements condemning the State Government and the former coalition Federal Government. But A.L.P. members of this Assembly are not sufficiently interested to listen to this debate or attempt to refute any criticism made here. I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is not one Opposition member in the Chamber. That is what they think of the people of Queensland.

In conclusion—I plead with the department to try to relate teaching to the interests that pupils will have later in life. I plead for the elimination of homework and the restriction of learning to the hours in which children are in school. I also make a plea that school-children be allowed to produce something of value to the community. Otherwise the schools will be producing people who are immature and not capable of taking their place in society.

(Time expired.)

Hon. V. J. BIRD (Burdekin—Minister for Education and Cultural Activities) (3.9 p.m.): In closing the debate on the Estimates of the most important department within the Government, I should like to repeat my earlier thanks to all who participated and in so doing made constructive suggestions or drew my attention to wrongs, real or imagined, major or minor, soluble or insoluble. All, I am sure, are important to the members who raised them and the electorates that they represent. In my final say, I shall attempt to cover any areas raised by members with which I have not already dealt. Should I omit any matters of importance, I would ask members to raise these privately with me at a later time. My main regret is that I will not be able to reply in detail to all those who did participate in the debate.

The honourable member for Rockhampton made a plea to give credit where it is due and referred to the Commonwealth Government's contribution towards colleges of advanced education. He compared figures for two financial years—I think 1971-72 and 1974-75. The approximate figures he quoted were \$5,000,000 as against \$40,000,000. Although the honourable member might have been unaware of it, his comparison is extremely misleading and a little unfair. The fact is that, under the matching formula operating in 1971-72, the State provided nearly \$2 for every \$1 recurrent funds provided by the Commonwealth and \$1 for every \$1 of capital funds. This means that in 1971-72 the Commonwealth provided about \$5,000,000 but the State provided \$7,000,000. In 1974-75, under the changed funding arrangements, the Commonwealth provided all funds direct for colleges after making an appropriate deduction from the general grant to the State. Of the \$40,000,000, about \$24,000,000 was deducted from the State's general grant. Whereas the State contributed 56 per cent of the total funds for colleges in Queensland in 1971-72, in a very real sense it provided 60 per cent in 1974-75. To give credit where it is due, we should recognise that credit for the apparent increase from \$5,000,000 to \$40,000,000 for Queensland colleges in the period 1971-72 to 1974-75 is not by any means due to the Commonwealth alone.

The honourable member for Isis suggested that teachers in schools should be paid salaries comparable with those of university lecturers. For the record, I should probably remind honourable members that the days when teachers' salaries lagged greatly behind other groups with comparable qualifications and responsibilities are past. In recent years teachers have benefited substantially from salary increases. Today the salary scales for university lecturers and four-year-trained teachers in fact overlap.

The honourable member for Albert expressed the hope that the establishment of the college of advanced education at Southport will proceed as planned. I regret that I have to advise that the Commonwealth Commission on Advanced Education has deferred the development of the proposed new college which it had formerly supported in its fourth report. Nevertheless, the Queensland Board of Advanced Education will be taking up the establishment of the Gold Coast college again with the Commission on Advanced Education in the context of planning for the 1977-79 triennium. The same member also made reference to the need for a close watch on growth in his area. This is, of course, something that he shares with members from other areas. But I would like to say that my Planning Branch has under way a major study of the Woodridge-Kingston area in terms of its needs now and for the future. I would also point out that we have had very useful discussions concerning land use and school-site

requirements with the Beaudesert Shire Council. This is something I would most sincerely like to see happen with other local authorities about the areas that they control. It was, indeed, a most useful discussion and I would like to see many more of them.

Several honourable members referred to the possible overproduction of graduates for available jobs. Without attempting to deny the problem, I am nevertheless conscious that it would be undesirable to over-react. Overseas experience seems to indicate that gloomy predictions about job prospects might not be fully warranted, because of the number of possibilities of adjustments and changing trends on the demand and supply sides of the labour market.

It is very easy to be unduly influenced by specific or temporary crises. Students, though, are generally not fools and enrolment patterns seem to have a habit of responding quickly to labour-market changes.

In the United States of America, where the problem of unemployed graduates is much greater than anything we can envisage for a long time, the influential Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in a report entitled "College Graduates and Jobs", after a thorough assessment of the situation, concluded—

"We are totally opposed, with a few special exceptions, to a 'man-power planning' approach to higher education; we believe that reliance on student choice is superior—it is more flexible, a more constantly dynamic mechanism. Man-power planning leads towards rigidities and toward controls, and we find it, by and large, both ineffective and a repugnant mechanism and probably also an unenforceable one as well. Student choice, in the long run and by and large, is superior to central planning of higher education to accord with centrally determined manning tables. The 'free-choice principle' is generally superior to the 'man-power principle'."

There may well be increasing competition amongst graduates for jobs. But I think we should not view tertiary education simply as a meal ticket. It involves much more, and the more thoughtful of our students are quick to point this out. Many of today's students show what I consider to be a commendable concern for matters concerning the quality of life. Students, in fact, often seek more broadly based courses. Irrespective of its employment capability, a tertiary education can improve the quality of life.

Moreover, if we pause for a moment, we can no doubt all think of occupations that have developed in the past 20 years that were undreamt of when we were at school. Many of these new occupations call for highly developed skills. The field of computing, with the variety of jobs it has fostered, is a classic example. Too-detailed

planning for today's manpower needs can easily lead to a vacuum in meeting the changing needs of tomorrow.

Employees with tertiary qualifications can often make valuable contributions in areas in which it has not been traditional to employ such officers. Government services, for example, are increasingly tending to employ graduates in fields where a few years ago it was unusual for persons with such qualifications to be found.

Let us recognise that there may well be a tightening situation for graduates in the future. But let us face the prospect with balance, lest we panic to apply remedies far worse in their consequence than the malady itself.

In my opening remarks I made reference to the recent retirement of the former Chairman of the Board of Advanced Education, Mr. Wood. The new year—February, in fact—will see the retirement of another leader in education, the permanent head of my department and my principal adviser, the Director-General of Education, Mr. Arch Guymer.

On 20 February, Arch Guymer will conclude a distinguished career of more than half a century of devoted public service at State and national levels. He is a true product of the Queensland school system, having attended a small bush school at Manapouri and then, at the age of 14, travelled alone to Warwick, found his own accommodation and enrolled at the Warwick State High School, and proceeded from there to the old Teachers' Training College and his first teaching appointment at Bundaberg East State School.

He interrupted his teaching career to give long and highly distinguished service as a pilot in the R.A.A.F. in the British zone, and then was seconded to the R.A.F. to play an important role in the Burma campaign. He rose to the high rank of squadron-leader. Shortly after the war, Arch Guymer became an assistant to the Director of Primary Education. In 1949 he was appointed as one of the original regional directors of education, establishing the South West Regional Office at Roma, and later serving as regional director in the Central Region based at Rockhampton. In 1959 he became Director of Primary Education. The '60s were characterised by many reforms and innovations in primary education, many initiated by the director and all supported by him.

With the formation of the Public Service Board in 1969, Mr. Guymer became a commissioner and deputy chairman of the board, where he served until early 1971. In 1971

he returned to the Department of Education as director-general, and has led the department most ably in the last five very important and challenging years when education has undergone so many changes and has become much more an area of public debate and scrutiny.

On behalf of the Government, and personally, I thank Arch Guymer for his distinguished service to education and to Queensland.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. BIRD: It is regrettable that I have not time now to dwell at length on the remarks made during the debate on my Estimates over the last few days. Generally speaking, the debate has been an excellent one. I would congratulate all of those who participated.

I do not like to mention names but I should like to thank the honourable member for Salisbury and most of the others who took part in the debate. They had a lot to contribute, and have given me and the officers of my department much food for thought. Although some of the suggestions put forward have covered matters already exercising my mind, those honourable members may be assured that I shall not allow those thoughts to stagnate, and I will be looking forward to further discussion and debate on those matters in the future, and to the implementation of many of the suggestions.

In addition to Mr. Guymer, I should like to thank the other officers of my department—my directors and regional directors, school inspectors, principals and teachers—members of parents and citizens' associations right throughout the State, and all who have assisted in the education of our children in past years, particularly those who have assisted since I took over the portfolio on 10 March this year. I must admit that I am thoroughly enjoying the office of Minister for Education. This is due, no doubt, to the assistance that has been forthcoming since I took over the portfolio. It is also due to the assistance given by my education committee. Although I must admit that there have not been the problems—fortunately—for me to call upon my committee in more recent months, we know we still have many problems to solve in the education system. I will be looking forward to discussing those problems with my committee early in the new year. Again my thanks go to all those who have participated in the debate and to all those who have given assistance to me since I become Minister for Education.

VOTES PASSED UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 307 AND SESSIONAL ORDER

Under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 22 October, the questions for the following Votes were put by the Chairman and agreed to:—

Education and Cultural Activities—	\$
Department of Education, Chief Office	5,688,027
Balance of Vote, Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds	446,553,316
Executive and Legislative, Balance of Vote	2,168,261
The Premier	9,499,366
The Treasurer	174,569,618
Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries	14,486,435
Community and Welfare Services and Sport	30,161,687
Health	215,443,390
Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs	13,411,079
Justice and Attorney-General Police	20,657,149
Police	58,203,367
Survey, Valuation, Urban and Regional Affairs	9,392,108
Water Resources	7,469,058
The Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations	199,802
The Auditor-General	1,792,199
Trust and Special Funds Estimates, Balance of Estimates	791,683,728
Loan Fund Account Estimates, Balance of Estimates	68,350,483
Supplementary Estimates (Consolidated Revenue), 1974-75	142,127,816.04
Supplementary Estimates (Trust and Special Funds), 1974-75	125,972,161.28
Supplementary Estimates (Loan Fund Account), 1974-75	23,704,398.37
Vote on Account, 1976-77	553,000,000

SEVENTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY—RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS

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

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS

The Resolutions being taken as read—

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

“That the Resolutions be now agreed to.”

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

OPENING OF COMMITTEE

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

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

“(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1975-1976, a further sum not exceeding \$755,547,335 be granted from the

Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1975-1976, a further sum not exceeding \$921,293,112 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1975-1976, a further sum not exceeding \$119,174,483 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(d) That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-1975, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$142,127,816.04 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-1975, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$125,972,161.28 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1974-1975, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$23,704,398.37 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1976-1977, a sum not exceeding \$270,000,000, be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1976-1977, a sum not exceeding \$250,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(i) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1976-1977, a sum not exceeding \$33,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

FIRST READING

A Bill, founded on the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced and read a first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (3.43 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

This Bill is the second and final Appropriation Bill for the current financial year. It covers expenditure included in the Budget Estimates, unforeseen expenditure incurred during the previous financial year and expenditure for the first two months of the next financial year to carry the Government over until further supply can be granted in that year.

An amount of \$2,974,014,930 is provided for 1975-76 to cover anticipated expenditures from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund. This amount represents the appropriation for the full financial year apart from \$124,454,172 appropriated under special Acts as set out in the Estimates. It incorporates amounts appropriated in the second Appropriation Act last year, which granted supply for July and August of this year, and the further amounts appropriated in the first Appropriation Act, which was assented to on 1 September, to enable us to carry on until the passing of this Bill.

Unforeseen expenditure for 1974-75 totalling \$291,804,375.69 is also incorporated in the Bill. This amount has had executive authority but now requires the approval of this Parliament. Full details of this amount under the relevant funds are set out in Parts VI, VII and VIII of the Schedule to this Bill.

The Bill provides for an amount of \$553,000,000 to provide supply for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund for the first two months of the financial year 1976-77. Adequate allowance has been made for cost escalations in the interim period.

As honourable members are aware, when an Appropriation Bill is introduced, it is customary for the Treasurer of the day to refer to matters which are of major interest, particularly as far as the finances of the State or the future welfare of the State are concerned. At no time before has this custom been as urgent as it is right now.

There can be no doubt that the next couple of weeks will be the most crucial in the history of this nation. Decisions made by Australians will affect every aspect of their future welfare and every facet of their lives. Clearly, in this year of 1975, we stand at the very cross-roads in Australia's political and constitutional history. So critical are the issues involved in the 13 December elections that it is my plea to every voter in Queensland to take the time to examine them quietly and objectively. Each elector must decide what type of life he wants for himself and his family in this country for the next 20 or 30 years.

Seriously and sincerely, I ask voting Queenslanders to free their minds of sensational side issues which have been included as ploys in this election campaign. I urge Queenslanders to forget hysteria, to be wary of glib tongues, to be most careful of the political confidence tricksters and to be aware

of the tactic of creating other issues so that the sins and errors may be forgotten and submerged in the excitement of rabble-rousing, wild rantings and the rhetoric of smooth talkers. It's all part of the trick of getting in early with the "big lie" and attempting to hoodwink the people. The people have the responsibility to judge.

One of the major issues of this election is the preservation of parliamentary democracy in this country. We have heard a tremendous amount about democracy in recent times, but what concerns us all is the preservation of parliamentary democracy. It surely must be strange to the people of Australia at the present time to be asked to accept that the forcing of a corrupt and discredited Government to the electors is a threat to parliamentary democracy.

Let us look closely at just who is threatening parliamentary democracy in Australia and at the political party which has consistently said that the system—our system; our parliamentary democratic system—has to be changed. Mr. Whitlam has been one of the chief opponents of our existing parliamentary system and has argued that it has to be altered. His party associates, Senator McClelland, Mr. Clyde Cameron and Dr. Cairns, have also weighed in with their support against what we know as our democracy. These are the men who, during the last two or three years, have been running round saying consistently on various platforms that our parliamentary system is not the one they desire. An ardent supporter has also been clenched-fisted Bob Hawke. These are the people about whom we must be concerned when we are considering the Bill before us this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, a Bill that allocates finance for our future.

Anybody with any common sense knows that those who are opposed to democracy desire a socialist dictatorship, a system that is totally foreign to the Australian people, and I am certain that the Australian people will reject such a move out of hand if they are fully aware of just how close we are to it if we return a Whitlam Government. In my opinion, we can kiss goodbye to parliamentary democracy as we know it if Mr. Whitlam and his cohorts are returned on 13 December. We will not be assembling here, as we are this afternoon, to approve in a democratic way the allocation of funds for the furtherance of Queensland's development.

If we think back, Mr. Speaker, we recall that our parliamentary system in Australia has succeeded—in fact, gone from strength to strength—under various Liberal-Country Party Governments since 1901. We recall some of the things that have happened in Queensland over the years until 1972. This was a progressive Queensland. We could bring capital in from overseas; we could encourage development and provide jobs for people; we could ensure that the future of the next generation was provided for.

Not one Liberal-Country Party Government, not one Liberal-Country Party Opposition, has ever urged replacement of a parliamentary democratic system by any other, and I emphasise that to honourable members this afternoon. The Liberal-National Country Parties stand for the preservation of the parliamentary democratic system, the preservation of the Constitution that protects us from the demagogues and the would-be dictators who wish to be entrenched without check or accountability in Canberra.

The Parliament in Canberra consists of the Governor-General, the Senate, which is a representative House elected by the people of each State, and an elected House of Representatives. The Australian Constitution provides for the preservation of State Governments with sovereign powers. In fact, it enables the Treasurer of this State to stand up in this Chamber, as I am doing this afternoon, and indicate to the people of Queensland the basis on which funds will be provided and spent in the period ahead. It is the basis of democracy as we know it.

State Governments then determine which powers of a local nature shall rest with local authorities also elected by the people. Local governments are not under a dictatorship. They work in close association with the State Government under the present democratic system.

This is the system of parliamentary democracy in which we believe. This is the Australian Constitution in which I believe and in which every true Australian must believe. This is the system that will preserve us and protect us from the whims of the petty dictators who wish to run the lives of all Australians and control their destinies from the impersonal marble halls of distant Canberra. As one who has been there on many occasions, I know just what can be done in those marble halls.

What will be the future of State Governments and the people who live in the States more distant from Canberra during the next three years if our democratic way of life is destroyed on 13 December?

For a start, it has been the clearly stated intention of Mr. Whitlam to get rid of the Governor-General if he is returned. He will scream from the house-tops that he has a mandate to do so if the people are foolish enough to give him power after 13 December.

He has said he would clip the wings of the Senate, the elected representative House of the States, and he may, by some device, even do away with the Senate if he could sight a majority in that House.

We then would have Mr. Whitlam controlling the House of Representatives, and the world knows just how ruthless his control can be.

We have witnessed what happens to people who fall foul of this hatchet man—Barnard,

Cope, Cairns, Cass, Cameron, Crean and Murphy, all sacked and gone in a period of three years.

In debating and passing this Appropriation Bill, we are operating under a democratic way of life. If Mr. Whitlam were allowed to engage in more blood-letting, who would then become the real tyrant of the Australian Parliament? None other than the mighty Gough, ruling supreme in Parliament, unchecked by a Senate and unafraid of the influences and responsibilities of the Governor-General. We have to beware. Then, of course, he would proceed with his vendetta against the States. That was the purpose of the words I used earlier this afternoon. If Mr. Whitlam gets into power we will not be here this time next year in the same situation as we are today. The States are the other bulwark against his unfettered dictatorial control of the Australian economy and society.

Already in the last three years Mr. Whitlam has moved into many areas of State responsibility and denied the State Government funds to carry out its responsibilities. He has promoted many hare-brained schemes in the area of State responsibilities. He has also promoted very earnestly a principle of regionalism, his concept of regional growth, whereby he wished to establish a region as an arm of government responsible to Canberra for its funds and, indeed, its very existence. He would seek to usurp entirely the main functions of State Governments and local authorities.

If Labor is returned, I can see it all happening within the next three years—within the present term of this State Government. State Government funds will be milked so that the regions, the puppets of the Federal Government, may be strengthened financially. With local authorities then dependent upon the regional funding system for their very existence, the States would fade away as political forces. Local authorities, too, would fade away as political forces.

A one-man Federal Government controlled by a man named Whitlam would administer the regional puppets. The regions would be compelled to dance to the Whitlam tune because they would be entirely dependent on cheques from Canberra for survival. To a degree we have already seen some evidence of this in the Hayden Budget.

I am not going to refer to that wretched document in any detail, but I would point to the lopping of funds for urban transit, the abolition of funds for projects such as the Monduran Dam at Bundaberg and the Julius Dam at Mt. Isa. The availability of funds for such capital works as schools and other educational facilities got the same treatment from the Hayden Budget. They were the warning signs. They were the indications of future life conditions in the States under the Whitlam crew. I say again that, if the real issues of this election are considered quietly and seriously by the electorate

at large, it will realise that Labor must never be allowed to resume its chaotic regime. If it is, Queensland will be sorely treated.

On the score of the fate of the parliamentary democratic system and the Australian Constitution alone, the Whitlam gang deserves to wither in the political wilderness. We are living at a time when this State, given the opportunity, can return to the prosperity that we enjoyed until about three years ago.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.1 p.m.): I can recall quite vividly that, on the previous occasions when the Treasurer brought down the second Appropriation Bill, I referred generally in my speech to the political situation in Australia and that in his reply the Treasurer castigated me and claimed that I should have restricted my comments to the finances of the State.

It is pleasing to note that at long last the Treasurer has learned that the finances of Queensland are tied to those of the Commonwealth. I am very happy to debate some of the issues raised by him. Of course, he has the advantage in that he had prepared notes. Nevertheless I will endeavour from memory and from my knowledge of the situation to answer his comments.

The second Appropriation Bill is designed to give the Government sufficient finance to carry it through until the next financial year. As we know, it was the failure of the Senate to debate and pass such a Bill that led to the forthcoming election. As Federal finance plays such a major part in the State Budget, it is appropriate for me to refer to the current financial and political situation as well as to the events that led up to it. In the light of the Treasurer's comments, I shall certainly deal with them in much more detail than I had originally intended. I shall also, of course, answer some of the very wild statements and charges made by the Treasurer. It was to be expected that he would take this opportunity to have a lash politically, because I think everyone would agree that up till this point in time he has been completely overshadowed by the Premier.

Mr. Hinze: That's nasty.

Mr. HOUSTON: No it's not; it's the truth—and the Treasurer knows that in reference to him I try to stick very closely to the truth. The fact is that, when the caretaker, temporary Prime Minister wished to discuss a new tax formula, he did not invite the Treasurer to Melbourne to discuss it with him. As we know, he invited the Premier instead, and by so doing insulted both the Treasurer and the State of Queensland. Although the Premier would like to be Treasurer also, he has neither the chance nor the capacity to hold that portfolio.

Before analysing the financial attitudes of both the major political parties and their effect on Queensland's Budget, I record some of the events that led up to the forthcoming election.

We know that the Liberal and National Parties never really got over the shock of their defeat in the 1972 House of Representatives election. I recall that, when we were debating the second Appropriation Bill prior to that election, heated comments were made by Government members to the effect that Mr. McMahon could not possibly be beaten. It is recorded that the member for South Coast, the present Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, offered 3/1 that Labor could not win. I am glad that he is in the House. It was just as well that his offer was made in the House and that none of us wanted to convert this place into a gambling establishment. If we had, many of us would have won thousands of dollars from him—not that he could not afford to pay it; he certainly could. But it shows how ridiculous the situation was. Naturally, there was a tremendous reaction when the final figures went up and the coalition parties lost the House of Representatives, where the Labor Party had a majority of nine.

But they were not satisfied with that. They used the democratic processes to try to force a Federal election. They were successful in 1974 in forcing one. In the meantime they interfered with the financial stability of our nation. It was that attitude of theirs—the frustration that was created in the minds of those who were given the right to govern and the constant knocking back of legislation for no other reason than some hope of political gain—that brought about the 1974 double dissolution of Parliament.

I believe everyone hoped that that election would clear the air. However, it did not. The result was a return of Labor in the House of Representatives and a Senate in which neither of the major forces had a majority. It is true that an Independent from Tasmania and another senator from Tasmania decided to join with the coalition parties when votes were taken; but still, neither of the major groups had a majority in the Upper House.

However, the coalition parties were able to stall legislation again; so the political crisis that was established deliberately by the Opposition at that time was not solved by the 1974 election. As we know, those who supported the sacking of McMahon and Gorton were not happy with Snedden, so they finally got rid of him and Fraser became leader of the Liberal Party. His earlier statements were to the effect that he would not use the Senate; that he would not use other than the normal constitutional means to become a Government. Of course, as time went on we found that he was prepared to use any means at all, and the tactics were built up. I believe that his public statements were completely contrary to his private actions. Publicly he was saying, "I will do nothing to interfere with the smooth running of the Parliament and the smooth development of our nation."; but it is now shown that every action he took was directed towards this election.

Not having the numbers in the Lower House, he could not do anything about it there; but the position was different in the Upper House. Finally, the tragic and untimely death of Senator Milliner in the State of Queensland gave the National Party the opportunity to give the anti-Labor forces in Canberra a boost in numbers. It is to the credit of some people in this House that they saw fit to support the return of a Labor member. I say to those who did that that I believe they did the right thing and I believe that history will show that they were the wise men of the present State Government.

