

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 1976

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 1976

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

QUEENSLAND ROAD SAFETY COUNCIL; ERROR
IN ANSWER TO QUESTION

Hon. K. W. HOOPER (Greenslopes—Minister for Transport) (11.3 a.m.): I wish to apologise to the House for information conveyed in answer to question 31 on Wednesday, 1 September, which stated that no fees are paid to the members of the Queensland Road Safety Council. I have just ascertained that non-Government members of the council are paid attendance fees in line with rates fixed by the Government for meetings of organisations of this type.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. MANUFACTURE OF INSULATING FOAM FROM SUGAR

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs—

(1) Is he aware of the recent development in the United Kingdom of a process to manufacture insulating foam from sugar?

(2) As most of the existing insulating foams in use in Australia are manufactured from oil and are far more flammable than the sugar-based article and usually give off great volumes of suffocating fumes and poisonous gases when burnt, will he have this matter investigated not only from the point of view of a possible reduction in the numbers of deaths from fires but also as a further possible manufacturing by-product of the sugar industry?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) Sugar can be substituted for petroleum derived polyols in the production of expanded foams. In some cases such foams have increased fire resistance and a marked reduction in the evolution of toxic fumes under the influence of high temperatures. Their development has been under consideration by the sugar industry for some time. With the increasing costs of petroleum based hydrocarbons, the prospects for the increased use of sugar for the production of not only foams but a wide range of chemicals, detergents, etc., can be expected to improve.

2. SUGAR INDUSTRY FOR PAPUA NEW GUINEA

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

(1) Has any approach been made by the Government of Papua New Guinea to the Queensland Government or its agents the C.S.R. Company to seek its assistance in establishing a sugar industry in Papua New Guinea?

(2) Has the Commonwealth Government made any such approach during the last five years on behalf of Papua New Guinea?

(3) What sales of sugar has the Queensland Sugar Board made to Papua New Guinea during the last five years?

(4) Have such sales been under contractual agreements at world market prices or direct sales by Australian refineries?

Answers:—

(1) No such approach has been made at Government level. However, there have been informal contacts between officers of the Papua New Guinea Department of Agriculture, Stock and Fisheries, my department, and Australian sugar industry personnel over a number of years with respect to the development of a sugar industry in Papua New Guinea.

(2) The Commonwealth Government has made no such approach to the Queensland Government during the last five years. However, there has been contact, at officer level, regarding assistance to visiting officers of the Papua New Guinea Department of Agriculture, Stock and

Fisheries, seeking information pertinent to the development of a sugar industry in Papua New Guinea.

(3 and 4) Neither the Sugar Board nor Australian refineries sell direct to the Papua New Guinea market. Such sugar is purchased in the first instance by agents, appropriately licensed by the Commonwealth Government, who then export such sugar to Papua New Guinea on commercial terms. Such exports totalled about 17 000 to 18 000 tonnes per annum in recent years. The Sugar Board traditionally sells raw sugar for refining for the Papua New Guinea trade at prices related to free world market prices.

3. PIONEER RIVER FLOOD MITIGATION WORKS

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Water Resources—

(1) As testing on the physical model of the Pioneer River at the Queensland University by the Main Roads Department to establish a proper design for the Rocleigh Bridge has now been completed, has a testing programme been prepared for the Pioneer River Improvement Trust to enable it to properly design for flood mitigation works in the lower reaches of the Pioneer River?

(2) When will this testing be completed and when will the recommendations be available to the trust?

(3) What assistance is the Commonwealth Government prepared to give for this work?

Answers:—

(1) The testing programme has commenced on the fixed-bed physical model of the Pioneer River to satisfy the requirements of the two Pioneer River Improvement Trusts. The series of tests will probably take several months to complete as the results of one test can often lead to a further test run.

(2) After the fixed-bed tests are completed, some further tests will be required with a movable-bed model. It is not possible to determine the time involved in the overall programme precisely. The results and recommendations from the tests will be supplied to the River Improvement Trusts as soon as available.