Mr. Doumaay: 13 December will tell.

Mr. HOUSTON: 13 December will only be an event that is part of a major situation. By electing Mr. Field in place of Senator Milliner, the Government parties have created a precedent that will not stop at the election on 13 December. Anyone who thinks that that action will be forgotten at any time in the future by a Labor Government within this nation is not looking reality in the face.

The point is that this Government saw fit to deny the Labor Party in the Senate that extra Labor vote, which made the critical difference. On one vital occasion the vote in the Senate was equal. But for the death of Senator Milliner the result would have been different.

In my view the refusal of the Senate to debate or to look at the Budget or even to admit that the Budget had been passed in the Lower House did go a long way towards creating financial problems for many people in our nation. France, with constantly changing Government and with splinter parties having the balance of power, had unstable Government for many years. In Australia the seeds of unstable Government have been sown and I am sure that nobody wants that.

I have no doubt that this policy of frustration did reflect on the life of every person, whether he was in business or not. Business confidence was lost in many fields and the failure to adopt the Budget interfered with the financial recovery of our nation, which was on the way to financial recovery. It was this factor that caused Mr. Fraser and those who supported him to make the move when they did to have the Budget finally rejected. When the Budget went to the Senate, it was not in fact rejected by the Senate, nor was any part of it.

Let me now come to 11 November 1975. Up till this year that date was observed as Remembrance Day, in memory of those who sacrificed their lives in the First World War. It will now have a dual memory. It will be remembered as the day when the Government was sacked—when the Governor-General saw fit to remove Mr. Whitlam's commission.

Whether that action was constitutionally right or not, I do not know. I am not a lawyer. Whether Mr. Fraser knew of the Governor-General's intention or not, I do not know. But I should record some of the opinions that were expressed by people who, according to themselves, knew something of the situation. The Australian National University law professor, Professor Geoffrey Sawer, who is a leading constitutional lawyer or expert, said—

"It was improper of the Governor-General (Sir John Kerr) to ask the Chief Justice (Sir Garfield Barwick) for legal advice on whether to sack the Whitlam Government.

"... it was unwise of the Chief Justice to respond to the request."

"The Courier-Mail" reported—

"More than 150 Australian political scientists yesterday issued an open letter claiming the Governor-General (Sir John Kerr) was wrong in dismissing the Whitlam Government.

"Sir John acted wrongly in making a political judgment when he said that a half-Senate election would not resolve the deadlock. It may well have, but in either case, it is not his role to make a judgment on such a matter.

"His solution of a double dissolution does not guarantee a resolution of the conflict. The present crisis arose out of just such an election."

That is their opinion and I must endorse it.

As I said, in 1974 we had a double dissolution of the Federal Parliament with the idea, it was claimed, of bringing back stability. There is no guarantee—and the Governor-General could not guarantee; nor should he guarantee; nor would he know—

Mr. Porter: How could he guarantee it?

Mr. HOUSTON: He could not even surmise. When a Prime Minister is sacked, surely the decision should be based on more than supposition. There is no guarantee that after this election the state of the parties will be any different.

We also know that Mr. Whitlam offered, and asked for, a half-Senate election, which in itself could have broken the deadlock. The election date would have been the same but the counting of votes would have been much quicker and the composition of the new Senate would have been known much sooner. It is possible that a half-Senate election could have resolved the deadlock. With the new senators from Canberra and the Northern Territory—

Mr. Porter: Whitlam never asked for a half-Senate election.

Mr. HOUSTON: He did.

Mr. Porter: Tell me when it was announced.

Mr. HOUSTON: It was prior to the announcement made by the Governor-General of his action. If the honourable member wants to debate this matter, he can do so.

Mr. Porter: I will, but you are telling untruths.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is completely wrong. I am not telling untruths. The honourable member for Toowong would be the champion in making wild statements that are not backed by facts. I shall be very interested to hear his contribution. I dare say that if he makes a speech, it will be based on the speeches of others. I have yet to hear him make an original speech on any subject.

I believe that the Governor-General knew that Mr. Whitlam had intended to call on him to advise a half-Senate election. It had already been announced publicly, so I see no reason why the Governor-General would not have known of it the same as everyone else. Let us see what was contained in the news media on that day. The first edition of the "Telegraph" contained the information that there was to be a half-Senate election, and the date was given. It was later that the news was received that the Governor-General had sacked Mr. Whitlam.

Let us also consider some of the statements made in "Nation Review".

Mr. Lane: Is that your great authority?

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not an authority. I am referring to material that has been published so that all matters can be seen in correct sequence. This is part of the statement made by the correspondent Mungo MacCallum—

"This week, in spite of a lifelong distrust of conspiracy theories of politics, I am not so certain. Kerr, through his official secretary David Smith, has denied any sort of a deal between himself and Fraser, has denied telling anyone of his decision before he gave it to Whitlam and has claimed that he arrived on it by himself and in particular without the help and advice of the present chief justice and former Liberal attorney general, Sir Garfield Barwick. And one must, of course, accept at least the letter of the viceroy's denial."

That is what he said, and there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Governor-General in making that statement. This reporter then went on to say—

"But there are certain facts which we know.

We know for instance that in the middle of last week the Liberal organisation suddenly booked around one million dollars worth of advertising space for the next four weeks."

Has that been denied? There has been no denial of it by the Liberal Party. Mungo MacCallum went on—

"We know that when Whitlam went to government house at midday on Tuesday to advise Kerr to call a half senate election Malcolm Fraser had already arrived ten minutes earlier, and that his driver had been told to park his car out of sight, with the result that Whitlam was unaware of Fraser's presence when he came to keep his appointment."

He continued—

"We know that earlier that morning after Whitlam told Fraser that if supply was not passed he would call a half senate election, Fraser refused to communicate this to his party meeting but instead told them to trust him and that things would come right later that day."

Mr. Byrne: Was Mungo in there, too?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, but this has not been denied. I wait eagerly for someone in authority to deny these things.

MacCallum continued—

"We know that as long as two weeks ago, members of the opposition with no legal training whatsoever were confidently predicting that Kerr would sack Whitlam, against the conventional wisdom of most lawyers and political observers.

"We know that when Whitlam did see Kerr, Kerr (without waiting for Whitlam's advice on the half senate election) instantly asked him whether he was prepared to hold a general election; and when a rather surprised Whitlam said no, Kerr dismissed him without warning thereby denying Whitlam (and giving Fraser) the incalculable advantage of campaigning as incumbent prime minister.

"We know that at least as early as Saturday night sir John Kerr's wife told at least two people that her husband planned to sack Whitlam on tuesday.

"We know that some senior opposition members have since claimed that they knew as early as 11 a.m.—an hour before Whitlam saw Kerr—that Kerr would sack Whitlam that day."

He went on—

"These are not matters of argument or conjecture: they are facts."

I am not saying that they are facts, but I do say that statements like that published in a newspaper should be answered officially.

Mr. Lowes interjected:

Mr. HOUSTON: Government members quote from other newspapers. They quote them from one newspaper after another, but that is quite all right. They not only quote them; they claim that what they are quoting is right. I am not claiming that this is right; all I am saying is that these things have been published and I have not seen denials. Honourable members opposite can

rise and deny them if they want to. As we are going to have this election, let it be based on fact. As the Treasurer said, "Let the people think about it." All I am saying is: let us know all the facts, all the conjecture, all the superstitions and all the things that are being said by people who claim to be responsible. Let us put them all together and have a look at them. Let us deny the things that are untrue and clear the decks of them and let us fight the elections on factual matters.

Let us go further. The Governor-General sacked Mr. Whitlam and asked Mr. Fraser to form a Government and guarantee Supply. He did not need to guarantee Supply; the House of Representatives had already passed it. Do not forget that Fraser and his team wanted to vote against Supply in the House of Representatives, yet they turned around and supported it in the Senate. But they did not debate the Budget. They could have, because all the Governor-General said was that Fraser had to guarantee Supply, but they did not do that at all; they passed it without debate. They thought that was all they needed to hold an election. We know that the House of Representatives was still in session at that time. The Governor-General had not dissolved Parliament. At that stage the Governor-General still had Fraser as Prime Minister and the House of Representatives passed a vote of no confidence in him.

Mr. Ahern: Never even gave him a chance to speak.

Mr. HOUSTON: It would not have made any difference, because he had already spoken. Just as we see here, Ministers seem to have many chances to speak on an issue. But in this case Fraser was defeated in the House of Representatives prior to the Governor-General's dissolving Parliament and declaring that an election should be held. It would be interesting to know why the Speaker of the House of Representatives was not given the opportunity to relay the message of no confidence, because, after all, it would have made this difference: it would not have stopped the election, but it would have meant that the caretaker Prime Minister would have been Mr. Whitlam and not Mr. Fraser. If the system that has been put into effect is carried on, it will mean that the Prime Minister could as of right come from the Senate. If the Senate and the House of Representatives have exactly the same power, why could this not be so? Why was it necessary for the then Senator Gorton to resign from the Senate in order to be elected to the House of Representatives so that he could become Prime Minister?

Mr. Porter: Read the Constitution and you will know why things are done in a certain way.

Mr. HOUSTON: Don't tell me it's in the Constitution. The Constitution has already been bent and twisted enough. We have

always understood that the House of Representatives was the main House in the Parliament; but it is not the main House any more. The Senate is the major House because it now has the power to veto. It not only has the power of veto; it has the power to determine when elections shall be held.

Mr. Porter: Nothing has changed.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, it has. On many occasions over the years the party with a majority in the House of Representatives has been different from the party with a majority in the Senate, and everyone has accepted that that would not mean the constant calling of elections.

However, an election is now to be held. As the Treasurer told people how to vote, let me refer to some of the issues in the election. One of the main issues is the constitutional power of the Senate to bring about the downfall of a Government. It should be remembered that, because of the method of electing the Senate, no major party has a very great majority in that House. In some cases, because of the presence of splinter groups, neither major group of parties has a majority in the Senate. The situation could arise that, after a Federal election, the House of Representatives is controlled by one party and the Senate by the same party by a majority of one. If one senator died, a State Government opposed to the party in control of the House of Representatives could give full play to its constitutional rights. There could be another example of the Field case.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Talk about giving us a choice! What choice was this House given by the Premier? He submitted the name of only one man. What choice was the House given when Senator Bonner was elected?

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Only one. I received a copy of the letter in which the Premier asked Sir Gordon Chalk to nominate a name. Only one nomination was made in the House, and Senator Bonner was elected. No other names were submitted. That had been the practice in every other Parliament in Australia over the years until New South Wales departed from it. At least New South Wales justified its replacement of a man who was transferred to another position, but a Senator representing this State died.

I say to the people of Australia that the system is in jeopardy now that that principle has been established. It means that the Senate is the dominant House. It means that the House of Representatives could be controlled by one political party and, right in the middle of its programme, there could be a change of political philosophy in the Upper House. That could mean elections every six months.

The other issue is the economy. Anti-Labor forces have said that the economy is bad and getting worse. Looking at honourable members opposite, I do not think that any of them are starving. Looking at some of the people who are associated with them, I do not think they are starving, either. Although they say that the economy is bad, they do not back any of their statements with evidence. Many of the statements made by them are contradictory. One of their leading speakers tells the people one thing; another tells the people something else.

One of the great tragedies is that since December 1972 the State Parliament of Queensland has been used continuously and increasingly to attack the Federal Government. As a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I strongly supported the introduction of questions without notice in this Chamber because I believed that it would be in the best interests of the State for members to be able to ask pertinent questions without notice. However, advantage has been taken of that and now questions without notice are constantly used for the purpose of launching attacks. Ministers often are fully aware of questions they will be asked without notice and come into the House with a prepared statement. In most instances such answers are not factual. Exaggerations are commonplace in Ministers' replies to those types of political questions.

Mr. Frawley: Why don't you tell the truth?

Mr. HOUSTON: I always tell the truth. The honourable member's trouble is that he does not recognise it when he hears it because he is so used to telling untruths.

Strikes have been used as an argument against the Federal A.L.P. Government. We know that the major strikes in this State have not been in any way connected with the activities of the previous Federal Government. We know that the coal strike—the biggest strike in recent times—was the result of the Coal Board's failure to deal quickly with the log of claims from the miners. When the miners finally got to the Coal Board, they were given the majority of the things they went on strike for. We know that the strike at the breweries was over a matter completely outside the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government. It was the result of an attempt by the breweries to change the award under which their employees worked—a change that meant a loss of conditions to them. The State Government had the power to do something to get the matter settled, but it failed to exercise that power. A lot of people were affected by the strike at Provincial Traders. That strike was allowed to continue a lot longer than it should have. In each case the State Government sat back and said, "Let's blame the Federal Government for it."

In its propaganda the State Government says that business people have lost confidence. I believe that the confidence of

business is reflected in the share market. Honourable members opposite have said that a thousand times. Let us look at the share market.

Mr. Gygar: It went up like a rocket when Gough was sacked.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is the wild type of statement honourable members opposite make without knowing anything about it. I admit there was jubilation among stockbrokers. After all, they are like bookmakers. Actually they are worse than bookmakers in their desire to handle money. The bookmaker at the racecourse offers odds and a person pleases himself whether he accepts them. The stockbroker wants people to trade, and he takes his rake-off. He can't lose. At least the bookmaker bets his money against the judgment and money of the punter. The stockbroker likes to trade because he gets commission. He does not want absolute stability; he wants movement in shares. He likes people who are prepared to gamble on the stock-market.

Let me make it very clear that I have great admiration for those who invest money in new enterprises. They are the real people I would be prepared to help and support in every way possible. I admire those who are prepared to put their money in original ventures. Their money creates the industry; their money creates jobs. They are different from those who buy and sell shares in established industries and those who wait until a venture is successful before buying shares in it in the hope that the industry booms and they can sell them at a profit. If that is the way they want it, they can do it. I have no objection at all. In the main they are gambling on getting more for their stock when they sell it, or that profits will rise so that they will get bigger dividends. Of course, the professionals rely on the suckers, who think that they can get rich quick.

Mr. Frawley: How much did you get out of it?

Mr. HOUSTON: I don't go in for it; I took the honourable member's advice a long time ago.

I want to read now from the "Finance News" from the Transport Journal of Australia of October 1975, in which reference is made to the share market over the months of September and October. In all instances the prices quoted are buying prices. I remind the House that the period referred to is one when the Whitlam Government was still in power; Mr. Whitlam had not at that time been sacked.

This is the position: A.W.A. 50c stock rose by 21 per cent from 97c to \$1.18; Ampol 50c stock rose by 20 per cent from 40c to 48c; Ansett 50c shares went up 30 per cent from 63c to 82c; Bell Bros. 50c shares rose from 88c to \$1.10; Clyde 50c shares rose from 92c to \$1.15; Dunlop \$1 shares went up 27 per cent from 71c to 90c; and so it goes on.

All this occurred within one month. Other shares that rose were those of Eagers, Email, Grace Bros, Mayne Nickless, Olympic, Repco, H. C. Sleigh, Thiess and York Motors.

Government members suggest that the share market is the criterion. I repeat: from September to October the share market rose, therefore indicating that the economy of the nation was improving and, but for the action of the Senate, would have improved to a substantial degree.

The anti-Labor forces claim that the cost of living is increasing. No-one denies that. But what is the cost of living based on? It is based on prices. Prices are not in the hands of the Government; rather are they in the hands of the traders. The Liberal and National Parties opposed the referendum over price and wage control. They campaigned vigorously against it, saying, "Don't give power to Canberra. If you vote 'Yes' you will be giving power to Canberra." By their vote the people did not give that power to Canberra; so it must remain with the States. The Liberal and National Parties have accepted the defeat of the Federal Labor Government's proposals in the referendum, but they will not accept the result of that defeat.

Although wages are controlled by indexation, prices continue to rise. As I have said, the cost of living is based on prices of certain commodities. Prices are determined by supply and demand. There are, of course, efforts made by certain persons to get rich quickly, but I am rejecting those for the moment and dealing with normal supply and demand.

Last month Brisbane food prices rose by 1.6 per cent compared with the average rise in State capitals of 1.3 per cent. The food lines on which prices rose were beef, potatoes, onions, milk and eggs—all primary products. Would anyone say that it is wrong for their prices to increase? Perhaps not. But Government members cannot have it both ways; they cannot on the one hand support increases in prices of primary products and, on the other, complain about the rise in the cost of living. Yet that is what they are trying to do. What they want to do is give the primary producer a higher income without raising the cost of living. Certainly many sections of primary production have been depressed—but only because the markets were not there.

Government Members: What rot!

Mr. HOUSTON: Are Government members trying to tell me that there has been a buoyant beef market? I have heard them complaining time and time again about the beef market. There has not been a buoyant beef market.

Mr. Byrne: The export levy helped a lot, didn't it?

Mr. HOUSTON: It wasn't the export levy that interfered with the amount of beef that was taken by Japan or the amount of beef that was taken by America. That had nothing at all to do with it.

Primary producers cried about wanting increased prices. Now they have it—and, of course, Government members are crying about it. They want it both ways. We do not deny that these people should get an increase for their products once the demand has grown.

There have been increases in the prices of other things, such as manufactured goods. That is entirely in the hands—

Mr. Byrne: Telephone charges.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, they went up, but so did other things go up under other Governments. The status quo has not been kept over the years. Increases have been imposed by other Governments, but Government members want to forget about that. They want to forget that postage rose under their Government, that taxation rose under their Government, that the price of petrol rose under their Government and that many other imposts were introduced by their Government. They want to forget the 1961 credit squeeze. They want to forget the 1967 credit squeeze. But don't forget that the Hayden Budget was eventually passed without debate and without contradiction in the Senate!

Fraser claims that small businesses are closing. I have heard Government members here claiming that small businesses are going bankrupt. They are—and there are many reasons for it. One is competition—and there is some unfair competition by some of the major stores. The Government parties foster them. They will do anything at all to foster the big man. They don't care a damn about the little one, despite the words of sympathy they mouth for him. Some small businesses are undercapitalised. Some of them are mismanaged. Some of them are not giving service to the public. I know of one business that went broke because it was not giving service to the public. It lost its good name and respectability, and the people would not go to it.

I invite Government members to look at the document I am holding up, an advertisement inserted in the Press by the Registrar of the Small Claims Tribunal. Are they going to deny the accuracy of that? Do they think people who look at those names will not think twice before they go to those firms? When the legislation was introduced into the House, one of the things that was said about the Small Claims Tribunal was that such information would be published to make traders worry about their names being made public. I do not agree that the name of a company should be made public when a case against it is dismissed—in other words, not proved. I would be quite happy if the names of those firms were not published.

In that one advertisement, 31 businesses were successfully proceeded against in the Small Claims Tribunal for various reasons

—mainly workmanship. I am excluding those who were proceeded against for not refunding bonds and that type of thing.

Mr. Porter: How many were not?

Mr. HOUSTON: There could be quite a few who were not.

Mr. Porter: Are you trying to prove that all business is bad?

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not trying to prove that.

Mr. Porter: What is your point?

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member for Toowong would not see the point. He is not capable of seeing the point.

The point I am making is that in one month 31 businesses through their own actions could lose the public's confidence. If a business loses public confidence, it will go broke. The point I make is that some small businesses—and this advertisement deals basically with them—would go broke because they were not capable of doing the job. They all add up. They all make up this large number. But Government members try to make out that small businesses go broke because of the Federal Government. I am pointing out that many businesses go broke because they cannot do the job that they set out to do. I do agree with the honourable member for Toowong that, although 31 companies are mentioned, another 131 could have a bad reputation through lack of ability to do the job. They would get bad publicity by word of mouth.

Some big businesses, too, go broke. In Queensland big businesses have gone broke and thrown hundreds of men out of work. Their collapse has been due to various circumstances. I do not intend to go into them all here. The point is that they have gone broke—in some cases because they over-contracted; in others, through bad management. They went broke not because of the Federal Government, but as a result of their own activities.

One southern car manufacturer had trouble, and it affected Queensland. The reason was that the public did not want the vehicle it was producing. According to the motoring writers, the product was not favourable and therefore the public steered clear of it. When these things happen, it is completely ridiculous to start blaming the Federal Government. It shows the low depths to which some people will go in trying to gain political capital out of a situation.

In Queensland there has been great development of supermarkets. These complexes have a multitude of trading activities. Naturally they must affect what we used to know as the corner shop—the small fellow—that operated in isolation from others. When these new complexes are opened up, it is not the existing fellow who moves back in, but a new one, and this interferes with the old established businesses. These are normal

business risks. But trying to claim that it is only the action of the Federal Government that caused this is wrong.

Certainly rises in taxation have an effect. No-one denies that. Certain increased charges have to be made. This Parliament has been passing Bills recently that will increase taxation. The State Treasurer has justified the increases. At the moment a Bill to increase stamp duty, in some cases by 300 per cent, is before the Parliament. When the Treasurer introduced the Bill, he tried to justify the increases. I will not go into that debate. But every increase in charges or taxes has an adverse effect on some people.

Many claims have been made about jobs for the boys, but the coalition parties should not forget their own actions.

Mr. Lindsay: What about young Whitlam?

Mr. HOUSTON: What about young Whitlam? Young Whitlam is going into Federal Parliament. Let there be no doubt about that. He won selection and he will go into Federal Parliament.

But let me outline some of the actions of the coalition parties which put men not into Parliament, but out of it. Let me start right at the top with the Governor-General. I think his name was Hasluck. He was appointed Governor-General of this nation by a Liberal Government. I wonder why he was appointed. A serving politician was promoted to the position of Governor-General and Government members talk about jobs for the boys! What about Mr. Freeth, the Western Australian, when he was beaten in a poll? What did the Liberal Government do? It sent him to Japan as Ambassador. It wanted to get rid of Dame Annabelle Rankin, so she was promoted to the position of Ambassador to New Zealand.

Mr. Porter: What a lot of rubbish!

Mr. HOUSTON: It is rubbish when the coalition parties do it, but not when the Labor Government does it.

An Opposition Member: What about Kevin Cairns?

Mr. HOUSTON: When Kevin Cairns was defeated, he was given a job here. When Vince Gair was defeated, he was given a job here, but Government members cried when we gave him one. This is the type of double standard that this Government wants.

Mr. Porter: We gave Colston back his job.

Mr. HOUSTON: Dr. Colston was entitled to his job just as any other person who stands for Parliament is entitled to return to his position. It is well known that the Government arranged for dummy questions to be asked to let Dr. Colston know that his job is threatened if he is not elected. But he will make it; he will be fourth of the six A.L.P. senators elected.

Sir Garfield Barwick was a politician who was appointed to the High Court. Apparently it is quite all right when the Liberal and National Parties do these things. In this State Dr. Delamothe's seat was eliminated in a redistribution. So what did the Government do about that? They sent him to Britain as Agent-General for the State. As soon as he resigned—unfortunately he died shortly after—another Minister, Wally Rae, was sent to London as Agent-General. If it is good enough for the Liberal and National Parties to do this sort of thing, why should they complain when someone else does it?

Sir Gordon Chalk: You wouldn't mind if I went?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, I would welcome it. I would not even call it "jobs for the boys"; I would say that it was a man's job. The Treasurer cops a lot from his colleagues and he is still able to take it.

Mr. Moore: Are you giving him the kiss of death?

Mr. HOUSTON: No. The honourable member for Windsor has been trying to stab him for years so my little bit won't hurt him.

Many people in this State have been given jobs on various boards and other controlling organisations. I do not intend to mention names, because I see no point in doing that. The fact is, however, that many who have been given such appointments are ardent supporters of the National and Liberal Parties. When they were appointed to their positions, they were active supporters of those parties, and in some cases they were named later as possible National and Liberal Party candidates.

We all know, of course, that "jobs for the boys" will continue, and personally I do not see anything wrong with a person who has had considerable experience in Parliament accepting a job in the Public Service or other similar organisation.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Don't worry about me. When I retire, it will be real retirement. Let us not have two standards. Let there be an end to the contention that it is right when the Liberal and National Parties do it and wrong when Labor does it. It has to be one or the other.

Mr. Lindsay: Young Whitlam is going into Parliament. There is a difference.

Mr. HOUSTON: He still has to be elected—and he will be.

Mr. Lindsay: It's a red-ribbon seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. HOUSTON: I now propose to refer to some other things that have been happening. I refer to the political advertising being carried on in this State. This year

over \$1,300,000 was spent on what I believe to be political advertising. I know that the Premier will say that some was Railway Department advertising and some was the advertising of industrial development. It will be noted that at about the time of the last State election and now, with a Federal election approaching, there have been large increases in the amount spent in this way. I venture to say that, under the present policy of the State Government, over \$2,000,000 will be spent this year on advertising of that type. This means that public money is being used for propaganda purposes by a political party. That is completely wrong.

Occasionally something appears that one knows in one's own heart is illegal but it has something about it from which it could be argued that it furthers the interests of a Government department. No-one can argue against that type of advertising. Look at what goes out under the photograph of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, supposedly to keep the public informed of the laws of the land. I have one here from the 23 November issue of the "Sunday Mail". It is all about stocks and shares.

Mr. Ahern: Mr. Wright supported that.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not arguing against it. That can be classified as being in the public interest, but I see no reason why the photograph of the Minister for Justice should appear in it. There is a difference between something put out in the public interest and something tied up with a political figure. We all know that in political advertising photographs are used. I have one here which carries the sentence, "Authorised by the Premier". That is nothing but blatant propaganda at public expense. I have another, a bigger one, which is again nothing but blatant propaganda. And worse still it embodied the photograph and name of a man who denies he gave authority for it. Mr. Hamer has denied in the Press that he gave the Premier the right to do what he did.

Let me come to what I believe is another very serious matter associated with the operation of our Parliament. In the Federal Parliament, when a member asks a question of a Minister, he receives an answer, and one can take it that it is an answer associated with the question. Let us look at what the Premier said in answer to a question that was asked here by the honourable member for Nudgee.

Mr. Ahern: Read it closely.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will. He asked—

"(1) Was the advertisement in 'The Courier-Mail' of 19 November which carried the words 'inserted by the Queensland Government as a public service' charged to his department and, if so, to what vote?"

"(2) What was the cost of the advertisement?"

"(3) Were advertisements placed in other Queensland newspapers and, if so, what was the cost and the name of each newspaper?"

They were three very clear questions asked by a member of this House and I believe they should have received an appropriate answer because, after all, this is not or should not be a secret society. It is public money that is being spent. The Premier did not deny it. In his answer he said—

"If the honourable member had read the advertisement, he would have seen that it carried a warning to every Queensland, and indeed to every Australian, that our parliamentary system and free way of life were in danger. It is quite clear to me that no price can be too great if democracy is to be saved and the tragedy of the return of the Whitlam Government averted. This message in the Press was one small way by which I have sought to warn the electors of the dangers of a socialistic regime. I believe that the people of this State will demonstrate, as they did at the last State and Federal elections, their confidence in the type of policies that my Government and I present. I can only hope that the honourable member, too, will heed the warning."

The point is that the Premier did not answer the question. I know that Standing Orders do not allow you, Mr. Speaker, to interfere, but I believe our Standing Orders should be altered to allow the Speaker to demand that at least questions of that type, straightforward questions, are answered.

The Premier or his officers must know how much those advertisements cost and in which newspapers they were inserted. These matters should be made public. If not, what is to stop the Premier going out and doing other things in the future? It is to the credit of the honourable member for Everton that he asked a question on this subject. He has the right to do it. These are matters of public importance. I believe that if the same thing happened in the Federal Parliament, honourable members opposite would be up in arms yelling and screaming, but they are silent now. Of course, they agreed to this use of public money. It is a use of public money that is unwarranted and unjustifiable.

It is only the Premier's opinion that the Federal Labor Government was a bad Government. My knowledge of May's "Parliamentary Practice" leads me to believe that opinions are not acceptable in answers to questions. The Premier said that he had done it in the interests of the State. He did not do it in the interests of the State; he did it in the interests of the National Party. I object strongly to such a blatant misuse of public moneys. When things such as that occur, people are moved to take action. The misuse of public moneys has brought down nations, and I believe that the Premier was completely wrong in using public moneys as he did.

In the advertisement, the Premier referred to freedom. I am pleased that the Minister for Police is in the House. I ask: What freedom do we really have in this State? Ask any woman to walk the streets of Brisbane alone at night and she will say. "I will not. I am frightened." In earlier years, police foot patrols operated in this city. When I was young, one could walk the streets of Brisbane, either alone or in company, from one end to the other without being molested. One would find policemen on virtually every corner. Nowadays people cannot walk the streets in safety.

There have been so many changes in Police Force policy that I wonder whether any senior officer knows exactly what the policy is today. In my opinion, foot patrols by police must be reintroduced. I believe that the basic freedom is the freedom to go where one wants to go as long as one does not interfere with the welfare of anyone else. A Country-Liberal Government closed suburban police stations. Even in suburban areas today a person cannot move from one point to another with complete confidence that no-one will interfere with him.

The Minister for Police expressed some concern about the situation but did not do anything about it. He suggested the appointment of special policemen. What a lot of nonsense! Police work today requires a very professional approach, and the young men and women who are trained at police training establishments are well qualified and very capable members of the Police Force. How could the Minister seriously suggest that people could carry out their job part-time?

Laws apply in Queensland that do not apply in other States. For example, adults in Queensland are not allowed to view films that may be viewed by adults in New South Wales.

One sees in advertisements that Mr. Fraser is going to bring stability to the economy. He does not give us any indication how he is going to do that. He announced a policy some time ago when the Constitutional Convention was taking place. I remind honourable members that that meeting was boycotted by the Liberal and National Parties in some States, while other attended. The representatives of those parties in the Queensland Parliament and the Federal Parliament did not attend. On that very same day, when important decisions were being made and debated, the Premier of Queensland—not the Treasurer—went to discuss that financial policy with Mr. Fraser.

Basically, that policy said that some taxing powers would be returned to the States. Even the Treasurer questioned whether that would be to Queensland's advantage. I am sure that, as he has considered it further, he has come to the conclusion that taxation on that basis would not be to Queensland's advantage. The population of this State is small, and Queensland is one of the States

that rely heavily on over-all taxation in Australia. What would happen, of course, would be that many industries would leave Queensland because they would be in a higher tax bracket than that applying to their competitors in other States. Either that would happen or the ordinary members of the community would have to carry the added burden.

Mr. Fraser talks about cutting down Federal spending. In what way will he cut it down? He doesn't say. I suppose Medibank will get a big cut-back, and that next year this State will not get the \$50,000,000 that it is entitled to get this year.

Mr. Doumany: That was the agreement.

Mr. HOUSTON: Agreements don't mean much to honourable members opposite. They break them at the drop of a hat. They don't even need a real excuse to break an agreement.

During the 1972 election campaign, and again in 1974, we saw great big placards depicting people being stabbed outside hospitals, and Medibank was condemned by one Liberal-National member after another.

Mr. Marginson: Two of them were going to resign.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. But, of course, their hip pocket would have been hurt, and they were not capable of earning a living in the ordinary community, so they decided to carry on. Now the Fraser regime says that it is going to carry on with Medibank.

Mr. Porter: With modifications.

Mr. HOUSTON: Oh, with modifications! We are not even told what they are. They are not even being honest about it.

Mr. Porter: You will hear.

Mr. HOUSTON: I have been waiting for two weeks to hear what the policy is. Last night we heard Mr. Anthony rave and yell before an organised audience, but he still did not say very much. I hope Mr. Fraser comes out and tells us whether he is going to reduce expenditure on Medibank. If expenditure on Medibank is not going to be reduced, is the expenditure on other health services going to be reduced? He can't have it both ways. He cannot come out and say, "I am going to cut down on taxation; I am going to give you people a lot more money in your pockets; I am going to cut down on public spending; but I am not going to stop anything."

Mr. Powell: The Labor Party has been telling us that for years.

Mr. HOUSTON: What the Labor Party said and what the Labor Party was endeavouring to do—

A Government Member: Were two different things.

Mr. HOUSTON: No.

A Government Member: The difference between theory and reality.

Mr. HOUSTON: The difference between theory and reality was that there was a Senate that blocked everything. In 1974 the Senate and the House of Representatives had a joint sitting so that certain Bills could be passed, and the Medibank legislation was one of them. Now Government members are saying that it is all right if the Liberals support Medibank, but it is all wrong when the Labor Party supports it.

Or is the brake going to be put on education? Is that where the Liberals and Nationals are going to cut down on expenditure? Let us be clear about it. Let us be told how all this money is going to be saved and, at the same time, taxation reduced.

Mr. Powell: By stopping waste.

Mr. HOUSTON: Honourable members opposite are talking about millions of dollars. They talk about \$2,000 million. Waste is absolutely nothing compared to the amount of money they are talking about. They can't even point to where waste is occurring.

Let me refer here to social services. It is very clear that National Party members believe that every person who is out of work is a dole bludger. That is what the honourable member for Cunningham said. What a name to apply to persons who cannot get a job. He talks about helping the unemployed, yet he refers to them as dole bludgers. Shame on him! It is suggested that social services will not be affected.

It is said that pensions will be increased in accordance with increases in the cost of living. What a miserable way to do it! Under the Labor Party policy there was to be an increase in pensions in accordance with the average increase in incomes. That is completely different from a cost-of-living adjustment. A bare minimum is being offered to the pensioners, and any pensioner who falls for that has a completely wrong idea of the realities of how much he will receive. Under the Federal A.L.P. Government, pensioners were treated as human beings who were entitled to have a living income. Under the McMahon Government, pensioners were kept back and starved for years. Many of our areas of need are the result of the economic policies implemented during 23 years of mismanagement by the Liberal-Country Parties.

One of the remarkable things about Mr. Fraser is that he has accepted many of the Labor Party's policies as being the correct ones. In the 1972 and 1974 election campaigns, those policies were condemned by the Liberal and National Country Parties, yet now many of them are accepted by those parties. For example, although in 1972 the coalition parties adopted a policy of compulsory military training, they now say they will not reintroduce it; although the coalition parties have condemned the Labor Government's policy of making money available

directly to local authorities, they now say they will give financial assistance to them. The Labor Party's policy was condemned also by the Queensland Treasurer. I do not deny anyone the right to express a point of view. But all that the coalition parties are doing is chopping and changing in an endeavour to cash in on current situations. Local authorities are entitled to receive direct financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Porter: Naturally you would say that; you want to get rid of the States.

Mr. HOUSTON: I don't want to get rid of the States at all. What I want to get rid of is the constant increase in rates. I am sick and tired of seeing people forced off their land and out of their homes by ever-increasing rates brought about by skyrocketing land values. Those Government members who represent silver-tail electorates should go into those containing ordinary working people who have simple yet very comfortable small homes. They find that on their retirement the value of their properties has increased because developers want to acquire nearby blocks for the construction of home units and that therefore their rates have risen sharply. Although the Brisbane City Council is doing all it can to be generous to ratepayers, it is forced by the State Government to maintain rates at a high level. The Government has cut back on the subsidies payable to local authorities. People are forced to sell their homes because they cannot afford to pay the rates assessed on their properties. Money must be made available from the Commonwealth Government direct to local authorities. After all, local authorities are elected by franchise.

I realise that it was the policy of the coalition parties to break up the Greater Brisbane Area. At one time, simply because a taxi driver had suggested that there should be a change in the method of selecting the Lord Mayor, Government members supported a proposal to alter the number of aldermen in the Brisbane City Council and to change the method of election of the Lord Mayor.

Instead of helping local authorities, the coalition parties have cut back on the rate of subsidy payable to them. I have no doubt that the Treasurer will claim that the amount paid by way of subsidies has risen. I am talking, however, not about the amount but about the rate of subsidy made available under 18 years of National-Liberal Party Government. We have reached the stage where it is imperative that the Federal Government assist local authorities.

I do not object to Fraser changing his mind; what I complain about is the fact that he does not know where he is going. Every time he speaks, he announces a different policy. Every day, he says something different.

Dr. Crawford: No way.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course he does. The honourable member does not know what Fraser's policy will be tomorrow. He will change it before then.

Sir Gordon Chalk: I have his speech here for tonight, if you want to look at it.

Mr. HOUSTON: No, I don't want to see his speech. I only have to read the Western Australian papers to see the guts of his speech. The coalition parties are so badly organised in that State that they forgot to withdraw the advertisements from the newspapers when they learned that Fraser would not be able to deliver his policy speech.

The Liberal and National Parties have taken those parts of the Labor Party's policy that they believe are popular and have announced them as their own policies. Policies that were condemned three years ago and again last year in both the Senate and the House of Representatives have now been claimed by the coalition parties as their own. Now the Government parties say, "This is our policy. This is what we believe in." Why can't they be fair dinkum? Why don't they say, "We don't want that. We are only giving it to you to try to buy your vote."?

Let me proceed to talk about the economy. Apparently that is what Mr. Fraser thinks he will be arguing on. As I said, he has to come out and say clearly where he is going to make the cuts in public spending.

Dr. Crawford: The worst unemployment for 40 years! After three years of Labor, we have the worst unemployment that this country has ever seen!

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not denying that, but I am saying—

Dr. Crawford: Through mismanagement.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not. A lot of firms in this State could employ more people but they are not doing so. That is what is happening. There are shortages in many commodities. I invite Government members to see how many commodities wanted by Christmas shoppers are in short supply.

Dr. Crawford: There is no incentive to work under Labor.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course there is. There is plenty of incentive. The honourable member is changing his ground. This is what Government members do. First of all they say there is unemployment. Then, when I point out the shortages of goods, they say that people do not want to work.

According to what the National Country Party leader said last night, the people will be given more money to spend. If the public has more money to spend, there will be a greater demand for the commodities that are available. Won't that cause inflation? Won't that hit it up higher? I can remember when inflation first started, back in the early 1970s. Many economists in the Liberal Party

advocated increased interest rates and increased taxation. That was their theme. Immediately the Labor Party increased the interest rates in an endeavour to cut down on some of the spending, they condemned it. However, they have not suggested a solution.

Let us have a look at some of the yardsticks that the Government itself has used. In 1972 the Treasurer tried to argue that Queensland, out of all the States, was in a great condition. As one of his yardsticks, he used the increase in new motor vehicle registration. He said that was a very good yardstick to show whether or not the State was in a good condition. I said then that I accepted it. What is the position now? In the nine months from January to September in 1973, 39,760 new cars and 6,718 new station wagons were registered in Queensland. In other words, in the first nine months of 1973, 46,478 new motor vehicles were registered. For the first nine months of 1975, 41,289 new cars and 7,801 new station wagons were registered. In other words, 49,090 new vehicles were registered—an increase of more than 2,000 over 1973.

If that is the Treasurer's yardstick, and after all it is the yardstick that he suggested was right to accept at that time, I suggest it is right to accept it now. Let us look at the total number of cars registered over the years. At the end of June 1972 the total was 778,600; in 1973, it had increased to 837,800; in June 1974, 906,600; and in June 1975, 941,300. Surely that shows, by the yardstick that the State Government itself uses, that the conditions in Queensland for the average person are not as bad as Government members try to make out.

I am not saying that the situation is not serious. What I am saying is that it is not due to the Federal Government at all. It is due to many factors. Some are the result of the actions of this Government. The State Government has contributed as much as anybody else to some of our problems. Basically the problems are caused by matters that are outside the control of all Governments. Today, many people could employ more staff, but for various reasons they are not doing so. If they did, the employment position would be greatly improved.

The Treasurer said that Queensland will be better off under a Fraser Government. Let me outline how Queensland fared under the previous Liberal-Country Party Government compared with other States in the way of Commonwealth General Revenue Assistance. The increases between 1971-75 and 1975-76 were—

	Per cent
New South Wales	77
Victoria	102
South Australia	121
Western Australia	112
Tasmania	104
Queensland	138.

Mr. Moore: 138 per cent of what?

Mr. HOUSTON: The amount we received in 1975-76 compared with what we received in 1971-72. That is the first time today that I have had to look at printed notes to supply an answer. For the benefit of the honourable member, I wanted to present accurate figures, because if I did not, he would not understand it.

If by some chance Mr. Fraser becomes Prime Minister, what will be the taxation position in this State? Will he allow or force the State to introduce State taxation?

Mr. Moore: Yes, a little bit of that.

A Government Member: No.

Mr. HOUSTON: Not immediately. I thought I might get a response and I did—from two members. The National Party has one idea. It says, "No". The Liberal Party, which is represented by the honourable member for Windsor says, "Yes". So there is the situation; we do not know what the policy is. But I hope that tonight the caretaker temporary Prime Minister will be well enough to deliver his policy speech so that we will know where we stand. The only guarantee I want from him is that he will not change his policy again next week.

Dr. Crawford: No way.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member can give guarantees, but we have had him. He was the man who was going to resign if Medibank came in, and he is still here. I do not think he is still here for a financial reason. I think the reason is that he was told by his colleagues that, if he resigned, his electorate would come to the Labor Party.

I am interested—and I am sure the people of Queensland are—in knowing how this taxing arrangement will operate. It is all very well to say what is going to happen, but the people are entitled to know.

As I said at the outset, the Hayden proposals were not debated in the Senate when they could have been. There was nothing at all to stop the Senate from sitting for 24 hours to debate those proposals. The Opposition could have rejected any part that it thought was wrong, because it had the numbers. All that the Governor-General asked for was Supply. He did not say that Supply had to be given immediately. He said, "I asked Fraser would he undertake to get Supply through." The Budget was passed and it is now a legal document. I venture to say that it will not be substantially changed because, once it is given an opportunity to work, it will work, and very effectively. I said at the outset that Fraser decided to move quickly because he knew that the Budget, and other actions that the Labor Party had taken, were starting to operate successfully.

My last point concerns the claim that, since Labor took office, mineral exploration has dropped substantially.

Dr. Crawford: There is no mineral exploration at all.

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not know who is telling the true story. A few weeks ago, I and others were in company with people who are associated with one of the major mining industries in this State. They gave us a graph compiled by them which shows the extent of exploration over the years.

Dr. Crawford: Exploration for what?

Mr. HOUSTON: For minerals.

Dr. Crawford: General minerals?

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes. The maximum exploration was in 1970-71, and the cost of it, on 1973-74 values, was about \$44,000,000. In 1971-72 the amount decreased to just over \$25,000,000. It reduced still further in 1972-73. It is true that the figures did not increase under Labor; rather they levelled out. There is no secret about this document. Any member can see it. In fact, most members probably have a copy of it. The fact is that mineral exploration levelled out.

Only a few months ago, Utah announced the discovery of another coal field, and we have just passed a Bill relating to the mining of phosphate rock. Certainly no great announcements have been made, and it is true that the Labor Party called a halt to the unfettered, unrestricted "find, mine and get rid of" attitude of the Liberal and National parties. If our forefathers had adopted the same attitude, we would not have the minerals that we have today.

The Labor Party laid down the guide-lines. Everyone admits that they may have been too tough initially, but a halt was called at that time. The Labor Party then said, "Let us look at the position and see what is doing." It is true that the price of coal increased almost immediately and coal miners started to get something decent from their industry. From that time coal prices have increased. I can remember that, when I argued about the miserable 5c a ton that was then being received in royalties for coal, Opposition members were told that this rate of royalty was set because the companies had to be encouraged to begin operations here. In other words, they could not afford to pay much more in royalties. Yet after the Labor Party negotiated with the companies and laid down firm policy guide-lines, the coal producers received substantial price increases. So successful was this policy that the State Treasurer was able to receive not 5c but \$1 a ton for coal. I can imagine him saying to the coal-mining companies, "It is no good complaining. You can afford to pay." Perhaps some of his plans came a little unstuck when the Federal Government said, "We helped you get more. What about giving us a bit?"

That is a matter for the two Governments to fight over, but the fact is that the Queensland Government has received a lot more out of it and on 25 November 1975 Utah was able to increase—

(Time expired.)

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (5.30 p.m.): The House has paid a rather heavy price for the Opposition agreeing to say "formal" to various Resolutions of Supply because we have just been subjected to an hour and a half of straight, unadulterated, boring political gunk—dreadful stuff. I suppose in a sense, in talking on this Appropriation Bill and listening—

Mr. Marginson interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Wolston to obey the rules of the Chair and refrain from interjecting.

Mr. PORTER: However, we do owe the honourable member a small debt of gratitude, because in making this pathetic attempt to snatch a few crumbs of consolation for his side of politics as we reach this final fortnight of a very vital election campaign, he has opened up the debate to enable us to look at certain issues. He is trying to pretend to this House that literally everything that has happened in the past three years has all been to the good, and if there was anything that was bad it was not the fault of his colleagues in the Federal House, but was due to a strange combination of other circumstances—the peculiar coincidence that all that has happened in the past three years (soaring inflation, tremendous unemployment, business failure, the odd alignment with strange allies) is all to the good and was forced on us by circumstances beyond our control.

He tries to pretend, of course, that there was a 1974 poll when Mr. Whitlam's Government was elected and that now it is being unfairly forced to the polls again by what an Opposition has done in the Senate. I want to remind the honourable gentleman and remind the House precisely what the facts are, because these facts were mentioned by a number of people, certainly by myself, immediately after that Federal election. The fact of the matter is that in 1974 the Labor Government was returned with a paper-thin majority of seats, so paper thin that not even Mr. Whitlam was game to claim a victory for 10 days after the election. In fact, the Government was returned to office with fewer votes and fewer seats, and on exactly the same day that the people voted for the House of Representatives, they voted for the Senate, and in the Senate they deliberately put Mr. Whitlam's crowd in a minority position.