(3) Application has been made for Commonwealth assistance to undertake flood mitigation works on the Pioneer River. The Commonwealth has advised that no decision will be taken on the application until the model-test programme is completed.

4. AWOONGA HIGH DAM

Mr. Prest, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) Why has the Gladstone Water Board ceased work on the foundations of Stage 1 of the Awoonga High Dam?

(2) Why has the board called in Mr. Ivor Pinkerton and Mr. David Stapledon to advise it in consultation with the local government on alternative designs?

(3) What delay will be incurred in the investigation?

(4) What additional cost is involved in the investigation?

(5) Is there any danger to the foundations of the existing wall now or during flooding of the Boyne River?

Answers:—

(1) Work on excavation for the new Awoonga Dam indicated that the depth to the high-quality rock required for a buttress-type concrete dam was greater than had been indicated by test diamond-drill holes over an appreciable area. The Gladstone Water Board decided it should obtain expert consultant advice as to whether an alternative type of dam might be cheaper to construct.

(2) In seeking expert opinion from consultants, it was considered that Mr. I. Pinkerton from the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation, and Mr. D. Stapledon of Coffey and Hollingsworth, both eminent in their field, were most suitable.

(3) No major delay is anticipated. In fact, should a rockfill-type dam be adopted, construction time might be reduced.

(4) The information to answer this question is not yet available, as estimates for alternative designs are not complete. An alternative design would not be adopted unless savings would result. The cost of retaining consultants is small compared with the total expenditures involved.

(5) The depth of foundation excavation is a cause of concern over a particular limited area. Regardless of the type of dam to be constructed, this area must be fully protected before the next wet season introduces a risk of major flooding. Only a very large flood would create a problem. Arrangements to carry out the work are already well advanced. Sheet piling has been ordered and will arrive on site at an early date, when protection work will begin, and completion prior to the wet season is not a problem.

5. DUAL OPERATING THEATRE FOR GLADSTONE HOSPITAL

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

(1) Will he give urgent consideration to the application by the Gladstone Hospitals Board for the building of a dual operating theatre at Gladstone?

(2) Will he give urgent attention to necessary repairs to the existing operating theatre?

(3) Will he inspect the Gladstone Hospital at the earliest opportunity?

Answers:—

(1) Approval was given to the Gladstone Hospitals Board on 17 December 1975 for the preparation of sketch plans and estimates of cost for a new building to contain two operating theatres, an intensive-care ward, and a central sterilising department. Sketch plans submitted by the hospitals board have recently been examined by the Departmental Building Advisory Committee and the board will be informed of the result of such review in the near future.

(2) The matter of any necessary repairs to the existing operating theatre is one for consideration in the first instance by the Gladstone Hospitals Board.

(3) Since assuming the office of Minister, I have indicated my firm intention of visiting all hospitals throughout the State. Gladstone is one hospital I have not as yet visited, and I will do so as soon as time permits.

6. IMPROVEMENTS TO MT. MORGAN HIGH SCHOOL

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

(1) Will he give urgent consideration to painting the interior of the Mt. Morgan High School?

(2) Will he cover the pine floorboards of the school with suitable covering?

(3) Will he upgrade the classroom furniture and the staff lunch rooms?

Answers:—

(1) Funds are not available for such work at this stage.

(2 and 3) The district office has been requested to investigate and report on the position in each case.

7. VEHICLES FOR TRAINING MOTOR TRADE APPRENTICES

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

(1) As it is necessary for apprentices to the motor trade to have vehicles to work on during their college training, in particular such trades requiring panel work and spray painting, from where are the vehicles obtained for such purposes?

(2) Has there been any change in policy this year and, if so, what is the change and why was it made?

Answers:—

(1) It is essential for apprentices to the motor trades to have operational vehicles to work on during their college training. The vehicles used at the present time are those owned by apprentices in attendance on course at the colleges.