That is the fact, and to suggest that the voters knew what they were doing when they voted Mr. Whitlam into the House of Representatives, and therefore this represents their sole desire, and they did not know what they were doing when they voted a majority against him in the Senate is, of course, a very peculiar attitude for somebody who claims to

be a democrat to take. It is a typical A.L.P. socialist attitude of believing the voters are clever when they vote them in, but that they are damn fools whenever they vote against them, and it is not good enough—

Mr. Moore: They voted against a referendum, too.

Mr. PORTER: They did exactly the same. The honourable member for Windsor is quite correct. In fact, we had a State election only seven months later. The Federal election was held in May 1974 and the State election was held in December 1974, so that if there was any doubt about what the people in this State thought in the Federal election, they said it again in spades doubled and redoubled in the State election when the Labor Party received fewer than one of every three votes that were lodged in the ballot-boxes.

Yet the honourable member for Bulimba has the gall to try to suggest of this House that the attitudes we take, the principles we espouse, the things we stand for are wrong and are out of touch with what people want. He suggests we do not understand certain types of electorates. He gave us a sad little story about people losing their homes and those in the silver-tail electorates not understanding. Let me remind him that as of now, following that State election, we represent more working-class electorates than does his famous Labor Party. People turned to us in droves and will again in a fortnight's time.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. PORTER: Labor will be very lucky to come out of it with a feather to fly with, in my view.

The honourable gentleman, again speaking in a very peculiar way to this Appropriation Bill, tried to pretend that what has led to this vital Federal poll in two weeks' time has been a series of events that threaten democracy. I find this such a perversion of fact as to be almost beyond belief. Does any intelligent person believe that holding an election is a threat to democracy? I should have thought that exactly the reverse was the case.

Of course, he took part in that squalid, stupid, dirty little tale of trying to pretend that the Governor-General of Australia (who was, of course, Mr. Whitlam's nominee) is part of the conspiracy against Labor. This all goes along with the attitude of the Labor Party to try to stop people using their reason, to try to suspend all rational thought, to inflame them, to infuriate them. It is like their use of electronic gear at their rallies—we saw it again today in the City Square—when they began the chanting, the booing and the "We want Gough" with loudspeaker systems. It is all pre-recorded—canned—and fed into the system to try to whip up the faithful and bring them along with it. What a travesty of the democratic processes! Today the mob, whipped up by the electronic gear of this synthetic party, suggested that they would endorse Fred

Daly, the chief chopper and the axer of the last Federal Parliament, to be the next Governor of Queensland.

Mr. Miller: The people of Queensland will have something to say about that.

Mr. PORTER: If the people of this State do not realise that they have been warned—and warned in the plainest terms—they deserve everything that will surely come to them. But I am certain that the people of Queensland have much more intelligence than members of the Opposition are prepared to ascribe to them.

One hears a tremendous amount about principles and conventions and practices when members of the Opposition try to pretend that things are running against them.

Dr. Crawford: Have you heard of Gough's rent-a-crowd?

Mr. PORTER: That may be true, too—the same crowd taken in the same buses from place to place. They certainly have an extremely synthetic look about them these days, and they sound very dispirited when they try to whip up enormous enthusiasm or enormous anger and rage. I would imagine that anybody other than a complete fanatic would regard the whole performance as totally phoney. But we find the Opposition trying to go along with Mr. Whitlam in this extraordinary attempt to induce people to believe that what has happened has been the very opposite of the democratic process, that what has been done is a threat to democracy.

Mr. Whitlam is trying to pretend that it was very dastardly of the Opposition in the Senate to block Supply and thus cause a double dissolution. He used very inflammatory words. The type of inflammatory words and phrases used by him and others have their ultimate and inevitable end in an attempt at violent outrage—the letter bombs. There can be no question about what has led to them.

Dr. Crawford: He has not got a policy.

Mr. PORTER: He has not got a policy. Indeed, all one hears from him now is vituperation and demagogic rhetoric. We have the Prime Minister trying to pretend that, for an Opposition, blocking Supply is terrible, unheard of and a threat to democracy. Yet in 1974 we did not hear anything from him. At the first threat of the blocking of Supply he rushed off to the polls, because he thought then that he was going to win. In 1970 he is recorded in half a dozen places in "Hansard" as saying that he, then in Opposition, would see that Supply was blocked in the Senate. The Labor Party tried to block Supply, and it failed to do so only because it could not get a couple of D.L.P. senators to go along with it.

So I say that what we are getting from the Labor Party and from this dismissed

Prime Minister—this Mr. Whitlam—is a performance that is consistent only in its downright, blatant hypocrisy, and in nothing more. We have a man who pretends a sudden concern for the processes of true democracy. Yet this was the man who refused to advise the Governor-General to have a double dissolution once Supply was cut off. He was prepared to try any devious, roundabout method to conduct Government without having the assent of Parliament to the expenditure of money. If that is not a threat to democracy, I do not know what is. He is a man who is consistent in only one thing. That consistency is to advance the cause of Gough Whitlam. The Labor Party will pay a very high price for that man, a higher price than it paid for the late Dr. Evatt when he was the leader of the Labor Party and led it into shattered pieces.

Mr. Houston: You abused him while he was alive and then cried when the poor man died.

Mr. PORTER: If the honourable gentleman thinks I am accusing the Prime Minister of anything that is unfair, let him or somebody else on his side of the House say so. Everything I say about the Prime Minister is a matter of clear fact. On 13 December the honourable gentleman will discover that the overwhelming majority of the Australian people, certainly the Queenslanders, will endorse totally what we say. He is due for a very rude awakening on Sunday morning, 14 December. This election is about things that are vital to all Australians. In my view the election is to determine whether Australians want their country restructured further along socialist and centralist lines. If, by any remote chance, Mr. Whitlam were to be returned, he would take it as an endorsement to turn this country into a socialist republic.

Mr. Houston: What rubbish!

Mr. PORTER: He has already said what he is going to do. He would get rid of the Governor-General and put a stooge in his place; he would get rid of the Senate. He would prevent the Senate from ever again being what the Constitution of Australia says it has to be—an equal House with the House of Representatives. He has said all of those things; it is not just my opinion. There is no question about what he intends to do. This election is about whether we want the type of Australia and Australian society that all of us have known and so many of us believe will continue for our children and children's children to enjoy, or whether we are to have a centralised and socialised economy that will wheeze, ail and flag along, showing all the chronic and classic symptoms of mismanagement—galloping inflation, massive unemployment and wholesale business failure.

That is the record of the Federal Labor Government that honourable members opposite want to support. Its record shows that it has tricked, cheated and lied. It has

spent colossal amounts of money on "Blue Poles", world jaunts and all the rest of it, on a scale unparalleled in Australian history. It has made self-help a vice and bludging a virtue. It has forced on us all the values of a sick society. In the name of a new Australian unity, we have had a Government in Canberra which, for three years, has been a cynical divider, setting group against group, class against class, and the States, which should be part of a partnership, against the central Government. It has reaped economic disaster on a scale that could not have been dreamt of three years ago in our worst nightmares.

The honourable member who spoke for one and a half hours should recognise that the Whitlam Government's record of nepotism, extravagance and even corruption, and certainly venality, is unprecedented in our history.

We have a man who does not think in Prime Ministerial terms but totally in Presidential terms, who has spent all his time trying to destroy the federal system. Yet the honourable member for Bulimba wants us to be indignant about advertisements. What are the advertisements about? The advertisements are to remind the people of what the Whitlam Government has done to destroy the federal system, of which this State is one integral part. We are entitled to tell the people where our sovereignty is being threatened.

Fortunately we have now got to the stage where we will have an election. That is a worry to honourable members opposite. Above all things, they do not want an election, because they know what is going to happen. Despite all Mr. Whitlam's hysteria, all his attempts to cloud the issue and all his pretence, this election is not about how the election came on or whether the Governor-General had the right to dismiss the Government. No constitutional lawyer in Australia now even pretends to argue that the Governor-General was not totally and legally correct in what he did. Not one—not even the fellows who are trotted out by the honourable member for Bulimba. When he trotted out Professor Sawyer, he gave only part of his opinion; he should have given the rest of it. It is a wonder he did not trot out Professor Howard, who has been used ad nauseam by certain newspapers and the A.B.C. No-one mentions, of course, that he is a very well-known British socialist and a card-carrying member of the A.L.P. He was a major adviser to the then Senator Murphy at the time of the A.S.I.O. raids. If people only knew that, they would be able to evaluate this clever professor's academic judgments a little more correctly.

The election on 13 December will be about survival. All of us recognise that. It will certainly be about Mr. Whitlam's survival. I think this is the measure of his fury. I have no doubt that Mr. Whitlam believed he could get away with democratic murder and that, when the Governor-General did

what a Governor-General should do, his fury knew no bounds. He had obviously expected to have somebody who would go along with him but instead found that the Governor-General was a man of integrity, and that was a disaster for him.

This election is about survival and about the continuance of what we loosely term the Australian way of life. It is about restoring an independent and healthy economy and about returning from a nightmare world of socialist gobbledygook to a rational world in which once again independence, initiative, thrift, economy and self-help become things for which one can earn credit instead of earning contumely and opprobrium from would-be socialists.

We have had three years of almost Byzantine extravagance—almost incredible extravagance. The honourable member for Bulimba asks, "How will Mr. Fraser save money?" There are tens of millions of dollars to be saved by cutting out the waste that goes on in unnecessary departments, in areas that totally duplicate what is done in States and should be done in States and in the plethora of officials who infest our State departments trying to make sure that we do what they want with the spending of money that comes from various Federal sources. There are tens of millions of dollars to be saved.

I believe that Australians, not only in Queensland but in all the other States as well, will accept the Queensland lead and will never vote into power again Whitlam or any Labor Party that is led by a man like him. None of us can envisage the new dimensions of irrationality that this posturing, arrogant, venomous, megalomaniac type of man will lead us into if given another chance. We in this country have a very healthy record of individuality, and I believe that Australians do not want any part of Government that tries to subdue them and turn them into cogs in a huge bureaucratic machine. We don't want any Big Brother here, nor do we want any El Presidente or Chairman Gough. We want a free society.

That is what the election is about—freedom; freedom for each and every one of us to make the major decisions that affect our own lives and to be the architects of our own destiny without the all-powerful State coming in and trying to tell each one of us what we should do.

Now that we are reaching the final stage in this election, we will find Opposition members becoming ever more desperate as they see that the tide is running against them in a mighty surging torrent. And it is. How surprising it is that wide publicity is given to a public opinion poll taken among 120 people in two State capitals of self-designated swinging voters and showing an enormous swing to Labor, but when the Morgan Gallup Poll, the one with the longest and best record of tipping election results in Australia, shows that the swing is away

from Labor, it does not get talked about. Richard Carleton of the A.B.C. is horrified by it, so he puts it aside. He does not want to talk about it at all. Of course, the A.N.O.P. poll, which favours Labor, is used a lot. What nobody mentions is that the A.N.O.P. is the employee of the Labor Party. The A.N.O.P. is the body which conducts the merchandising and marketing surveys for the Labor Party on which it bases its policy and its advertisements. So everybody needs to know, when looking at an A.N.O.P. poll, that it is taken by the employees of the Labor Party, and should judge it accordingly.

Dr. Crawford: Surprise, surprise!

Mr. PORTER: Yes, surprise, surprise! Of course, it is largely used by the A.B.C.—this peculiar little gentleman Richard Carleton and others.

When we look at polls, we need to view them with real objectivity, and the Morgan Gallup Poll is the only one I know of from long years in this game that provides it.

We are talking about Appropriation. I believe it would be impossible to talk about Appropriation for this Parliament without recognising the grievous changes that have been wrought in the financial, political and other relationships between the States and the central Government over the last three years. It is impossible for a State now to effectively plan its future in even the short term, let alone the long term, because we have had a Labor Government in Canberra that has been determined, despite the fact that every election and every referendum has shown that the people do not want it, to turn what the Constitution says should be a Federal system—a Federal partnership between the States and the Commonwealth—into a unitary system where all the effective power resides in Canberra. Our High Court today is jammed with the backlog of work created by test cases on Acts passed by the Whitlam Government, which was constantly testing the parameters of its powers. It is a Government that has got to go—and go it will.

Dr. Crawford: There is a constitutional lawyer who practises in this town who is of the opinion that if those—

Mr. Houston: Have a chat together.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! I suggest the honourable member for Toowong proceed with his speech.

Mr. PORTER: It is unfortunate. I think the honourable member for Wavell had something worth while to say, but perhaps he will have an opportunity to say it later.

I believe the hour-and-a-half servile dissertation by the honourable member for Bulimba should be printed by people on my side of politics and given wide distribution. It would win scores of thousands of votes for us. I think he is of great service to us and he should be encouraged.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (5.53 p.m.):
Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Mr. Moore: You're slow to rise, Wright. Have you got lead in your trousers?

Mr. WRIGHT: I am sorry, but it seemed to me that there was an arrangement that another member in the Chamber was going to get the call. At the last minute I was told about the change.

For many years there has been a growing realisation of the need for a review of the respective financial situations of the various levels of government. Claims have been persistently made that under the present system the States and, more importantly, the local authorities are hamstrung. The Commonwealth revenue has continued to rise. This is because of its total control over personal income taxes. So we have the situation that, regardless of the inflationary pressures on the economy, the income of the Commonwealth Government has improved. While this system remains, that will always be the case. As wages go up, the tax return to that Government will rise accordingly.

Efforts have been made previously to restructure the tax system. The Australian Labor Party in Canberra tried to do that, too. In January hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people will learn of that endeavour when they find something like an additional \$5 to \$7 in their pay packets. That will be retrospective to July 1975.

I admit that, in the past, changes have been made by the coalition Governments, but those alterations have been across the board. Apparently they tried to help everybody. As a result, they benefited the man on \$35,000 a year but certainly did not do a lot for the low-income earner, although he might have received the same percentage. In contrast the latest programmes have been aimed at the low and middle-income earners. There is a lot of merit in this type of programme.

The restructuring efforts have certainly not eliminated the problem, so political parties have been looking at new types of tax and financial systems for all levels of government. Recently a special announcement was made by the Premier of this State, which was quickly backed up by the caretaker Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser), that it is now Liberal-National Country Party policy to have a dual tax system. If by some stroke of luck Fraser gets into power, we will have a system under which the States will be able to raise revenue by way of income tax. So, instead of paying one tax, the people will be paying two taxes—one to the Commonwealth and one to the State.

This system has been propagated as being an important part of State rights. It has been put forward by the Premier as being of the essence of State rights. This has also been acclaimed by the Premier of Western

Australia (Sir Charles Court) and the Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Lewis). It was grabbed at by the caretaker usurper Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser).

This move was said to have been initiated by the Queensland Premier and we have to blame him alone because there is obvious conflict in this House and between the various parties as to the worth of this policy. It has been questioned by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Sir Gordon Chalk) and by Mr. Kevin Cairns, who is a Federal member and, I believe, an economist. It has been challenged by the Liberal Movement leader (Senator Steele Hall). It has been opposed by Treasury officials.

When I looked into the matter, I discovered that something like 18 months ago the idea was considered very carefully by the Whitlam Government. It was put forward by certain groups in the community as one way of overcoming the problems. It is on record that it was recommended against—in fact opposed—by a vast majority of Treasury advisers and officials.

We all have to make the clear admission that there is a need for restructuring. I contend that the dual tax system as now advocated and accepted by all Government members—it is their policy and no doubt they will stand by it—is not the answer. It might sound good to those people who are interested in State rights and want to carry that banner. It might be a theoretical way of giving some States greater financial power.

Mr. Katter: You are not interested in State rights?

Mr. WRIGHT: I shall be talking about that, so I advise the honourable member to stay in the Chamber.

I agree that it theoretically removes the strings that are so often attached to Commonwealth grants and assistance. It does give the States an essence of independence because it gives them a greater decision-making role. The States are enabled more or less to set their own priorities for the needs of their communities. It also has an element of decentralisation of financial resources. When it is weighed up, it seems at first sight to have some good characteristics.

However, when the idea is considered objectively, it is clear that the disadvantages to States such as Queensland far outweigh the advantages. Governments have limited ways of raising money. They have four main avenues: firstly, by earning money through Government instrumentalities; secondly, by imposing indirect taxes on commodities and services provided; thirdly, by raising loans nationally and internationally, and, fourthly, and most importantly, by raising money from the people in taxes levied on incomes earned.

Whether the States have the right to levy these taxes or whether it is left as the sole domain of the Commonwealth, the source

of the income is the same size. The number of people does not change. No more people are involved in paying that tax. Money has to be raised from the wage earners. This is accepted as a fact of Government administration. The amount of money that is raised is limited by the levy percentage and the number of taxpayers. So it is rather ridiculous for people to think that suddenly, because this power is handed back to the States, a magic wand is waved and the States have more money.

Under the uniform tax system, irrespective of where a person lives, except for zone allowances people pay the same types of tax, the same amount of tax and the same degree of tax.

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

Mr. WRIGHT: In considering the history of the uniform tax system of which I have been speaking, it is interesting to note that, under the various Liberal and Country Party Prime Ministers, such as Mr. Menzies, Mr. Holt and Mr. McMahon, no move was made to change that system. Whilst I have not gone through all the speeches that have been made by the Premier, I have had a chance in recent weeks to try to find occasions on which he raised this matter. But not once in all the speeches to which I referred did I find any reference by the Premier—including the times when he was a back-bencher and when he was an ordinary Minister—to the need for a dual tax system. I wonder why he advocates it now.

I think it is worth while to realise that previous Prime Ministers did nothing about the uniform tax system because they agreed with the philosophy of it. They agreed that we are all Australians and they understood that the benefits obtained from developments and advances throughout the nation are enjoyed by all. Queensland airports, for instance, are not used only by Queenslanders, even though they are funded by the Commonwealth Government. They are used by people from all over the nation. Likewise the people of Queensland benefit directly and indirectly from scientific, agricultural and pastoral advances in the other States. It is completely wrong to try to separate taxation and say that income tax is a State right.

The benefits of Government assistance given to commerce throughout the nation cannot be confined to the States in which the finance was provided. If assistance is given to the motor-car industry in South Australia, we all benefit indirectly. All Australians travel and they gain from improvements to roads and methods of transport. They enjoy improvements in living conditions in other States and they benefit from the services provided by the Commonwealth Government regardless of the State in which they live or the States in which they travel. We therefore need to consider this question very carefully.

I accept that there is need for change but I think we also have to accept that there is a real need for the Commonwealth Government to have massive amounts of money. They have to pay for national services, and they have to provide them for all the people. The Armed Forces form one area of massive expense. I am sure nobody would want the State to have to pay for its own service aircraft or naval ships. It is the job of the Commonwealth to look after export and import industries and the promotion of sales on an international basis. The Minister for Primary Industries has just entered the Chamber. I appreciate that he has undertaken profitable trips overseas for the purpose of promoting Queensland products. There is much to be gained from working together in this type of co-operation. I think that this has been achieved in the beef industry, the wheat industry, the heavy industries and many other areas.

Foreign affairs and immigration, consumer protection and the media are all areas of administration that are given to the Commonwealth because we believe that they come within their purview, as the Minister for Community and Welfare Services might say. While the advocates of the dual tax system accept that these areas should be in the Commonwealth's field, although with varying degrees of acceptance, they still persist in espousing the idea that the financial powers of the Commonwealth must be curbed. I agree that we must give consideration to these policies and their effects.

I return to a consideration of the populations of the various States. I ascertained these populations from the June 1975 statistics—

New South Wales	4,800,000
Victoria	3,700,000
Queensland	1,900,000
South Australia	1,200,000
Western Australia	1,100,000
Tasmania	406,000
Northern Territory	88,000
Australian Capital Territory	191,000.

The income tax raised from the States is raised from the populations of those States. New South Wales has more than twice as many people as Queensland and about four times as many as South Australia. It also has about four times the population of Western Australia, and 10 times that of Tasmania. The costs of administration in Tasmania and South Australia might not be as great as those of New South Wales mainly because of their geography and population concentration. Nevertheless, if the system of dual taxation is ever adopted in Australia, the people of those States will have to carry a tax burden that could be three to six times the burden that they now have to bear.

In Queensland the administration costs are greater because of the size of the State and the decentralised population groupings. Because of this we need longer roads; we

need longer rail facilities and we need more public servants per capita. There are higher costs involved because we require more ports, more schools, more police stations and so on to meet these needs. Then there is the higher capital cost of providing Government buildings and facilities.

We only have to compare New South Wales and Queensland—New South Wales with 4,793,200 people approximately and Queensland 1,998,000 people—to see that the people in the smaller States would have to fund the massive financial need of those various Governments. It is estimated that the income tax of Queenslanders could be at least three times what they are now paying if the State tax system is adopted, and the way our Premier spends money lavishly on political schemes no doubt the burden would increase even more. The people will have to pay. It is understandable that the Treasurer was unsure of the value of this scheme. He should know. After all, he is the financial expert in this Assembly. He is the man who has the financial expertise, probably more than any other Minister. I often think he has forgotten more about the Treasury portfolio and the aspects of its finance than the Premier would ever learn. It is no wonder that the Premiers of South Australia and Tasmania—note, the Premiers of the small States—are opposed to this proposition.

But there is more to it than just the actual tax that people pay. For three years the Federal Labor Government has poured millions of dollars into the other area of government, that is, local government. In 1974-75 \$55,234,000 was given to local authorities throughout this nation, of which Queensland received \$10,470,000. Additionally they were assisted under the R.E.D. scheme to the extent of \$9,982,000, as well as \$496,000 for pre-school and child-care services, \$1,853,000 for Aboriginal advancement, \$973,000 for home care services, \$124,000 for senior citizens' centres, \$350,000 for leisure facilities and \$2,500,000 for area improvement programmes. Millions upon millions of dollars have been given or granted to local authorities throughout this State, money that will not be forthcoming if the revenue resources of the Commonwealth are drastically cut.

This is the money that has kept the local authorities' rates and charges down, and has allowed them to undertake urgent works such as drainage and sewerage and to involve themselves in the establishment of recreation facilities. It has enabled them to complete projects that were dreamed of for years but simply could not be financed, and yet this dual tax system will prevent this major assistance being continued to local authorities. I wonder whether this is part of the Premier's plan, because the Liberal and National Parties, especially in this State, have always been directly against direct grants from the Commonwealth to local authorities, and they know that if the finance is made available to them it will break the parental control of this State. The Premier knows

that the dual tax system, if the finance goes to him and does not go to local authorities by way of grants and assistance, will keep the States all-powerful over local authorities. We know that the State Government parties are totally against local authorities having direct access to this Federal pool of money, but I would point out that this is not the view held by local authorities.

One can look at a report that was put out by the Local Government Association of Queensland. It is a survey of the financial position of local governments in Queensland covering the urgent need for greater financial assistance from the Queensland Government. Page one of the report reads, *inter alia*—

"The purpose of the report was to provide the necessary information and evidence for the six State Governments to discuss with the Commonwealth Government ways and means of providing additional finance for local government generally, preferably by the annual allocation of a specific proportion or percentage of personal income tax levied and collected by the Commonwealth Government."

Mr. Frawley: Who gave you this brief?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Oh, shut up, you mug!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will restrain himself, as will the honourable member for Archerfield.

Mr. WRIGHT: The report also stresses the dilemma of local authorities and lists the statistics on debts and revenue raised. It refers to the pressure on all local authorities to provide new and better services, and to the problems of people who cannot afford to meet local government commitments—these are often pensioners and people engaged in primary industries—especially because of economic circumstances.

It is very interesting to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that although one hears so much about what has happened in the last three years, this report was completed and printed on 26 January 1972—almost a year before the Labor Government came to power. I suggest that the problem is now worse, because the percentage assistance per capita from the States to local authorities has decreased, and it has been decreasing for many years. I know that the total quantum has increased, but the percentage assistance per capita given by the States to local authorities has certainly decreased.

It is also interesting to have a look at the comments made in this report. On page 15 it says—

"There can, of course, be no real disagreement with the claim that there is in Queensland, at least, a gross inadequacy of finance, both revenue and loan, to cope with the services which local government is now expected to provide and this financial gap is forever widening."

The position must worsen, and I suggest that it will worsen in country areas because in many shires populations have decreased drastically. There are also greater problems in the cities and in urban areas because of the tremendous pressure on local authorities to provide new services and to maintain and extend old services to the people. I state very emphatically that the problem is multiplied over and over again in areas in the metropolis and provincial cities in which there is an urban boom.

It is interesting to look at the conclusions in this report—not only the conclusion that there is a need for an annual allocation of a specific proportion or percentage of the personal income tax collected by the Commonwealth, but also the many conclusions and recommendations on page 18. Firstly, it says—

“That the Queensland State Government be requested to pass legislation, similar to that enacted by the Government of New South Wales in 1968-69, to create a Local Government Assistance Fund and to provide for payment into such Fund from Consolidated Revenue each year a fixed minimum sum for distribution to councils throughout the State. This principle could also be applied to any moneys made available by the Commonwealth for local government in Queensland.”

The report does say that local authorities are not contending that these direct grants should go to the local authorities from the Commonwealth. It says that these could be made through the States.

The report continues—

“(2) That a Grants Commission be established to administer such Fund under the Minister for Local Government, such Commission to comprise selected members on a part-time basis. The Commission would investigate the claims of all councils and recommend payments to the Minister. By this means all councils could share in grants or subsidies, in addition to those already being received, and such grants could be either free or block grants, or specific grants, as determined by circumstances and investigation.

“(3) That the State Government be asked to confer with local government, as a matter of urgency, to arrive at some formula or agreement, with the object of affording at least temporary relief to those councils burdened with excessive loan repayments or the inability of ratepayers to pay their rates. Only in this way can any real stimulus be provided for local government—and stimulus it badly needs.

“(4) That the State Government be asked to carry out a complete review of the present basis and ratio of Government grants and subsidies for capital works with the object of updating these payments to a more realistic level in the light of present day costs. This request is not regarded as unreasonable in the light of the greatly

increased allocation of funds to the States by the Commonwealth Government during the present financial year and amounting to an increase of 22 per cent on the previous year. Also, as indicated elsewhere in this report, there has really been quite a reduction in subsidies over recent years.”

That substantiates the claim I made earlier that the subsidies and assistance given have decreased.

The report continues—

“(5) As mentioned earlier in this report, the present is not considered an opportune time to raise the question of an extension of activities in the general field of community and social services and amenities because of more pressing problems already referred to. However, I consider it reasonable and proper to suggest that the Government might have another look at the assistance given to free public libraries because, bearing in mind the heavy cost of conducting this service, there should in common fairness be some substantial contribution towards what are heavy and continuing running costs.

“(6) With the tremendous development and growth of tourism, its beneficial effect on the Australian economy and particularly the economy of the State of Queensland and bearing in mind the all-important part played by local government in this industry, for industry it has become, it seems both fair and reasonable that the State Government should be asked to consider making some financial assistance available to those councils more deeply involved.”

Those points are very well made in that report. As one goes through the financial arrangements that have existed between the States and the local authorities, and the assistance given by the Commonwealth to the States for many years, and finally to the local authorities, it is fairly obvious that a new approach needs to be taken to provide the money required to meet the increasing demands on local authorities. And I add to that, the increasing demands on the States. But the dual tax system is not the answer. It might be O.K. for New South Wales and Victoria, but it is totally against the interests of this State and the 130 local authorities involved.

I want to look at the existing arrangements because, under the arrangements we have had, special assistance has been given by way of grants to the poorer States. That has been going on for something like four decades. The idea was, and still is, to try to maintain a standard of living and development in the smaller States. It has certainly been beneficial to Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia, because all those States have been claimant States at some time. The Commonwealth has accepted the difficulties of the States, and for many years it has given much-needed financial assistance.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: The point to make to the fellows in the peanut gallery who are so keen to yell and scream, but never get up to make a speech, is that this money did not come from thin air. The money was not simply manufactured in some way, but was part of the over-all national financial pool. If one looks back to the actual percentages, one sees that in the main it came from New South Wales and Victoria. That money would simply not be forthcoming now. Under the new system of the States being able to raise their own money by way of income tax and through the Commonwealth, can we expect the people of New South Wales and Victoria to agree that they should pay a tax to the Commonwealth, a tax to their own State and also carry out the additional task of providing extra money which could then be distributed to the smaller States? Would it mean that the tax they paid would be fair? What it would mean is that the tax they paid to the Commonwealth would be more than that paid by their counterparts in the smaller States of Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia. At the moment they accept the idea of paying a uniform Commonwealth tax, because they know everyone is paying it, and realise that the money is being distributed to those who need it.

Can honourable members imagine Mr. Hamer or Mr. Lewis agreeing to raising less State taxes from their people just so that the Commonwealth could raise more taxes from the people of Victoria and New South Wales so that that money could be distributed to the States that are not so well off? Surely their policy, simply for political survival, would be to let everyone pay his own way. Surely that is the political approach they would be forced to take. Their costs, requirements and demands are expanding all the time. There is no way that they will be able to say, "Yes, we will derive less taxes for the State from our people, and we don't mind the Commonwealth getting more, because we know the other States need it." That would not happen.

This brings me to deal with the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory. I am always surprised at the way in which the Liberal Party and the National Party can become gymnasts in politics. One month they say one thing and 18 months later they say the opposite if the political flavour is to their liking. We notice it was the Liberal-National Country Party that stated that it would give the Northern Territory the status of a State. Mr. Fraser announced this and said, "You will have 10 senators." It is very interesting to note that the policy of giving the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory just two senators was opposed viciously by the Liberal and National Country Parties. They opposed it and opposed it and opposed it—and even took the matter to the High Court.

Now the Liberal and National Country Parties say that the A.C.T. and Northern Territory will be given the status of States

and will have 10 senators. How on earth will the people of the Northern Territory survive without special financial assistance? With a population of 88,000, how can the Northern Territory possibly meet the needs? If the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory are given the status of States, surely they will have the right to levy their own income tax. The people will have to pay State taxes as well as Commonwealth taxes. Imagine how much money will be raised by 88,000 people who are faced with the problems of distance, massive numbers of Aborigines in their area and a frontier environment that will require the expenditure of billions of dollars to develop it and bring about the quality of life that is enjoyed by others throughout the nation. Imagine the fantastic costs involved in establishing new administrative facilities.

None of this could be done without special assistance. And where is the money going to come from? Will Commonwealth revenue be cut back? Will the States be allowed to make great inroads into this type of revenue? The Liberal and National Country Parties are going to say to the people of the Northern Territory, "You make it on your own." The Liberals previously opposed it, but now seem suddenly keen to do something about it. They are keen, of course, because they think they will win votes by suddenly saying, "You people can now have 10 senators." I hope the people of the Northern Territory are well aware of what this would mean.

Mr. Katter interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: Don't you start talking. You went to Biloela and stated that your own Government was going to reintroduce university fees. You have been quoting that all over the place.

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

Mr. KATTER: I rise to a point of order. I have never at any stage at any meeting in Queensland stated anything that even remotely approximates the remark attributed to me by the honourable member for Rockhampton.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will accept the denial of the honourable member for Flinders.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept his denial, and I shall bring back proof of my claim when I return to Brisbane again from Rockhampton.

As I was saying, there is a need to adopt a new approach to finance, and we need to adopt a new approach to regional development. There is a part for the national Government to play and one for regional government to play. Some of the areas must be administered on a national basis. I have mentioned, for example, the Armed Forces. Certain legislative measures, such as companies and securities Acts, and certain means

of transport, such as the airways and shipping, must be administered on a national basis.

Imagine what would happen if Queensland had to try to find the millions of dollars that were needed to prop up the wool industry. Queensland had to go to the Commonwealth to seek matching finance for the cattle industry. In the law of bankruptcy, too, there is a part for the national Government to play. But there is also a part for grassroots government. I suggest that if the dual tax system is implemented and if the financial policies of the Liberal Party are implemented, the present grassroots government that we know today will be starved out of existence.

In this Chamber we hear a great deal of nonsense about centralism. We have been told that we must stop centralism. Stop centralism! In Queensland we have exactly that. Everything is centred on the Brisbane boomerang. The Treasurer in his Budget has allocated massive sums of money to the metropolitan area. The Brisbane boomerang is the centre of bureaucratic administration. Fancy Government members complaining about centralism in Canberra when Brisbane administers the city of Cairns, which is a thousand miles away!

In the Queensland Cabinet, too, we find centralism. The vast majority of the Ministers come from areas within easy reach of Brisbane. Most of the Ministers either live in Brisbane or have spent most of their time here. It is no wonder that the North Queensland areas have been up in arms. It is no wonder they have hailed the appointment of the Honourable Val Bird as Minister for Education. I must admit that Central Queensland has done fairly well under the system because we have Messrs Newbery, Camm, Wharton and N. T. E. Hewitt. But the rest—13 other Ministers out of the 18—come from the south-east corner. So when the Government members talk about centralism and the need for decentralisation of financial resources, they should look at home first.

There is a need not only to reassess the financial aspects but also to review the structural aspects. The State Government has a part to play. Its importance is open to some debate. There is a need to redraw boundaries, a need to restructure functions. We need a system of regional Government in our State. It could be a system of 10 or 12 areas—areas that have similar problems; areas that could co-operate in administration; areas that could pool their resources; areas that could work towards the idea of direct democracy, with the people being involved very closely with Government and administration decisions.

After all, the States are separated only by lines on maps. They are not recognised by industry. They are not recognised by the transport systems. We have Ministers co-operating, with Attorneys-General and Transport

Ministers working together on a national basis. We are saying time and time again that there is need for more co-operation because we know that these matters no longer fit within the administrative structure that we have today.

Changes are already coming. We notice a tremendous pressure to regionalise education. We notice, too, tremendous pressure to decentralise even further the workings of Government. I have heard members in this Chamber say, "What about establishing some sort of court system in the areas of Cairns and Mt. Isa? Instead of having a three-court system, why not decentralise even further?" It has been suggested that we even further decentralise the Works Department, which is one Government function that is already well decentralised. There is a need also for greater decision-making to be made locally. I heard at a recent educational seminar that regional directors of education do not have enough power. That is being said about those in charge of the Works Department and those in charge of Children's Services. Too much has to be referred back to Brisbane all the time. Too many decisions are made in the south-east corner.

The man who can help is none other than the Treasurer himself, because after all he has the personnel behind him with the expertise and also his own experience to promote and even direct these changes. We already have a Co-ordinator-General's Department that is working in that way. It was only a few years ago that we introduced legislation to set up 10 super regions under the Co-ordinator-General to involve the various local authorities in greater co-operation.

That brings me back to the point that there is a need not only for regionalisation but also for new initiatives in decentralisation. The present policies are against that. We note that it is cheaper to send products from Brisbane to the outside areas than it is for the country manufacturer to send his product for sale in Brisbane. There are special subsidies for firms here. I have used it before, but Castlemaine Perkins provide the ideal example. They get a special loading or subsidy on all the tonnages of their alcoholic "fuels" that are sent to outlying areas. This State has an opposition to the Australian National Line visiting the various ports in the State.

It is important that we improve the quality of life for people in provincial areas. It is important that we give them greater job opportunities. Too many people are leaving country areas. They do not have access to the services that many people in the metropolitan area take for granted. They do not have the cultural and educational facilities available to them.

I might say that many of the provincial cities are surviving—but what of the country areas? One has only to look at them. I will quote some figures comparing the position

at the 1961 census with the position at the 1971 census. The Blackall population dropped in that time by 20.4 per cent; the Cunnamulla area by 19.2 per cent; Mitchell, by 20.8 per cent; and Winton, by 28.4 per cent. If one looks over the five-year period, the decline is even worse. Ayr has dropped by 5 per cent; Charters Towers, by 3; Chinchilla, by 9.7 per cent; Home Hill, by 13.1 per cent; Longreach, by 10.8 per cent; Monto, by 13.7 per cent; Tully, by 7.5 per cent; Warwick, by 7.7 per cent; and so it goes on.

So it is no longer true that Queensland can stand on its own record on decentralisation. If it were not for the mining boom—if it were not for the impetus or the catalyst created by the mining industry—those figures would be far worse. They would certainly be far worse in the central and northern regions. So there is a need for new incentives especially to enable the local authorities to develop an infrastructure to keep people there.

We need a dual approach. We need balanced regional economic development and also decentralisation. These will be achieved only with planning and Government involvement. There is a role here for the State. The first thing to do is to set up a department of decentralisation. There is a role for the Commonwealth. We need better zone allowances. The zone allowances granted to people in Queensland and the Northern Territory are shocking. They are about 40 years out of date. Regardless of political colour, the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to do something there.

There is also a need for tax concessions to industry. Decentralised industry needs to be able to write off its initial capital investment and costs. In overseas countries, not only are guarantees given, as we do in some instances through the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, but also, for instance in Singapore, some of the pioneering industries pay no tax for the first five years. In the United States, massive depreciation is allowed by way of tax deduction. If this were allowed at the Commonwealth level, small industry would be given a great boost.

The average industry in this nation employs only something like 20 people. We are not always talking about companies such as G.M.H. and Ford, but usually about the ordinary industry that is quite happy to go into country areas. We need also to encourage the large corporations to decentralise and regionalise their activities. The present trend is towards centralisation. Provincial city distributors, which I think are an ideal example, are closing down their provincial city warehouses. Representatives travel from Brisbane 400 and 800 miles to service retailers in places like Rockhampton and Townsville. We need to create local growth. Local authorities must be enabled to improve

their incomes by giving them access to rate-paying enterprises, and this is surely industry. The whole thing could completely change.

The tourist industry is the major industry of the future. There is no doubt about that. It is vital to decentralised and regionalised development because its profits are always reinvested locally. It is heavily job-oriented. It gives the boost required to ancillary industries such as food groups and cleaning services. It creates greater expenditure by the Government because it has to provide extra roads and facilities such as airports. It is an ideal industry for foreign exchange earning. We have only to consider the number of people who tour overseas. I am told that the number of people who travel overseas has increased tenfold in the past four or five years. Investigations and surveys show that these people go to Singapore, Hong Kong, the South Pacific or New Zealand long before they see Australia.

There are great economic and social advantages in regional development. We have to encourage people to stay in these regions. We need to give them a better type of life. This cannot be left solely to private enterprise. We cannot say simply, "It is up to you fellows. Use your risk capital and let us hope that everything goes all right." There must be incentives and they have to be provided by State Governments, by local authorities and also by the Commonwealth Government. It is not just a question of money. It is a question of attitude as well. In New South Wales, \$16,000,000 was spent by its Department of Decentralisation in its first year. It is a question of policy. Queensland's policies are negative and this is shown by the State Government's attitude to A.N.L. That and similar attitudes must be changed if we are to bring about decentralised and regional development.

Mr. DOUMANY (Kurilpa) (7.49 p.m.): I rise to support the Treasurer in the second reading of this Appropriation Bill. Firstly, I refer to the tirade—and a very boring tirade it was—that we have had from the Opposition this afternoon and this evening.

The honourable member for Bulimba was fairly sincere in many of the sentiments he expressed. Whilst I believe that he is misguided in many of his beliefs, I think he actually does believe in them. For that, I must commend him. However, I believe that the honourable member for Rockhampton has led us up all sorts of byways with his skilful manipulation by dealing with matters of trivia and matters of mechanical and procedural importance, but he has avoided the fundamental question of where the economy has been heading, how it has been managed, and what strength has been left in it after it has been eroded and decimated by an incompetent and irresponsible Federal Government for three years.

All the talk about the mechanics of government and intergovernment funding counts for nothing if the economy has lost

its thrust and momentum, and if the incentive to work and produce has been cut to the bone. Let us return to some common sense and get rid of the Trades Hall business principles that we see in operation today. We have had Trades Hall business principles in operation now for some three years.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about Chamber of Commerce business principles?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Archerfield. If he persists with interjections, I shall deal with him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That was my first interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will not argue with the Chair. He knows the rules of the House.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I bow to your ruling.

Mr. DOUMANY: Not only have we had Trades Hall business principles. They have been laced with the long hairs of the ivory tower—and God knows we have never seen so many of them. We have been asked where we will cut expenditure. One of the first things to do is to sack some of these impractical, stupid people who for months on end have received handsome retainers, some as much as \$30,000 a year, and who have waxed fat on the incompetence, carelessness and irresponsibility of the central Government which has been so generous to them while they have espoused Fabianism and its stupid philosophies of self-destruction.

It is not easy to talk about the State of the economy today, because it is in such a mess, and it is not easy to comment on the task that has confronted the Treasurer and his department over the last few months as they have struggled with the problems that have been created and exacerbated by central Government action. It is quite a wonder that they were able to come up with a Budget that is almost balanced. That is a great credit to them.

I propose to refer to facts rather than the emotional claptrap that has been coming from the Opposition benches. In 1972 inflation was running at about 4 per cent, which put Australia somewhere in about the third quartile of the list of advanced Western economies. I am referring to the third quartile taken from the top of the list towards the bottom. In other words, Australia was somewhere below the middle of the list. At that time the level of unemployment in Australia was about 1½ per cent.

Australia now almost heads the list of countries in order of inflation rates. In fact Australia's inflation rate is exceeded only by the rate in countries such as Italy, Ireland and the United Kingdom, which is the epitome and quintessence of mismanagement. They are the only countries in

which inflation is worse than it is here. That is certainly nothing to make us feel proud.

In terms of the degree by which wages have increased over the last three years, Australia heads the list. Never has any Federal Government thrown so much petrol on the fire of wage demands. In today's edition of "The Australian" the front page headline reads, "Strike record among worst in the world. 6m working days lost in year." The article states that Australia's high level of industrial disputes last year cost the nation as many working days as strikes in much larger countries such as Britain, Japan, Canada and Italy. What an enviable record! With a work-force a fraction of those in other countries, we have managed to score as many days lost through strikes as they have. I do not blame the working man. The working man has been absolutely frustrated—

Mr. Byrne: It is another record for Labor.

Mr. DOUMANY: Yes. It holds quite a few records, but this one strikes at the very heart of the problem. It is little wonder that the workingman, the everyday trade-unionist in the streets—not the militant of the extreme Left—has been forced to demand more wages because, as he has tried to run on the treadmill, the Federal Government has been turning it faster and faster with its inflationary methods of management, and naturally we have had militancy and dissension in the industrial movement. It is a symptom of economic mismanagement and chaos, and something must be done about it. Something will be done about it after 13 December. Make no mistake, we have to come back to the very basic tenet of all economic management, and that is, "You can only take out as much as you put in. You can only disburse as much as comes out."

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Bulimba and the honourable member for Murrumba.

Mr. DOUMANY: It is most important that we recover growth in productivity, and return to that trend line we had before 1972, through which we were able to sustain the momentum of this economy and through which we were able to sustain the living standards of our people, and if we can ally a return to that productivity trend with a control of inflation, then we shall see the prosperous Australia that we all want and that we all enjoyed prior to 1972.

I would like to point to some aspects of the previous Federal Government's attitude to the economy and to the people of Australia. I think it is epitomised in the "banks affair" that immediately preceded the sacking of Mr. Whitlam on 11 November. Honourable members will recall that in the week immediately prior to 11 November the then Prime Minister was desperately striving to

herd the banks into an arrangement which he very cleverly, with Mr. Hayden, had contrived so as to save himself and hold things together in the face of denial of Supply by the Opposition in the Senate. The whole concept was to commandeer by stealth and through deceitful means the deposits of all the ordinary people of this nation and the shareholdings in the private banks—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: It was long overdue.

Mr. DOUMANY: We know your attitude. The honourable member for Archerfield has not altered his opinion one iota since the 1948-49 struggle over bank nationalisation. These leopards never change their spots.

But let me come back to the stealthy means which almost succeeded but for the wisdom of our bankers, who knew that the people of Australia would have rebelled and withdrawn their deposits. Honourable members opposite need not laugh about it, because it was quite clear that hundreds of thousands of responsible Australians whose money forms the backbone of the deposits of our banks—I am afraid many of the rabid supporters of the Opposition do not put very much money in the banks, anyway—would have rebelled and withdrawn their money. We could have had a national catastrophe. We all know that a run on the banks is the last thing any economy can bear, but there was no question that that was the risk that our former Prime Minister was willing to take in order to survive and to retain power. It was an enormous risk to take. Thank God the scheme did not come about! It was nipped in the bud.

Let me turn now to housing, and I know that members of the Opposition will scream when I mention this. The Priorities Review Staff had the temerity to put forward a proposal that a notional rental value be put on privately owned homes and residences, which would then incur taxation. I know that was not accepted or espoused by the previous Government; but there cannot be any question that somewhere in the briefing of the people who put forward that proposal there must have been a grain of suggestion, or there must have been a term of reference, which prompted such an outlandish concept to be put forward in print.

What more outlandish and unpalatable proposal could one have than to tax people for their own thrift and good management? What more despicable proposal could we endure, Mr. Speaker—and we have endured enough in the last three years—than to erode the very base of independence of the families of this nation? There cannot be any question that ownership of homes by families is at the very root of Australia, and it would be a tragedy if that strength were eroded by such a calamitous move. Yet it was contemplated, just as we have seen, Mr. Speaker, in the housing relationship between the State and Federal Governments, the pushing of the State Government

into a rental-dominant situation for housing for the needy. It is the avowed intention of the A.L.P. to kill home-ownership because it also kills the anti-A.L.P. vote.

Mr. McKechnie: They want pensioners to pay rent for their own homes.

Mr. DOUMANY: Rent is one of the most pernicious payments that a family has to make. When a central Government stands deliberately in the path of individuals and their families who are striving to own homes and makes it absolutely impossible for them, by virtue of high interest rates, lending policies, taxation policies, and so on, to buy houses, then I believe that Government has lost touch with this nation's spirit.