(2) Formerly, the vehicles used were not restricted to those owned by apprentices, provided the work to be performed was essential to the educational programme and could be timed to fit the programme. This policy has been changed in 1976 to avoid any possible imputation that Crown employees receive any benefit from this training activity.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

STATEMENT BY MEMBER FOR FLINDERS ABOUT CHARTERS TOWERS WORKERS

Mr. BURNS: I ask the Premier: In view of denials in "The Courier-Mail" newspaper today by the Townsville manager of the Commonwealth Employment Service (Mr. Brian Hocking) and the Town Clerk of Charters Towers (Mr. G. Sowman), will he disassociate himself and the Government from the vicious smear made in this Parliament on Tuesday against the workers of Charters Towers by the honourable member for Flinders?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I do not disassociate myself from any of my colleagues. I stick by them and stand by them, and I will always do that. The Leader of the Opposition has not always stuck by his colleagues. We remember what he did to his offsideer there some time ago. I stick by my men and I will continue to stick by them.

SUPPORT BY NEW SOUTH WALES TEACHERS OF DRUG RAIDS BY POLICE

Mr. POWELL: I ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: Has he seen a letter to the editor in "The Australian" of 31 August where teachers from New South Wales supported police raids on drug communes? Is he aware that the reason for the letter was that the New South Wales Labor Premier interfered with the work of the police and the teachers are concerned about the effect that this has had on the children under their care?

Mr. BIRD: Yes, I am aware of that letter. As a matter of fact I have a copy of it here. Indeed, I believe I should quote from it because what I have to say is very important to the people of this State. The letter states —

"As teachers in this area we are aware of the problems occurring and fully support the action of the police."

That was in relation to raiding a community.

"You, the Premier" (the Premier of New South Wales) "have apparently condoned the use and possession of drugs and apparently condemned the police who endeavoured to enforce the law. We are alarmed at the effect that this attitude might have on the children of this district."

The letter is signed by a teacher and 36 others of the Mullumbimby High School, Mullumbimby, New South Wales.

There we have teachers who are concerned, just as the teachers of this State are concerned, for the welfare of the children under their control. We have seen the Premier of New South Wales condemn the police for carrying out the duties for which they are sworn in. We have seen exactly the same thing happen in this State where members of the Opposition have condemned the action of police in raiding hippie communities to get at the root of the problem, namely, the growing of marijuana or cannabis. It is obvious from the actions of the New South Wales Premier and members of the Opposition in this House that they condone the use of cannabis. It is a crying shame and it is a shame that the Queensland Teachers' Union should adopt the attitude that it has—an attitude that can only bring down the prestige and good name of the teachers in this State.

DISMISSAL OF TEACHERS CONVICTED ON DRUG CHARGES

Mr. DOUMANY: I give notice that tomorrow I will ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: Is he aware of the threats and intimidation emanating from the executive of the Queensland Teachers' Union towards those teachers openly expressing and marshalling dissent from the current strike action initiated by the union executive? Is he also aware that individual teachers have been warned of extreme disciplinary action by the executive, with the ultimate threat of expulsion from the union and, thereby, according to Mr. Costello, termination of employment by the Department of Education? Will the Minister investigate this most serious situation and safeguard the interests of dissenting teachers from this blatant form of industrial thuggery?

Mr. BIRD: I shall answer that question now. I am indeed aware of the threats by the union to take disciplinary or other action against teachers who refuse to take the union's direction to come out on strike. Might I say in this House now—and I hope that this goes to the four corners of the State—that I have every intention of supporting those teachers who abide by the principle of giving an education to the students of this State by carrying out their duties as teachers and disobey an unlawful direction of the Queensland Teachers' Union. They have my support and they have the support of the Premier and every member of Cabinet and, I am sure, every Government member, all of whom will doubtless give them every assistance to ensure that no wrong action is taken by the union against those teachers who are thinking first of the students of this State and will indeed go on and teach them regardless of the union's action.

DOUBLE INCOME TAX IN QUEENSLAND

Mr. DOUMANY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Has he read the front page article in yesterday's "Courier-Mail", carrying the misleading headline, "Knox Hints at Double Tax" and containing a spurious warning from the Leader of the Opposition "... that double income tax would be a reality from July 1."? In view of the clear absence from the Treasurer's Appropriation speech of any real foundation for these mischievous claims, will he set the record straight for the people of Queensland?