We have seen recently a couple of other instances of the double standard that the A.L.P. has evinced over the last three years. We have seen Tony Whitlam endorsed for the seat of Grayndler without any contest. We have seen him endorsed in one of the safest seats for the A.L.P. in Australia. A silver-tail in Grayndler! I know Grayndler because I lived in that area for four years while I was a university student. What happened there? We know what happened, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Daly made a deal with Mr. Whitlam, and the deal was this: "I will defer my resignation", said Mr. Daly, "until the last minute, so that the machinery of endorsement—of pre-selection as it is called—can no longer operate and it will be incumbent upon the party to pluck someone from the air." How convenient that Mr. Tony Whitlam wanted to come home again!

Mr. Moore: With his Chairman Mao badge.

Mr. DOUMANY: That is right, with his Mao badge. What was Mr. Daly looking for in return? A few days ago we understood that it was the Governor-Generalship; but apparently he is a little more modest than that and is prepared to accept the State Governorship of Queensland. That is unbelievable, yet it happened.

Next we have the case of Mr. Bill Hartley—the darling of the Left. He is not only the darling of the Left but a man who travels with other fellows—if I might put it bluntly. There is no point in beating around the bush. Mr. Hawke, the Federal president of the A.L.P., has no time for that man because of certain basic issues in respect of which they are on completely opposite sides of the fence. Yet, in Victoria, Mr. Hartley, who traffics with Communists, is highly placed on the Senate ticket for the A.L.P. How could such a man be endorsed?

Mr. Gygar interjected.

Mr. DOUMANY: That is right; he is an avid and open supporter of the P.L.O., which is a terrorist organisation.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. DOUMANY: I would be prepared to believe anything of Mr. Hartley.

While on this subject I should like to quote from the "Australian Left Review" of May 1971, which is a Communist journal. An article in that journal basically covers an interview with Dr. Cairns and Mr. Hartley. I will quote a couple of the questions and answers—

"Do you regard the A.L.P. as a vehicle for socialist change in Australia?"

Dr. Cairns opened up and said—

"I regard the A.L.P. as a vehicle for socialist change in Australia."

Mr. Hartley agreed. I will not take up time by quoting that one. The next question was—

"As socialists, do you consider that revolutionary changes are necessary in Australia in order to establish a socialist society?"

Dr. Cairns answered—

"To establish socialism in Australia a revolution would be necessary."

Mr. Hartley answered—

"Of course the answer to that is yes."

Without denigrating Dr. Cairns, I point out that those are the sorts of answers that Mr. Hartley gave to those sorts of questions.

What kind of people do we want to govern this nation? We want practical people, not people versed in management and not ivory-tower people with long hair and beards—with all due respect to some honourable members here who have a healthy growth. We don't want Tammany Hall, trades hall business principles applied to the affairs of this great nation.

Mr. Houston: We don't want Tammy.

Mr. DOUMANY: We do want Tammy. Tammy Fraser is a very fine woman. We want experienced, practical decision makers with a feeling for business and a feeling for the everyday realities of making a nation and its economy tick, who do not rely on artificial things like price justification tribunals that tamper with the supply-demand mechanism and bring about a mis-allocation of our resources. That is what causes all the shortages that the honourable member for Bulimba is so worried about. They are the result of all this tampering with the economy. We have never seen such tampering. We have never seen such ham-fisted measures taken. Look what the 25 per cent tariff cut across the board did to the shoe manufacturing industry and the textile manufacturing industry. It wrecked them.

Mr. Lamont: Look what it did in the Bass by-election.

Mr. DOUMANY: Yes. The honourable member for South Brisbane knows the political realities of that sort of ham-fisted measure. Ham-fisted measures originate among the ham-fisted people in the trades hall, the masters of the A.L.P. Those are measures that ruin nations and bring them to their knees.

Mr. Powell: The people are learning fast.

Mr. DOUMANY: Indeed they are. They are learning that productivity is what counts, that hard work is what counts and that responsible decision-making is what counts. They want nothing to do with blackmail politics or the politics of the jackboot.

Mr. Lane: How many did Whitlam have at his rally today?

Mr. DOUMANY: Every rally of his from now until 13 December will have a diminishing attendance. The people wake up. They cannot be fooled all the time. Those wind-up people who have been coming along—

Mr. Moore: He hires a crowd.

Mr. DOUMANY: Indeed he does—and even they are getting fed up with it. I don't blame them. It is tiresome chasing a megalomaniac across the nation and cheering for him. The Australian people have had a gutful of Gough, and on 13 December they will show what they will do with him.

Mr. Katter: Ask him how many trade-unionists donated a day's pay.

Mr. DOUMANY: I would love to ask him that.

About two weeks ago we saw a day of infamy in Brisbane. Trade-unionists were being coerced to give a day's pay to a rally. What a dreadful demand to impose on people who, together with their wives and children, have the private right to hold whatever political viewpoint they choose.

At present a struggle is going on in the teaching profession in this State. Other members have more details on this subject, but I shall open it up by reminding the House that the Queensland Teachers' Union, through its illustrious Mr. Costello, has called on every member to donate his support to the A.L.P. and to be an A.L.P. supporter whatever his politics and private feelings might be. This is coercion at its worst. It is a natural step along from the undue influence that many Left-wing teachers are having on our children, deliberately, consciously and criminally.

However, I think we can take heart from the situation that arose in Victoria, which was described in the following terms in "News Weekly" of 26 November 1975, under the heading "Not getting away with it":—

"Uproar has erupted in the Victorian Teachers Union (VTU) over political statements made by the president, Don Bull.

"Mr. Bull issued a press statement on November 12 which said: 'The dismissal of an Australian government which held a majority in the House of Representatives, will produce a generation of children confused and disillusioned with the political process.

'Schools will not be able to counter the effects of this action.

'We endorse the call by ACTU President, Bob Hawke, for responsible union action.

'The VTU is calling on members to contribute \$10 a head to a campaign, rather than take stop-work action.'

What responsible action that is!

In a statement attacking that move, a gentleman named Mr. Wallace, a vice-principal at Manchester Primary School, said—

"The VTU has a tradition of non-alignment with any political party.

"If the union is going to take a party political stand for the election, many teachers might not remain members."

Because of that reaction, the VTU immediately back-pedalled and said, "Oh, all we are worried about is that the Federal funds flowing to education will diminish if a Liberal-National Country Party Government is elected." We are getting the same sort of coddle up here.

Mr. Lamont: Do you know that they have decided to give \$1,000 of Teachers' Union money to highlight Labor's policies?

Mr. DOUMANY: That is right. I would publicly declare here and now that every decent teacher in this State who belongs to the union and who has a mind of his own or her own in politics should openly reject this call from the union and its officials and should do so by public declaration. I hope the petitions will flow in in the next few days to demonstrate that the teaching profession is still solidly a decent profession and not one that is going to be prostituted by the A.L.P.

We have come a long way in Australia since December 1972. In that time we have seen the culmination of so many disastrous decisions in the sacking of a Prime Minister. We have seen the denigration of a Governor-General by disloyal A.L.P. politicians. This is a sorry time for Australia in many respects, but it is heartening to know that there are still practical men around who will take up the reins of government in this nation, in the same responsible fashion as our Treasurer and his ministerial colleagues here in Queensland—people who will not go chasing thousands of millions of dollars in dubious markets of the world—

Mr. Moore: It has to be paid back, too.

Mr. DOUMANY: That is right—people who are not going to hang interminable debts around the necks of the citizens of this State or Australia.

I would like to remind the honourable member for Rockhampton—he is not in the Chamber at the moment, but he certainly should be able to read this in "Hansard"—that in all his concern for the equitability of income tax revenue, he forgets one important consideration. This State is a

producing State. If we total its production—its contribution to the balance of payments and its contribution to production—we find that it makes a pro rata percentage contribution well above its share. That is always conveniently overlooked by those people in the southern States who say that Queenslanders get too much.

Mr. McKechnie: Did you notice he used the word "Commonwealth", jumping on the band wagon.

Mr. DOUMANY: Sure. They have to use the word "Commonwealth". They had better get used to it in their vocabulary. It will be back after 13 December.

It has to be remembered where the wealth comes from. The wealth comes from basic industries such as agriculture, sugar, beef and grain. It comes from mining. It comes from the basic manufacturing of steel and similar products. It comes from those basic areas and it has to be encouraged in those basic areas.

I will close with a little anecdote. On page 3 of today's "Telegraph" Mr. Whitlam is reported as making his usual claims about Mr. Fraser's receipts from the superphosphate bounty. He claims that Mr. Fraser is desperate to have the bounty reinstated so that he can get his \$6,000 a year. However, I point out that, if Mr. Fraser receives his \$6,000 a year in bounty, he would be buying something like 500 tonnes of superphosphate, which would be in line with the size of his property and the rates of application required. He would be paying out of his own pocket for the balance of the price of that product—something like \$40 to \$50 a tonne; in other words, something like \$20,000 or more. So for every \$6,000 he might be getting, he is paying more than \$20,000 out of his own pocket to place a vital resource into his property—the land he has, the capital, the labour and so on.

Mr. McKechnie: And providing jobs too.

Mr. DOUMANY: Yes; having provided jobs but more particularly having provided the increment in production that comes from the application of that input not only this year, but in future years—because superphosphate has residual effects which flow for 25 to 30 years—he will pay more income tax. I venture to say that by simple arithmetic it would be found that the additional income tax he will pay will far exceed the bounty he receives.

Mr. Tomkins: An increase in productivity.

Mr. DOUMANY: That is right. This is at the heart of the story of productivity. Yet we have people in the ranks of the A.L.P., not only here but federally, who want this whole concept of productivity thrown overboard. They do not believe in it.

I support the Treasurer wholeheartedly and I look forward, after 13 December, to the same standard and responsibility in economic management in Canberra under Mr. Malcolm Fraser and Mr. Doug Anthony.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (8.21 p.m.): As I usually do, I listened very intently to the Treasurer. We have learned over the years that whatever he says, he says very clearly. On previous occasions he has been very vocal. I regret that he has a malady of the throat but I found his presentation this afternoon rather more pleasant than in previous years because, although the tonal quality was marred, it was a little easier on my ears and, I suppose, your ears, too, Mr. Speaker, and those of other honourable members.

The statements he made have been made in this place for the past 100 years. I refer to the statements of doom; for instance, that the next election will be the most vital election in Australia, and that the next Federal election will be tragic if it goes a certain way. The Treasurer intimated that he hoped it would not go a certain way and that the previous Labor Government would not be returned. Statements of doom also apply to the Budget; it is always the most important Budget; the whole of the State and the Commonwealth depends on the outcome of what this year's Budget will do; the Budget next year will be the most important Budget ever brought down in this State.

Like many other honourable members, I do not agree altogether with the Treasurer's statements on the conditions prevailing at present. The bulk of our citizens have never had it better. Pensioners speak to me honestly and speak the truth—I am sure they do the same with everyone else—and they tell me that they have never had better conditions; they have never had a freer mind than they have had since the Labor Government gained office in 1972.

The lower and middle-wage people have never had it better. No doubt some of the higher-wage earners have lost through taxation. Money must be got in before it can be paid out. I pay a fair amount of taxation because I have no direct dependants. I am happy about paying that amount of taxation. I have enough to live on despite the heavy taxation I pay. I do not begrudge paying it. I think that the country I live in is so good that it is worth paying that tax. Australia is worth every cent of taxation paid by every individual in Australia. I do not agree—and I am sure that many people outside do not agree—with the Treasurer's statement that we are living under terrible conditions at present. They have never been better. Travel around any suburb in Brisbane and you will see not one but two or three motor cars in every yard. In some families each member has a car of his own. What do we see on roads at the week-end?

One can scarcely drive on roads in the Brisbane area, or beyond it for that matter, for cars hauling boats and caravans, and motor vehicles of all types.

Mr. Gygar: What about unemployment?

Mr. DEAN: I often wonder about that. I have been a representative of the people for 23 years, and in periods of unemployment it has been my experience that people approach their member or alderman looking for work. I can truthfully say that not one person has approached me to see if I could have him placed in employment. I am inclined to think that most of the unemployed are married women who have been displaced in industry. If anyone approached me—not a highly skilled or professional worker, but an ordinary person well and strong enough to work—I could find him a job. But no-one has approached me. That makes me think there is something wrong with the statements constantly being made about unemployment. Indeed, I throw out a challenge. I should like any members to present me with a list of genuinely unemployed males who have approached them in their electorates for work in the last 12 months.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. DEAN: The honourable member is very vocal; he is always very willing to interject during every speech made in this Chamber. I question the validity of the figures on unemployment.

Mr. Gygar: I hope they take you up on that one.

Mr. DEAN: They can, because I have had no approaches made to me. While the Treasurer was speaking I was glancing through today's "Telegraph". It contains an advertisement for European tours next year. A series of tours has been arranged leaving every seven days from March till 27 December. Those tours are not free, yet one will leave for Europe every seven days. I therefore wonder about unemployment and the supposed great shortage of money within the community.

Mr. Gygar: They say that sea cruises are very good for nervous breakdowns caused by the economic policies of the Labor Government.

Mr. DEAN: I might say to the honourable member for Stafford that overseas tours are very good for sweeping cobwebs from the mind. I would therefore certainly recommend an overseas tour to the honourable member for Stafford. He would then be able to see how people live in other countries. You have travelled overseas, Mr. Speaker, to the Far East and Europe, and I think you will agree with me that living conditions in those countries are nowhere near those enjoyed here, despite the great hue and cry about the terrible Labor Government.

Mention was made of last night's meeting in Festival Hall. I happened to hear the broadcast of it on my car radio while I was travelling home from a meeting.

Sir Gordon Chalk: You were going home a bit late.

Mr. DEAN: I wish I was able to return home at that time every night. It is the ideal time to go home. I was impressed with the practised way in which the cheer squad responded to the speaker. It reminded me of the early days of the rise of the dictators before World War II. When the sign was given, the roar was terrific. It reminded me of the cry "Il Duce!", and up would go the hands. I was old enough to realise what was happening during the rise of Mussolini and Hitler. That Festival Hall meeting reminded me of those days. The dictators had trained cheer squads—in fact, they had trained storm troopers.

I was not at the meeting last night and I could not say whether there were any storm-troopers in the Festival Hall, but I do not think there would be. Nevertheless, the vocal rendition there was so spontaneous and so well-practised that it would gladden the heart of any choirmaster if his choir responded to his baton as well as the crowd responded last night to the signals they must have been receiving from someone on the stage.

Mr. Gygar: They were inspired by a brilliant speech.

Mr. DEAN: I am not talking about the quality of the speech. I have heard so many political speeches that I am used to them. I know what to take from a political speech and last night I could not take much from the speech that I had not heard before in speeches made by politicians over the years. Again the promise was made to alleviate the terrible suffering of the people at present. That point was made very forcefully by the Acting Deputy Prime Minister.

Having used part of my time in that little preamble, I want to take advantage of this debate on the Appropriation Bill to discuss something I would have discussed this afternoon during the debate on the Estimates for the Department of Education if I had been present. Unfortunately, I was elsewhere attending to another important parliamentary function and, of course, I could not be in two places at the one time. Therefore I missed the winding-up of the debate on the Estimates by the Minister for Education. This afternoon I would have discussed the bad accommodation conditions in schools at the moment. When I say that, I am not casting a reflection on the Minister, as he has held the portfolio for only a short time. I say without hesitation that I have received very courteous treatment from him. He has received many deputations from me and

given me fair treatment. I am sorry for him because he has inherited such a grave problem.

In some schools accommodation is so bad that we see from time to time in the Press reports that conditions in Queensland schools are so bad that teachers are talking about open revolt to try to bring about some improvement in the conditions under which they work. They are concerned not only for themselves but for the pupils they teach. I am reminded of one of the schools in my electorate, the Sandgate Primary School, which is not only overcrowded but is listed as a disadvantaged school. Honourable members know what that means as far as the Commonwealth is concerned. It is a classification that was given after a survey of the school.

Just elaborating a little on that, I would like to point to some of the problems that the teachers and students have to put up with at that school. First of all, there is a severe shortage of playground area, a critical problem in an overcrowded school. I know a disastrous fire was the cause of one of the problems. There have been fires in other schools throughout the State and I suppose that has altered the new building or restoration priorities of some of these buildings. But that does not make any difference to the conditions at present. It does not give any solace to the teachers or the students. In addition, the children do not have ready access to several areas, especially the infants' section. These small children have to suffer very cramped classrooms. They are receiving their early education in shocking conditions. There is also a lack of shelter from sun and rain.

This is not all due to the damage caused by fire, but it is aggravated by an increase in enrolments. The approaches to the school are dangerous. We could have better approaches to the school, which would make entry for the children safer, if we added to the school area. In addition, the dividing fences of the school have not been maintained properly and children wander onto private property and church property next door. This causes a good deal of discomfort and inconvenience to the owners of those properties.

I again draw the attention of the Minister to these matters. He is already aware of them because, as I said earlier, he acceded to the request of the p. and c. association and me to see for himself the conditions under which the teachers are working and what the students have to put up with at present.

To come back to the problem of fires in schools—I suggest that the time is fast approaching when serious consideration must be given to the appointment of full-time caretakers at all schools. I know that it will cost money to do that; but fires in schools are not only costing money but also causing great inconvenience and distress to teachers and students. Out of school hours, anyone can

walk in and out of schoolgrounds and buildings and cause a great deal of damage. The equipment in science blocks alone is worth thousands and thousands of dollars, but on a night such as this it is virtually unprotected. Perhaps a passerby or a neighbour may see something and report it; no other protection is provided. Not only secondary schools, which contain very valuable teaching equipment, but also primary schools should be fully protected. I cannot see any reason, in the future, for not allocating finance to provide full-time caretakers. Such appointments would have a twofold result: they would provide someone with a home; at the same time, they would give protection to school property. In my opinion, it would be one way of reducing vandalism and the number of fires at schools.

Excellent work is being done by the Board of Adult Education. However, a certain amount of distress was caused this year by the early termination of classes. I asked the Minister a question about this and he gave me an answer with which I was not satisfied. I have heard rumours that classes were terminated early because of a lack of finance. As honourable members are aware, the main adult education classes are held in a building at the corner of William and Alice Streets, and there is a rumour that the venue may be changed. I hope the Minister will ascertain whether there is any truth in the rumour that is abroad in the city that adult education classes are to be held in another part of the city or in a suburban area.

Cultural activities also come under the Minister's administration. Much has been said about the new cultural complex that is to be built at South Brisbane, near Victoria Bridge. Such a complex has been long awaited, and no doubt it will be a wonderful asset to the city when it is complete. Recently, entertainment entrepreneur Michael Edgley said that Brisbane had the worst facilities in Australia for show business ventures. He said, "Don't even mention Her Majesty's to me." It is often said that Her Majesty's should be preserved, and I should like to see it saved for posterity. However, it is a very poor substitute for what is required in a modern theatre, and the sooner a new theatre is built, the better.

I was distressed about what I read in "The Courier-Mail" about the proposed complex. The committee responsible for its planning is referred to as the planning and establishment committee, with Sir David Muir as chairman. It is representative of the Performing Arts Trust, the Library Trust, the Museum Trust and the Art Gallery Trust, but no representative of musical interests is included. If the newspaper article is correct, musical interests in this city have been totally neglected.

Why can't the musical interests have some say in the planning of that very important complex? We have waited long enough for it and have been told that it is going to

cost over \$100,000,000. The committee does not embrace all cultural sections of the community when it does not include a representative of musical interests. The musical world covers a very wide field, not merely bands but the orchestral and choral fields. Representatives of those sections should be able to offer their valuable experience, guidance and wisdom to ensure that no great mistakes are made in the planning of that complex.

The new Conservatorium of Music is a beautiful building, but it has many shortcomings. Many other matters could have been considered if certain interests in the city had been consulted before the architect's final plan was approved. The restriction of representation on committees is too prevalent. It is a great disappointment to the musical interests in Brisbane that they have been overlooked. It is not too late to include them on the committee responsible for the planning of the cultural complex.

A great deal could be said about the cultural aspects of Brisbane. With its natural surroundings we have a beautiful city. It lends itself admirably to development as the best city in Australia culturally if we take advantage of the advice of people who could help to make it that. The last Warana Festival was the best ever. The Warana Festival could become the most magnificent festival in Australia if it were given the right guidance and support.

Mr. Moore: Which beer festival are you speaking about?

Mr. DEAN: The Warana Festival that was instigated in this Chamber. It is only natural that the honourable member's mind would turn to alcohol. He is always very vocal at this time of night. We know where he spends most of his time after dinner. However, that is his business.

I sincerely hope that the Warana Festival will receive the recognition that it deserves. It is well off the ground now. Other interests in the community can maintain their own activities, but I would ask them to co-operate fully with the Government in its desire to make Warana the festival of the year. There is no reason why it should not be as good as the Adelaide Festival of Arts, the Moomba Festival or the festival in Sydney. As a Queenslander I know the Treasurer will do all he can to make Warana Australia's No. 1 festival.

One good aspect about the debate on the Appropriation Bill is that members are given a great deal of latitude and are able to deal with a wide variety of matters. I touch upon the portfolio of Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service. In recent times, as the result of agitation and support of outside interests, national parks have received more recognition than in previous years. Some people tend to exaggerate the situation, but I think everyone is zealous in his desire to see Queensland retain its beautiful national

parks, which rank among the best in Australia. Nearly every issue of the Queensland Government Gazette contains a reference to the setting aside of an area for national park purposes, which is very good. In most instances the area is a large one, and this, too, is very pleasing to note. However, I ask the Minister in charge of national parks to give greater consideration to the smaller areas on the outskirts of the large cities and towns.

The Greater Brisbane Area contains many recreational areas and parks. They are, of course, under the control of the Brisbane City Council; but that fact should not prevent the Government from paying greater attention to developing the recreation areas of Brisbane as tourist attractions. A number of them are, of course, already tourist attractions, but they could be made even more attractive with Government assistance.

Many southern tourists spend their vacation in Brisbane and wish to travel no further north. Their interests should be catered for to a greater extent than at present. The Mt. Coot-tha reserve will prove to be an ideal tourist attraction when completed. A similar area lies adjacent to Parliament House. The Botanic Gardens compare most favourably with any similar gardens in Australia. They, too, are a wonderful tourist attraction.

In your electorate, Mr. Speaker, a lot more could be done for the large number of tourists who visit it. Similarly, in my own area not enough attention is paid to the needs of tourists. It contains the lagoon system, with natural water reserves. One lagoon embraces an area of about 50 acres and another an area of 134 acres. I think they have been overlooked, as other small areas have been, by the Government, which tends to look only at large national parks and reserves.

The Brisbane City Council has done as much as possible to develop tourist attractions in the area under its control. It is, of course, limited by the finance available to it. As I have said on earlier occasions, the Government should take back areas that could be developed into tourist resorts and so develop them. This would benefit not only tourists but also the ratepayers.

A great deal could be done along these lines in the Sandgate and Redcliffe areas. The local authorities are asked to carry too heavy a burden. The Brisbane City Council is responsible for an area of 375 sq. miles.

Mr. Moore: Are you suggesting we break it up into different zones?

Mr. DEAN: That is the last thing I would suggest. I can well recall the time when Sandgate had its own town council—a very poor one in financial terms. If it had not been for the advent of the Greater Brisbane Area, the development that has occurred in Sandgate would never have taken place. Whatever the faults of the Greater Brisbane scheme, they were far outweighed

by its advantages. The people of Sandgate could not have afforded to borrow the money that was necessary to bring about the development that has occurred there. The ratepayers in Sandgate would have been held back for many, many years before they could have afforded to borrow money to pay for the reticulation of sewerage. Instead, it is fully sewered.

Water reticulation is another problem. When I first sat on the council benches in 1952, North Road in Brighton—which you know very well, Mr. Speaker, as you pass it every morning coming to Parliament House—had no water laid on. No water was laid on from Eventide Home, up North Road to the Brighton State School. In fact, it was one of the electioneering points made by all candidates at that time. I was one who used that very extensively. Lack of water in North Road was one of the things that I felt gained my seat in the Sandgate ward. Not wishing to pat myself on the back for the work I did, I am happy to say it was one of the first things I brought about in my representation as a ward alderman. But we gained from being in the Greater Brisbane Area, just as did Wynnum and all the other places 12 miles away from the G.P.O.

On the other side, of course, we lost something. We lost the closer community interest that you have in your own city of Redcliffe, Mr. Speaker—a very closely knit city. The people of Redcliffe have their own town council and I am sure they have a much stronger community interest than we do in Sandgate. We are closer to Brisbane and most of our people think Brisbane rather than Sandgate. That fact must be recognised. Nevertheless, I am quite confident when I say that we gained more from being in the Greater Brisbane Area than if we had remained on our own.

I sincerely hope that, when the Minister for Tourism considers areas round Brisbane, he will give Sandgate some thought and make it one of the tourist attractions, in keeping with other near-city areas.

I shall now take a few more moments of the valuable time of the House. As I said, this is a very tempting debate because it gives one such a wonderful opportunity to spread one's comments over a wide range of topics. We do not often get the opportunity, because with legislation we are restricted. I feel sure that the message is getting home. However, I do wish to mention our present pollution problem. I sincerely hope the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads will deal with the litter problem. He has made many strong Press statements. I hope he backs them up with action. There is no doubt that the people have to be educated.

I am sorry to say that sometimes strong measures have to be taken to educate some people—though not all. There are some very tidy people in the community, but some very untidy ones, too. I hope the Minister

moves soon to do something about this litter problem. When he decides to move, he should either have the Act amended or make sure that the present legislation works. We worked on it for many hours in this place—till the late hours of the night. He should make sure that it is implemented, and implemented in a firm way.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the matters that I rose to speak about. I shall content myself now with the happy thought that the Ministers I have referred to will take cognisance of what I said and implement many of the suggestions I have made for the improvement of the State as a whole.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (8.55 p.m.), in reply: I think I could sum up this debate by adopting a few words of the previous speaker, who said that it was an opportunity to touch upon many subjects and perhaps not to concentrate on any one. That is the nature of the debate as it has taken place this afternoon and tonight. I chose the debate as an opportunity to impress upon the people of Queensland that, in moving an Appropriation Bill and discussing it, we are dealing with the activities of this State over the next 12 months. Having chosen that as my topic I took the opportunity to say a word or two on the responsibilities of citizens on 13 December.

It did not surprise me that the honourable member for Bulimba, in his speech, exercised his right to speak for 1½ hours on what were principally matters pertaining to what could and would happen on 13 December. He is fully aware of the tragedy that will befall the Commonwealth of Australia if by some mischance Mr. Whitlam and some of his colleagues are returned to Government. To make his own alley fairly good, he chose to speak on that matter.

He was followed by the honourable member for Toowong, who always makes a very valued contribution in this Chamber. If people read what he said, there would be no need for me to deal with any other portion of the subjects chosen by the honourable member for Bulimba.

The honourable member for Rockhampton exhibited, as he very often does, that a little learning is a very dangerous thing. He gave his views on Commonwealth-State financial relationships and endeavoured to explain something of the progressive policy that has been enunciated by Mr. Fraser and Mr. Anthony on what will be the position after 13 December, when they have control of the Federal Treasury benches. It is true that I have differed with one or two principles of that policy. But never at any period has the Premier of Queensland or any other Premier in Australia indicated that there will be what might be described as two forms of taxation. The principles that have been put forward by Mr. Fraser and by Mr. Anthony do provide that, if a State so desires, it could implement additional tax to enable it to

carry out some of the things desirable in that State that could not be financed in the normal way under the basis of Commonwealth taxation as it is applicable in Australia today. The honourable member demonstrated quite clearly that, while he had a passing knowledge of the proposal, he did not know the full background of it.

He said that this proposal was investigated—I think that was his word—by the Labor Government some 18 months to two years ago and that it was turned down. There has never been progressive thinking by the A.L.P. in Canberra. This is progressive thinking and, when implemented in the correct manner, it will be for the benefit of the community and not the basis of a double form of taxation as the A.L.P. would have us believe.

The honourable member for Kurilpa gave a run-down on the situation as he sees it applying in Queensland at the present time. I fully agree with him that it is necessary that the people of this State realise what will happen to Australia, and particularly to Queensland, if Whitlam and his henchmen take control of the Commonwealth on Saturday, 13 December. I was very pleased to see a young member of his calibre demonstrating to the people of Queensland, and particularly to members in this Chamber, his ability to so quickly sum up the situation and so ably present his case. He is a good example of the young members who entered Parliament on the Liberal and Country Party side at the last election. No-one entered, of course, on the Labor side. These young fellows obviously have a contribution to make to the advancement of this State and they ensure that there will be suitable people to sit on the ministerial benches when we of the older team decide to move over.

Mr. Houston: He must be very good because the Premier put two candidates against him.

Sir GORDON CHALK: That supports what I have just been saying. He is a member of such outstanding ability that he beat both of them, and your horse—or dog—as well. I should not really call any person a dog; I was thinking of the dog that the honourable member has running later in the evening. But I must return to the serious side of the situation. I appreciate that the honourable member for Bulimba realises the quality of the honourable member for Kurilpa.

Once a year we hear from the honourable member for Sandgate. He is a very dear old gentleman who has made a great contribution in the time in which he has been in this Chamber, and he is a fellow for whom I have a very high regard. I agree with some of the things that he said tonight. He said that there was a need for improvement in schools. No-one denies that. The fact that the Government gives to education a greater budgetary allocation than it does to any other department indicates that we,

too, appreciate the need to expand the educational facilities in this State. I fully agree with him that there are here and there areas requiring attention, and I can assure him that, when funds are available, all these things will be attended to. The Government has never denied benefits to any electorate because it is represented by an A.L.P. member. We are very fair and considerate, and money is spent when it is available wherever the needs seem to us to be the most pressing.

The honourable member stressed the need to increase assistance to the Warana festival, which he said was the best in Queensland. I am not going to argue that matter with him. Although I have a high regard for Warana, the Toowoomba Carnival of Flowers really sets the pattern for the whole of the State. However, the Government recognises that Warana must be helped, and we always provide all the assistance that we can.

I think that that is a fair summary of the debate that has taken place this afternoon and evening. As honourable members will appreciate, my voice is not what it usually is. The honourable member for Sandgate said that it was both calm and easy to listen to. I appreciate his comment. The Bill allocates money for the conduct of the business of the State into the new year. I am sure that, when those sums are approved by Parliament, this Government will spend them wisely and well in the interests of the people of Queensland and the further development of this State.

Motion (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 8, both inclusive, schedule and preamble, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Sir Gordon Chalk, read a third time.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (9.8 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Bill contains provisions which make it the most progressive piece of legislation in this area for many years, and one that has been welcomed by all sections of the community.

Briefly, the Bill's major purpose is to provide complete exemption from succession duty in respect of all successions coming to the spouse of the predecessor where the predecessor was domiciled in the Commonwealth at the date of his or her death.

I will not take up the time of the House repeating what I have already said in regard to the effect that this provision will have on the people of this State. Honourable members will all be aware, I am sure, of the past criticism which has been directed at this form of tax, particularly the taxing of property passing to the surviving spouse. I am sure honourable members will be equally aware of the great benefit which the amendment will eventually bring.

As with all tax concessions, there must be a commencing date, which will result in some people just missing out on the benefit it brings. The Bill provides for a departure from past practice in that the commencing date of the concession is not the date of Royal Assent to the Bill, but 25 September, or the day on which the public announcement was made. For the estates of persons dying prior to 25 September, the previous exemption for the spouse of \$50,000, plus \$5,000 for each dependant child, will apply.

The Bill also provides for the rebate of duty, presently available where the predecessor is domiciled in Queensland and estate duty is paid in another part of the British Commonwealth on assets situated in that country, to be available in respect of duty paid in any country.

The Bill will amend the Act to make it clear that extinguishment of debt, whether effected within three years prior to date of death or effected by the deceased's will, will be subjected to duty as a succession in terms of the Act.

The amendment proposed in respect of section 11C will make it clear that where marketable securities forming part of estate assets at date of death fall in over-all value or are sold at an over-all loss or a combination of both to a date 12 months after death, the value of those marketable securities at date of death will be reduced by the amount by which the loss exceeds 10 per cent of the total value of the estate.

In his remarks when the Bill was introduced into the House, the honourable member for Landsborough raised the problems associated with the primary producer and the burden which can arise in regard to the payment of duty. However, I would point out that the Act already provides very generous concessions in respect of the estates of primary producers. Where the value of the estate is less than \$120,000, a rebate of 50 per cent of the duty payable on rural property is granted, reducing to a minimum rebate of 10 per cent where the value of the estate exceeds \$200,000. This has been of great benefit to the primary producer. There is also an additional concession available if the primary producer was resident in certain isolated areas of the State. Further, the commissioner is empowered to waive any claim to interest where, because of the effects of drought, the duty is not paid in the prescribed time.

While statistics are not available which would show the proportion of duty derived by the State from the estates of primary producers, it is only to be expected that it would be reasonably significant because of the large number of persons engaged in primary production in this State, and the dominant role played by them in the economy of Queensland.

There is one point I would like to make clear, and which may not have been evident in what has been said on this matter. The Bill will exempt from duty successions passing to the spouse. It does not change the provisions of the Act which establish the value of the estate for the purpose of determining the rate of duty payable on successions passing to other than the spouse. This has not changed.

It is the policy of the Government to phase out death duties, and it has no plans to replace them or supplement them by any form of capital gains tax, regardless of any similarity that may exist between the two. As I pointed out previously, the revenue obtained from this source is substantial and it will take time to fully implement this policy. I might also mention that, as finalisation of estates can take considerable time, the full impact of the exemption to the spouse will not be felt on State revenues until 1976-77 or possibly later, and for this reason the revenue estimate for this financial year has not been greatly affected by the exemption.

The measures contained in the Bill have been welcomed by honourable members on both sides of the House, and, together with the complementary gift duty exemption, they provide a most generous concession from which many Queenslanders will benefit.

In commending the Bill to the House, I might say that I have been surprised by the number of letters I have received from people complimenting the Government on this move and, naturally, urging that further concessions be made as time goes on.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (9.15 p.m.): As indicated at the introductory stage, the Opposition supports this move. As a matter of fact we have urged for such a move for some considerable time. In the 1972 and 1974 elections it was part of Labor's policy. Naturally we are very pleased to see the introduction of the Bill.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Unfortunately, when in Opposition it is not one's duty to do it. We will see what happens federally. I have used what little influence I might have in that field to have action taken on a Federal basis. Because of the different taxation system in the Federal field, as the honourable member would realise, it is not quite as simple there. However, I am happy that the State has taken the lead. I do not want to take any of the credit away from the

Government that finally saw the wisdom of such legislation or from the Treasurer who brought the Bill down.

Succession duty has been a worry not only to the ordinary worker but also to many people engaged in primary industries and business. In days gone by, many people mistakenly had the belief that all property should be in the husband's name, despite the fact that the wife may have contributed substantially to the purchase of the property and that curtains, etc., in the house had been made by her. Very often the amount of death duty payable on the death of the husband was only small, but the worry was always there for the wife. Unfortunately, there are always those in the community who consider themselves to be experts and pass on information which is not accurate in the final analysis.

I will not labour the point. The Opposition accepts the legislation and looks forward to an extension of the principle of looking after those who are entitled to receive money from members of their family, money which they may have helped to earn and paid taxes on at some stage.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (9.18 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in this debate because over many years I have attended meetings throughout the countryside where resolutions covering the abolition of succession duty have been passed. The Government is taking a very progressive step. I compliment the Treasurer and the Government for having had the wisdom to bring this legislation down.

In my part of the world there has been enormous resentment against succession duty. Probably all of us have attended meetings where resolutions condemning succession duty and urging the Government to do something about it have been passed. Therefore it is with a great deal of pleasure that I discuss a Bill that does give relief from succession duty. We all know how a husband and wife work together as a team on a small farm, a sheep property, a cattle property or in a small corner store. A young couple might even open up a solicitor's office in a small country town.

With the present very high rate of inflation, which was created by the Federal Labor Government while in office, the value of many family homes has risen to such an extent that they are now worth approximately what the average business was worth three or four years ago. The payment of succession duty affects not only the businessman or the farmer, or any particular group, but the community as a whole.

As the honourable member for Bulimba pointed out, many wives put a great deal of thought and planning into setting up the family home. They make curtains and do a lot of other things to help make it comfortable. They have the right to expect to receive a share of the home on the death of the husband. Similarly, a dairy farmer's wife

who milks the cows or a grazier's wife who works on the property should be entitled to receive a share of the property under similar circumstances. In many instances the wife has contributed money to the home, to the dairy farm or to the property.

Through the sudden death of the husband, perhaps as the result of an accident or illness, many wives suffer great hardship. It will be eased to a great extent by this progressive and humanitarian measure. I hope that the Government will go further. The Bill refers to the passing of property from spouse to spouse. The arguments in support of it can be put forward also in relation to the passing of property from a parent to the son or daughter. Many families operate a farm or a property as a family business. Such a situation exists in many areas, for example, in the brigalow lands.

A family might work hard in a mining area for four or five years to put away enough money to pay a deposit on a small business or on a farm. In such circumstances the son might work hard in the business without any remuneration whatever, for the simple reason that the family business simply cannot afford to pay him. If the father is killed in an accident, the son, who has spent four or five years working in the business—perhaps he contributed some capital—should be entitled to some consideration. Quite often a young man who finds himself in that situation is forced to sell the farm or the business.

I should like to see the abolition of succession duty as it applies to the passing of property from the husband or wife to the children. I am not sure, however, that we should go much further than that. Admittedly in some instances a relation, or even a complete outsider, might be involved in a business and placed in a situation similar to that of the son or daughter. But I believe that the disadvantages of extending the concession would outweigh the benefits. I have never been one who adheres to a policy that would allow people merely to pass great sums of money on to anyone. I am a great believer in seeing people work for themselves and do something for themselves. I would not like to see the situation arise where someone could pass on millions of dollars to a person who has done nothing whatsoever towards accumulating that sort of money.

Mr. Greenwood: Maybe he should give it to the Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT: As I said before, if that person has played some part in the business or has some association with it, obviously we have a very real problem.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall resume my seat.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (9.26 p.m.), in reply: I appreciate the remarks that have been made by both the member for Bulimba and the member for Cunningham. It is

true that this is very important legislation. It brings great benefit to the community. In fact, it is legislation that over a long period of time has been advocated in very many circles.

I pay tribute to the advocacy of what I might term the three "C's". The honourable member for Condamine, my ministerial colleague, has been advocating this for some time. The honourable member for Cunningham has shown tonight his ability as another young man who can come into the Chamber fully expressive. Then there is the member for Carnarvon. He also has been a great advocate of this legislation.

I was quite interested in the contribution made by the member for Ashgrove, who suggested that, perhaps, if there is any surplus, it could be passed over to the Government. That is quite all right, too. The member for Brisbane is one who has been advocating this, too.

This legislation is an indication of the progressiveness of the Government. It is legislation, as I said, that is appreciated even by the Opposition. When I have the support of the Opposition in such a contribution as was made by the member for Bulimba, I feel the Government is continuing on a progressive path and one that I repeat is for the benefit of the community and the people of Queensland.

Motion (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 16, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Sir Gordon Chalk, by leave, read a third time.

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (9.30 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The proposals contained in the Bill are in the main necessary to provide additional revenue to the State to help meet increased costs and to offset concessions provided in the Budget in respect of death and gift duties. As I pointed out to honourable members when introducing the Bill, it has been possible in most cases to keep the new rates of duty at levels no higher than those prevailing in other States, and in some cases the new rates will still be considerably less.

Before commenting on matters raised by honourable members during the introductory debate, I will briefly outline the major increases in duty provided for in the Bill.

- * Duty on credit business in excess of the prescribed rate of interest of 14 per cent is increased from 1 per cent to 1.5 per cent while duty on rental business is increased from $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 1 per cent. Where the annual rental turnover is less than \$4,000, previously \$2,000, duty at 1 per cent will not be payable.
- * A new provision dealing specifically with credit cards is introduced. The duty will be the total stamp duty that would have been paid had the credit card holder drawn a cheque in favour of each supplier of goods and services (regardless of the number of individual transactions with the supplier) less an amount of 10c. I will have more to say on bankcards later.
- * Duty on cheques is increased from 6c to 10c while the duty on a bill of exchange of any other kind or a promissory note is increased from 10c to 12c per \$100 of the value for which the bill or note is drawn. However, where the bill or note is drawn for a period of less than 120 days, the duty will be 1c for every \$100 for every 10 days, or part of 10 days, of the term of the bill. When the bill has been appropriately stamped in another State, and is subsequently negotiated in any manner in Queensland, nominal duty of 10c only will be payable.
- * The rate of duty on conveyances will be increased from the present single rate of \$1.25 per \$100 of the value of the consideration for sale to a progressive scale of duty commencing at \$1.50 per \$100 when the value of the consideration is less than \$20,000, rising to \$3.50 per \$100 on that part of the value of the consideration in excess of \$500,000. Persons acquiring property as their principal place of residence will pay the lowest rate of duty irrespective of the value of the consideration.
- * The duty on instalment purchase agreements increases from an approximate rate of 1 per cent of purchase price to an ad valorem rate of 1.5 per cent of purchase price.
- * Leases will now be subject to duty on the total rent paid at the rate of 35c per \$100 of rental instead of the present 25c per \$100 of annual rent. To ensure that no-one is required to pay an unduly burdensome amount of duty at the commencement of a long-term lease, duty is accountable triennially.
- * The rate of duty on general insurance is increased from 2½c per \$100 of sum assured to 5c per \$100 of sum assured.
- * The basis of duty levied on motor vehicle comprehensive insurance policies is changed from 45c per vehicle to 5c per \$1 of the net premium payable.
- * Stamp duty on workers' compensation insurance is increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent of premium.

In addition to those outlined above, fixed rates of duty under a number of headings in the schedule are increased from \$1 to \$4, or in some cases from 25c to \$1. Duplicates of documents will be 50c each instead of the present 25c.

A number of concessions are provided for in the Bill. Refunds of conveyance duty will be available provided application is made within six months of the date of rescission of the contract. The present provision in the Act limits the time in which the application for refund can be made to within 12 months of date of execution of the contract. Under the new provision the commissioner is empowered to extend the prescribed period where special circumstances exist.

The value of development work required to be carried out by the lessee under a lease from the Crown or a public body will be exempt from ad valorem conveyance duty. Ad valorem conveyance duty will no longer be claimed when the relevant instruments effect the transfer of property from an association to its substitute incorporated body where it is a non-profit community organisation.

Indemnities executed by the payee of a cheque in favour of the drawer where the drawer draws a cheque to replace one lost or destroyed will not be subject to duty. Security instruments executed by marketing boards and the like to secure crop finance are now exempt from duty.

In general, the provisions of the Bill will come into effect on 1 December or the date of assent to the Bill, whichever is the later. However, the increases in the rate of duty on insurance will be effective from 1 January, while the changes to the Act with respect to leases will operate from a date to be proclaimed so that necessary administrative arrangements can be made.

In the debate at the introductory stage, the honourable member for Bulimba drew attention to what he considered were overly large increases in the rates of duty applying to insurance policies. I want to place these increases in their proper perspective. With the exception of New South Wales, all other States charge stamp duty as a percentage of premium. In one case this percentage is 7 per cent. In New South Wales, the rate of duty is 7c per \$100 of the sum assured, which is 40 per cent higher than the rate proposed in the Bill. Queensland policyholders are still therefore comparatively much better off than those in other States.

I might add that consideration was given to changing the basis of duty to a percentage of premium. However, having regard to the higher premiums paid by people in the cyclone areas of northern Queensland, and the higher premiums paid by other owners of property which face special risks, it was decided that this basis of levying duty was inequitable in the particular circumstances which exist in Queensland.

With respect to motor vehicle comprehensive policies, most other States levy stamp duty as a percentage of the premium payable, ranging from 5 per cent to 7 per cent. In this particular instance, there was no good reason why the Queensland policyholder need pay only a nominal amount of duty compared to those in other States.

The provisions in the Bill relating to stamp duty on Bankcard operations seek to ensure that the State will not lose revenue as a result of Bankcard operation and the fact that fewer cheques would be drawn, and I thought I detected in the speech by the honourable member for Bulimba some support for the principle that the State should not lose in these sorts of circumstances. Regardless of what the banks might say, I am satisfied that the State would have suffered heavy loss of revenue without this legislation. I do not deny that in a number of cases the cardholder may previously have used cash to settle his accounts. However, in many cases Bankcard would supplant payments of monthly accounts by cheque.

I do not propose to enter into debate as to the relative merits or demerits of Bankcards at this time. They are here. They are a fact of life, and so long as the revenue of the State is protected, I would not seek to prevent their operation. However, I want to quickly go over the administrative aspects with respect to stamp duty on Bankcards so that the position is clear.

It will be the responsibility of banks and other credit card organisations to file the required returns and pay the required duty. Where a bank or other operator fails to lodge a return, the Governor-in-Council may declare it to be non-compliant and it is then the immediate responsibility of the individual cardholder to lodge the return and pay the required duty. This will also apply in the case where the issuer of the card to a person resident in Queensland does not carry on business in Queensland. It will therefore be in the interests of both the issuer of the credit card and its clients for a bank or other operator to make arrangements with the commissioner for the lodgment of a single return in respect of all its cardholders. It will be administratively easier for the commissioner and all concerned, and on behalf of the commissioner I ask for the assistance of those persons operating outside Queensland and issuing credit cards to persons resident in Queensland. Obviously, their failure to co-operate will impose burdens on their Queensland clients which would tend to turn them away from the operator who refuses such co-operation.