Mr. KNOX: As honourable members heard, there was, of course, no hint at all in my speech about any double tax. I can only assume that there was a misprint in the newspaper and that the article should have read, "Knox Hits at Double Tax", because that is what I was doing. The proposal that was mooted last year did not relate in any way to double tax. But it is convenient for the A.L.P. to talk about double tax and mislead people into believing that it means double the level of taxation that they presently have.

At the moment the situation for the people of Queensland and Australia as a whole is that the level of income tax is far too high. The average wage earner in Queensland today is being taxed at levels that applied to wealthy people five or six years ago. I stress that the level of income tax is far too high. Any further imposition of income tax by either the Commonwealth or the State would virtually cripple the nation.

Mr. Doumany: It is just not acceptable.

Mr. KNOX: It is not acceptable in any form by us or by anybody else. The incidence of income tax is far too high on the average income earners. That is the present situation and there is not even a hint, a proposal or a suggestion that Queensland will be considering or imposing income tax.

CONTROL OF POLICE FORCE

Mr. YOUNG: I ask the Minister for Police: Is he aware of an article in today's Press which asks the question, "Who is running the Queensland Police Force?" That is the question I should like to put to the Minister: who is in fact responsible for the day-to-day running of the force?

Mr. NEWBERY: I did see the leading article in the newspaper this morning and I expected some questions on it to be asked this morning. I should like to say that as Minister for Police I will be aiming at a harmonious liaison between the police administration and the police union in the interests of the effective operation of the force. There is no question of the union running the Police Force. It does not and it will not. As Minister, I am finally responsible for the running of the force. The buck ends at my desk. However, I firmly believe that the union has a right to express

its views on aspects of police administration that may affect the working conditions and morale of its members and those views deserve my consideration.

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION WORK, BRUNSWICK STREET, FORTITUDE VALLEY

Mr. LOWES: I ask the Minister for Transport: In view of articles in today's "Courier-Mail" and yesterday's "Telegraph", will the Minister indicate to the House the circumstances surrounding the reconstruction of the road overbridge in Brunswick Street, Fortitude Valley?

Mr. K. W. HOOPER: I thank the honourable member for his courtesy in advising me that he would be asking this question. I commend him, and also the honourable member for Merthyr, on the representations that they have made in this matter.

The reconstruction of the bridge is necessary to provide additional rail trackage and increased head room (vertical clearance) for the electrification of the Brisbane suburban railway system. The design of the new bridge was carried out by consulting engineers to the Railway Department and in conference with railway engineers with long experience in building bridges over heavily trafficked railway tracks and in city areas. Fullest possible recognition was given to the problems of designing a bridge which would fulfil its functions with the least disruption to rail, road and business operations and least inconvenience to the general public.

The contract was let to a very experienced firm of contractors on 20 April 1976 and this provided for completion of the work in 45 weeks—38 weeks of which would involve work on the bridge, which would interfere to some extent with road operations. It was necessary for the contractor in his tender to comply with all necessary Brisbane City Council and Government safety regulations.

During planning of the bridge, representatives of the Railway Department approached business houses in the affected area and discussed with them problems which could arise during construction in relation to structural problems in connection with the project. When the tender was let, further discussions took place between representatives of the department and the contractor and the business houses in the area regarding arrangements which were to be required to maintain two lanes of traffic in Brunswick Street and at the same time provide protection for the contractor and his operations. The contract had been let following on discussions between the Railway Department, the Police Department and the Brisbane City Council on the basis that two lanes of traffic would be maintained during construction, and the Valley Business Council also wrote to the Railway Department stressing the necessity to keep two lanes of traffic open.

When the time came nearer for the actual construction to start and the traders in the Valley area were approached regarding

alterations to their awnings for clearance for buses and the erection of hoardings which would restrict vision into business premises, objections were raised and discussions took place between representatives of the Valley Business Council, engineers of the Railway Department, the Commissioner for Railways and myself. I would like to stress that Mr. Purdy, the president of the Valley Business Council has always conducted the discussions on a most courteous and amicable plane, whilst he has stressed the problems which could be foreseen for members of his organisation.