As I pointed out when I introduced the Bill, and also at the beginning of this speech, the new rates of duty will still leave Queensland relatively well off in terms of severity of taxation. However, as costs continue to escalate and demands for services continue to increase, it is not possible to give an

assurance that this will always be so. On the whole, honourable members have appeared to accept the necessity for the increases proposed, especially in the light of comparisons of duty levels in other States, and it is on that basis that I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (9.43 p.m.): On an analysis of the Bill I think it becomes very obvious that its main function is to increase the State's tax revenue. Of course, the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill was one with which the State was giving new concessions to the people and, as the Treasurer said, thereby reducing the State taxing power in certain directions. Because the main consideration of that Bill was the relief of spouse to spouse succession duty I think one could assume that it was aimed mainly at people in the older age group because it is in that age group where one unfortunately tends to lose one's partner, although I agree that accidents and the like affect all age groups. But the Bill had application basically to the older age group.

I believe that what the Treasurer has done here is take up the loss of revenue caused by the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill and impose a further burden through this Bill on the younger members of our community to keep the State's coffers buoyant. This will occur because of stamp duty being paid mainly on transactions conducted by younger people in the early days of their married life.

In some cases the rises have been of the order of 100 per cent, while in other cases they have been as high as 300 per cent. Without having the information available to the Government, it is almost impossible for the Opposition to analyse completely each section in detail. The Opposition has to take them en masse on the basis that they have been processed by the Treasury Department. Although some of the increases appear to be steeper than one would wish, one has to accept that the duties have been fixed after comparisons have been made of the relative importance of transactions and of the amount of business transacted in particular cases.

In the case of cheques, I believe that the Treasurer has gone too far. Today, cheque accounts are part and parcel of the way of life of most people. There are, of course, still people who operate on savings bank accounts, but the majority of people today, particularly where both husband and wife have an income, have cheque accounts, and certainly the business community makes extensive use of them.

Mr. Frawley: Do you pay the bookies at the dogs by cheque?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, I do not. I am very fortunate; in most cases they pay me in cash. I do not have to worry about that aspect of it.

The increase in stamp duty from 6c to 10c on each cheque—in other words, an increase of 66⅔ per cent—is a major increase. It will certainly affect the cost structure of businesses that have to write many cheques; it will also affect the ordinary household. When one takes into account the new postage rates and the additional stamp duty on a cheque, one sees that they add considerably to the amount being paid. It will not be worth paying smaller accounts by cheque.

As to Bankcards—the Government and the Treasurer interpreted correctly my remarks at the introductory stage. I believe that those who operate Bankcards have a similar responsibility to those who operate cheques. However, I think that the Treasurer has gone overboard in relation to the charges to be imposed on banks. Not only is he going to impose the usual duty of 10c on each transaction by the operator of the Bankcard—and let us not kid ourselves, Mr. Speaker; the bank will pass that on to the person who has the Bankcard—but in addition, it will be the costly responsibility of the bank to prepare a monthly return and submit it to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties. As a result, the banks will have to increase their staff. It is all very well for a bank to keep Bankcard accounts; but they will find it very costly indeed to process those accounts, complete a return on the appropriate form, assess the tax and then send it to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties. Again, I believe that the banks will pass on that charge to the holders of Bankcards. I cannot imagine for one moment that the banks will carry that additional cost themselves. Under this legislation, those who have Bankcards will find that the cost of operating them is in excess of the cost of operating the ordinary cheque accounts that are now the order of the day.

I cannot imagine that the companies which make available American Express cards and Diners' Club cards and have their headquarters in other States will fall into line with the Treasurer's wish to have them furnish the Commissioner of Stamp Duties, through the proper channels, with the returns that he requires. In my opinion, they will very soon be designated non-complying financial organisations. This will create a good deal of confusion in the minds of people who hold American Express or Diners' Club cards.

Many operate on them only on very limited occasions. They might not use them for two or three years, and when they do use them it might be for only four or five transactions because of a trip overseas or interstate. Those people are not likely to be aware that they have to furnish returns. What check will the State Government have? If there are non-complying financial institutions in Melbourne, Sydney or Canberra, how is the State Government going to know who has a Bankcard of that type? Unless

the person volunteers the information, how will the Commissioner of Stamp Duties know? Will it be a matter of the honest person complying and another person not complying? Will it be that those who know comply, and those who do not know do not comply but somebody puts them in and then they will be subject to the \$200 fine provided for?

There will be complications with world-wide organisations as distinct from the Bankcard system basically designed for use in one's home town or State.

I said at the introductory stage that I was concerned about taxation being applied to people who were prudent and doing things to protect themselves. I am not at all happy with the idea of constantly increasing taxation on those who want to protect their assets by insurance policies and those who are compelled by law to take out workers' compensation policies. Incidentally, I agree with that principle. We talk about helping those who have to pay rent, but again they are going to be taxed.

Although I can understand the Government's desire to get extra revenue, I cannot agree with certain clauses of the Bill which mean that prudent people will be hit by additional taxation in this form. I know we cannot stop the legislation. It is part of the Government's policy and part of the Budget brought down by the Treasurer. I hope I have made it clear that we are not happy with some provisions of the Bill. The Treasurer has used the argument that we are better off than other States. I refer him to his earlier statement that we have led the way in progressive legislation. I suggest that the Treasurer let us lead the way in relief from taxation on rent, insurance policies and other things that prudent people are doing which, in the long run, save the State finance and responsibility.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (9.54 p.m.): The increase in stamp duty on cheques from 6c to 10c is rather excessive in view of the other charges already imposed on cheque transactions. The bank itself imposes a charge of 10c for each cheque that is written. That means that in future each cheque we write is going to cost us 20c. The bank charges are as follows:—1 to 20 transactions, \$1.70; 21 to 45 transactions, \$3; transactions in excess of 45, an average of 10c per transaction. This means that every time a bank officer pushes the button on the computer, the customer is charged approximately 10c. It costs more and more to pay accounts by cheque.

The honourable member for Bulimba referred to Diners' Club cards. He pointed out that such a card could be issued in Sydney and that the holder of the card could be responsible for furnishing a return every time he used the card. I do not think he would bother to do that. In fact such a provision would be very hard to police.

Although these charges may bring in revenue to the Government, they will not be received very kindly by the public. This applies also to Bankcard. I am not at all happy with it. I am sure it will add to the cost of living.

Mr. Gibbs: Won't they give you one?

Mr. MELLOY: I have one, but I haven't used it. I don't think I will be using it.

Stores that accept Bankcards pay 4 per cent to the Bankcard organisation on all their Bankcard transactions. This means that the 4 per cent increase will be added to the cost of the item purchased. There is no way that stores will meet the 4 per cent out of their own funds; they are sure to pass it on to the consumers. Furthermore, stores that do not accept Bankcards will likewise increase their prices. If, for example, a store is selling shoes at \$24 a pair and learns that a nearby store is selling the same type of shoes for \$25 a pair, it will increase its price to \$25. It will charge the same price as that charged by the other store. So no matter where a customer goes, he will, in effect, be paying the additional 4 per cent that is paid to the Bankcard organisation.

Stores will not know whether or not customers carry Bankcards. In order to provide for that contingency, they will increase their prices by 4 per cent, with the result that all customers, whether or not they hold Bankcards, will pay the additional cost.

As I have said, a person who has a current account at a bank and also has a Bankcard will pay 10c stamp duty on each cheque, approximately 10c on each bank transaction and 4 per cent on each purchase made with a Bankcard. In view of that, I do not see the Bankcard system will be of great benefit to the average shopper.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. MELLOY: Government members seem to be joking about the fact that they will pay more for their banking transactions. They will wake up. The increase in stamp duty is one of the measures outlined in the Budget as a means of obtaining more revenue for the Government.

Mr. Lamont: Take your hand out of your pocket so we can watch you—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MELLOY: The honourable member is as big a dill as he looks.

Mr. Moore: Who's got the hand up your back, working the rods?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MELLOY: I have made it clear what I think about Bankcard. I do not know what the Treasurer's attitude is. He is having two bob each way. He wants to be in it and he wants to get a few quid out of it.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your attention. To the other members of the Chamber—I don't think I can thank them for anything.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.1 p.m.), in reply: I have listened to the two honourable members from the Opposition who have spoken on this legislation. It is true that no-one likes a Bill that increases taxes. On the other hand, I believe that, in presenting the Budget and also in introducing this Bill, I indicated the need for the State to go through the various forms of its taxation to see from what avenues we could gain extra revenue without making excessive charges, at the same time keeping within the limit that applies in other States. In other words, I said that any of the charges that I proposed would not place Queenslanders at a disadvantage compared to residents of other parts of Australia. That applies to all of the fields in which we raised taxation charges. However, it is true that we have set the pattern with Bankcard—a pattern which, quite candidly, I believe will be followed in several other States in a very short time.

One other matter is that, from the word "go", those who were responsible for the introduction and administration of Bankcard into Queensland were fully aware of a clause in our Act that was relevant to this matter. It is true that they wanted to argue that, as it was written, the obligation under the clause could be avoided. I made it abundantly clear right from the first interview that I had with those who were the representatives selected to see me on behalf of the banks that, if the legal advice tendered to me by Queen's Counsel indicated that the Act as it stood was perhaps challengeable, we would amend the Act so as to ensure that we would not lose revenue—revenue which I contended we would lose if the Bankcard system came into operation and replaced the issue of cheques by many people. So at no stage do I feel that I have to apologise to the banks or to the people who have taken out Bankcards, because at the time quite a lot of publicity was given to my utterances.

Having said that, I will now examine some of the remarks of the member for Bulimba and the member for Nudgee. I am surprised at the latter remarks of the honourable member for Nudgee, because in his opening words he indicated that he did possess and operate a Bankcard.

Mr. Melloy: No. I said that I have one but have never used it, and I don't intend to use it.

Sir GORDON CHALK: That is like going to the races, looking over the fence and not backing a horse. He is the holder of a Bankcard. I accept that he does not intend to use it, and that makes it even more difficult for me to understand him.

His principal concern is that this will add to costs. I do not deny that it might, but his statement that one business house that does not accept Bankcards will put up the price of its goods and make it comparable to the price at the shop down the road that does accept Bankcards indicates that the honourable member has not had much business association. Competition will always be the first consideration in business activity. If someone who does not accept Bankcards can sell his goods cheaper, I am certain that he will go after the cash custom, and most thrifty buyers will seek out the shop where the goods are cheaper.

Let me now deal with the operation of the card itself. I have made it abundantly clear in the legislation that I expect that the banks, the Diners' Club, American Express and others will accept the responsibility of lodging the return. If they do not, they will very soon find out that one of their competitors will. Once that situation arises, there will be a uniform operation in the whole transaction.

It has been said that the bank will have an extra duty to perform. The bank, having amassed the accounts for all of the transactions of an individual at a particular store, will feed the information into its computer. When the firms are paid the bank must indicate to the trading company that it is paying so much on behalf of Mr. Smith for the period under review. It will then be a very simple operation for the bank to prepare its return to the State at the same time. I am one of those who believe that, while some small additional work will be involved, the banks will very quickly overcome this problem and accept the obligation on behalf of their clients. If they do not, they will soon find that competition will enter into the matter and one banking organisation will accept the responsibility in the hope of drawing business to itself.

It has been claimed that the banks will receive 4 per cent on their transactions. I have not seen that admitted by the banks, although I have been told that it is true. I understand that organisations such as the Diners' Club collect 7 per cent on their operations. If that is the case, it is a question of knowing whether the banks are making a profit on their operations. I do not think that the Diners' Club or American Express is going broke. I believe that by way of service to their clients they, too, will collect the funds that the State is looking for.

That is the basis on which I have put the legislation forward. I am quite sure that it will mean additional revenue to the State. I have never hidden that fact. It ensures that the State will not lose revenue owing to the operation of this form of control of credit-handling.

The banks will provide certain funds on the basis that, if the account is paid within 25 days, no charge will be made on the

use of the money. That may be a drawback. On the other hand, the banks are also saying, "If you go over that period, you will pay at the rate of 1½ per cent a month." In other words, the rate will be 18 per cent per annum. The banks will get a fair rake-off if that happens. On that basis I felt that the State was entitled to what might be termed its due for the replacement of the use of cheques by Bankcards.

I appreciate the remarks of the honourable members concerning taxation generally. It is true that no-one likes increasing taxation, but it is essential in a State and Commonwealth in which costs are constantly rising and the Government has a responsibility to find funds for the facilities that it provides. It is on that basis that I have brought the Bill before the House.

Motion (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 14, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—New s. 64A; Provisions affecting the term of leases and payment of duty on leases—

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (10.13 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 10, after line 32, insert the following words—

'(8) For the purposes of this section, it shall be taken that the rental provided for in any instrument is one that cannot be ascertained if it is to be varied during the tenancy provided for by reference to any movement or change that cannot be calculated or quantified at the time the instrument is submitted to the Commissioner.'

The purpose of the amendment is to overcome a problem which has arisen in relation to a matter of legal interpretation of one of the provisions of the Bill. The intention of the amending Bill in relation to leases is that, if the total rent for the term of the lease cannot be calculated at the time it is presented for stamping after initial execution, the rental is to be estimated and the duty calculated on that estimated figure.

The problem is that under the wording of the measure in the amending Bill certain leases providing for a commencing rental which is subject to variation through the term of the lease in the light of movements in an indicator such as the Consumer Price Index or in the level of the lessee's business turnover could be considered because of the existence of a firm commencing rental to be a lease in respect of which the rental is capable of being ascertained at the time the document is presented for initial stamping. If the provisions were interpreted to this effect, such a lease would then have to be re-presented to the Commissioner of

Stamp Duties for stamping each time the rental was adjusted to take account of movements in the index or other relevant factor.

The amending provision will make it clear that, where the rental is to be adjusted in the light of an index or other factor, the lease is to be regarded as a lease with an unascertainable rental and stamped according to the estimated rent through the life of the lease. Leases stamped on this basis then have to be re-presented to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties at the end of the term of the lease or at the end of each three-year period. I have discussed this matter with certain legal representatives of a number of small businesses in this State, who have pointed out to me that the leases do have an adjustment because of index rises or because of an increase in business. The Government has no intention to create any hardship or to collect any additional revenue in relation to the broad principle that we are trying to put forward. On that basis, I have been quite happy to accept the proposal in this amendment.

Amendment (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 18, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Sir Gordon Chalk, by leave, read a third time.

POULTRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.19 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

I was pleased to note the wide interest displayed in the introductory debate on this Bill by members on both sides of the House, who appeared to be generally in accord with its aims.

The main objectives, as I outlined in my introductory speech, are:

- * Firstly, to change the composition of the Poultry Advisory Board.
- * Secondly, to make provision for the payment of egg industry precepts by commercial producers outside of egg marketing board areas.
- * Thirdly, to upgrade the qualifications of licensed chicken sexers.
- * Fourthly, to review the powers of inspectors and to extend those where necessary to ensure that hygiene standards are maintained in accordance with modern requirements.

I would like to thank the honourable member for Port Curtis for his general support for the Bill.

I might add that I regret the sudden illness of the honourable member for Port Curtis, a man who is held in high regard by every member of this House, and I am sure all hope and pray for his speedy recovery. Quite naturally, the Opposition spokesman has reserved his right to further comment after a closer study of the Bill, but I was particularly happy to have his support for the proposed inspectorial powers, which are designed, of course, for the protection of the public and of the high standards established by the Queensland poultry industry.

I would also like to thank the honourable member for Redlands for his thoughtful contribution to the debate.

The honourable member for Somerset requested information on the incidence of an avian tuberculosis in Queensland, and I am happy to be able to advise him that it is virtually non-existent. Some cases were recorded in small backyard flocks at Yelarbon over 10 years ago, but the outbreak was brought under control and there has been no record of the disease in poultry in Queensland since that time.

The honourable members for Kurilpa, Landsborough and Stafford referred to the technological advances made by the poultry industry in the last 10 to 20 years. There is no doubt that the changes that have taken place have ensured healthier and more productive flocks. These, in turn, have resulted in eggs and poultry meat for consumers at lower cost than would otherwise be the case. These same changes have made it necessary to amend a number of sections of the Act.

While the proposed changes to the Poultry Advisory Board were generally well received, some honourable members, including those for Callide, Townsville and Merthyr, had some reservations. I would point out to honourable members that I will in no way be losing contact with the board's activities, as two senior officers of my department are members and the board will continue to make its recommendations to me. I do not chair any of the other boards set up under legislation under my control, but I can assure honourable members that I have no difficulty in remaining in touch with their activities. The proposed change will give the board greater flexibility to arrange meetings, and will free me to attend to other pressing matters which can arise at very short notice.

Quite understandably, a number of honourable members expressed some concern at the question of extending the collection of precepts to growers in northern areas. The honourable member for Mackay was one of these, as was the honourable member for Barron River.

The honourable members for Flinders and Mt. Isa requested that producers be assured of increased departmental services when the precepts were imposed, and the honourable member for Mourilyan expressed the hope

that they would not escalate once they were imposed on a State-wide basis. I think I should point out that the appropriate provision in the Bill simply empowers me to extend the precepts to growers outside board areas at some appropriate time. I assure honourable members that I have no immediate plans to introduce precepts in North Queensland. It was considered, however, that this provision should be included at the same time as the other amendments were under consideration.

Although some suggestions to the contrary were made at the introductory stage, the honourable member for Landsborough was perfectly correct when he said that the services provided by my department's advisory staff in North Queensland, with the exception of Mt. Isa, are possibly of a higher order than those in southern areas. The adviser at Townsville visits most producers in the coastal area from Mossman to Proserpine every six to eight weeks. The producer at Charters Towers, and, for that matter, any other producer, can obtain assistance at any time simply by phoning.

Unfortunately, distance and low numbers preclude the same service being provided for Mt. Isa, but a divisional veterinary officer is located at that centre and should be contacted in emergencies. Producers at Mackay receive assistance from the adviser at Rockhampton, who normally visits the area at least once each quarter.

The matter of maintaining quality of eggs and poultry products was raised by the honourable members for Bundaberg, Cunningham and Toowoomba North. There appeared to be general agreement with the increased powers of inspectors to check the hygiene and health of such products and to seize and dispose of products found to be unfit for human consumption.

The proposed amendments to require increased efficiency before the issue of first-class licences to chicken sexers were accorded general approval.

The honourable member for Stafford requested information on the proportion of the 95c a dozen paid by the housewife for the largest grade of eggs that goes in taxes, precepts and marketing board fees. Although this does not strictly come within the ambit of the proposed legislation, I am quite happy to answer his question. The hen levy would amount to 6c, precepts 0.26c, board handling, grading and administration charges 9.14c, and the pool deduction 8c a dozen, or a total of approximately 23.4c a dozen.

The honourable member also challenged the proposed indemnity clause to give inspectors protection for actions taken when carrying out their duties under the Act.

I can assure honourable members that there is no intention to protect officers from responsibility if they are negligent in carrying out their duties. However, there is a real need to give them protection from action

should untoward effects result from advice given on the best of available knowledge and in good faith by officers of my department.

I would like to thank members for their support for the Bill, which contains many amendments of great value to the industry. I commend it to the further attention of the House.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (10.25 p.m.): Unfortunately the honourable member for Port Curtis is ill and consequently unable to take part in this debate.

The first matter I should like to comment on is the composition of the board. We are happy to see that the producing section of the industry is to have a majority on the board of 4:3. That is very desirable because the producers are the people mostly concerned with the industry.

The Minister referred to the fact that the honourable member for Stafford had raised the matter of charges and levies on eggs. That is a point of interest, too, because those matters are associated with the industry. The economics of the industry are important to the public. If 23c or 24c a dozen is charged against the producer initially—the consumer subsequently pays it—that is rather a large amount. It could be said that 24c out of 95c is not chicken feed! Although it may be necessary for the board to receive this income, it is a great imposition on the consumer. Although apparently there is no shortage of eggs at any time, their cost appears to be going up all the time. That is hitting the housewife hard because in many households eggs play a prominent part in the staple diet of the family.

I notice that certain controls over chicken sexers are going to be established. I do not know much about that section of the industry, but apparently chicken-sexing is an important part of it. I saw a segment on TV tonight which showed a mechanical chicken-sexing apparatus in use. The commentator referred to the fact that a pile-driver was being used on the chickens. Another point made was that all the male chickens are destroyed because nobody wants them. I do not know whether those male chickens are a loss to the consuming public or whether they could be reared and sold on the market as food. The Minister might be able to tell me why only the female chickens are retained.

As to the power to seize and dispose of poultry foods found unfit for human consumption—I was wondering how far that extends to such places as Kentucky Chicken. Is there any control over the quality of the chickens supplied to them? On one TV segment it was alleged that rabbits' legs were being used in one Californian chicken store. I do not know whether a matter such as this is covered by the Health Act, but I suggest that the supply of chickens to such stores could be examined.

I have nothing further to add. As the House realises, I am speaking in place of our shadow Minister. Generally, the Opposition accepts the Bill.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (10.30 p.m.): I do not wish to delay the House unduly, but I want to comment on the fact that, since the inception of the Poultry Industry Act, which was at the request of the industry, the Minister is severing his intimate association with the industry through the Poultry Advisory Board. I suppose it can be said that this is now possible because all the objectives that were aimed at when the Poultry Industry Act was brought into being have now been achieved. I refer to the rationalisation and regularisation of the poultry industry. It is fair to say that as a result of the introduction of the Act, the poultry industry is established on a sound basis with all aspects of it stabilised. I am sure that I speak on behalf of the industry when I say how much it appreciated the interest shown in it by successive Ministers and departmental officers. The poultry industry has now reached the highest peak of efficiency and is, without doubt, the most efficient primary industry in the State.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.33 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Nudgee for his comments. As he indicated, he is acting on behalf of the shadow Minister, Mr. Hanson, who is incapacitated. He indicated that the amendments are acceptable. He did make the point about the cost of 23.4c a dozen. As I outlined, there are charges and, as in many other instances, charges have to be passed on to the consumer; but I can assure the honourable member they are kept as low as possible.

The honourable member spoke of chicken-sexing and the TV programme tonight. I, too, saw it and thought it was rather interesting. It seems a waste to destroy baby roosters, but I should imagine that if there were a market for them the industry would avail itself of that market.

As to the query about chickens that eventually find themselves in Kentucky Fried Chicken, I assure the honourable member that poultry abattoirs are under very strict supervision by my poultry inspection staff.

Mr. Melloy: Are only hens accepted at these places?

Mr. Campbell: Broilers. Five per cent of hens and 95 per cent of broilers.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Does the honourable member refer to poultry abattoirs?

Mr. Melloy: No, the Kentucky Fried Chicken shops.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The honourable member for Aspley mentioned that 95 per cent would be broilers grown for the chicken-meat industry.

I thank the honourable member for Aspley for his comment. As all honourable members are aware, he has had a very long association with the poultry industry. I think it was his father who was responsible for setting up the Egg Marketing Board. I have always found it comforting to have somebody sitting alongside me who has such a great depth of knowledge about this segment of my ministerial responsibility.

Motion (Mr. Sullivan) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 20, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

The House adjourned at 10.37 p.m.