It was agreed to reduce the length of hoardings in Brunswick Street from 30 metres to 17 metres in length at the Wickham Street end of the project. It was also agreed to provide a suitable temporary footbridge on the city side of the existing bridge to maintain pedestrian access on that side during stage 2 of the construction. When the Valley Business Council were advised of these modifications, they still felt that there was too much inconvenience and possible loss involved for their members. A further approach was then made by the Valley Business Council to the Honourable the Premier and the matter was considered by the Government.

This is a joint State and Commonwealth project under the State Grants (Urban Public Transport) Act 1974 and the attitude had been taken that, as it was now a joint scheme, the extra cost involved of working shift work on the project to shorten time could not be found from the relevant sources. Following Cabinet agreeing to my recommendation and the approach to the Honourable the Premier, it was agreed that extra money would be spent to shorten the time of considered interruption from 38 weeks to 22 weeks by the introduction of a second shift. On further representations, the contractor agreed to consider the further shortening of hoardings on the Alfred Street end of the project, although it is not certain yet whether this is possible. The extra cost involved from these negotiations in terms of the pedestrian overbridge and the working of a second shift amount to \$116,000 bringing the total cost of the project to \$726,000.

Whilst these negotiations have been going on, other representatives of Valley trading interests have indicated that they believe the least interruption to business in the Valley would be achieved if traffic were temporarily completely diverted from the Brunswick Street area, making it a pedestrian area only during the construction of the bridge. I might add that there is a marked division between Valley traders who desire the complete closure of Brunswick Street and those who want two lanes left open for vehicular traffic. If the traders themselves come to some agreement and convince the police and the Brisbane City Council of the need to close Brunswick Street com-

pletely during construction, then the Railway Department would be only too happy to go along with this suggestion.

There have been suggestions that the design of the bridge should be altered and a new design arrived at which would reduce the amount of interruption to surface work in its method of construction. Railway engineers consider that full weight was given to these factors in the original design, and believe that the design evolved is a balanced one which produces the minimum inconvenience to the community as a whole at reasonable cost. If a redesign were considered and the present plan scrapped, there would be a delay of up to at least 12 months in redesigning the approach, obtaining the necessary fresh approvals at State and Commonwealth level and re-calling tenders and letting a fresh contract and in the present inflationary situation the increased costs would be obvious and, apart from this, there would be a corresponding delay in the implementation of electrification to the suburban area. I also want to point out that as a contract has been let, the cost of cancelling such a contract would be of such a magnitude that this course should not be contemplated.

It is obviously not possible to rebuild the bridge without causing some inconvenience, and this applies to any developmental work in an urban area. The Government has been most reasonable in attempting to find an acceptable solution to the situation.

If further developments make it necessary, I will have to give consideration to asking the Railway Department to examine alternative routes for the railway which will bypass the Valley area.

I must say to the honourable member that the Railway Department will be only too happy to accept an alternative suggestion of a pedestrian mall or complete closure of Brunswick Street if the traders themselves come to that decision.

DISMISSAL OF TEACHERS CONVICTED ON DRUG CHARGES

Mr. LANE: I ask the Premier: In view of the fact that Mr. Ray Costello, the President of the Queensland Teachers' Union, is a prominent and active member of the Australian Labor Party, does the Premier believe that the State Leader of the Australian Labor Party, Mr. Tom Burns, has an obligation to dissuade him from giving public support to the pot-smoking school teachers?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: This whole question has, of course, been ventilated many times from different angles in the Press. Naturally, I would expect the Leader of the Opposition to come out very strongly against Mr. Costello and his actions, because I do not see how he, or indeed any of us—and that is why the Government has taken the very firm stand it has—could compromise the lives of young children merely

so that Mr. Costello can consolidate his position in the union. The Government will not do it. I should like to see the Leader of the Opposition come out hard and strong, and if he does not condemn the attitude that is being taken in this instance and support the Government, we can, of course, draw the conclusion that he supports Mr. Costello in his line of compromising the lives of young children.

ABOLITION OF OFFICE OF GOVERNOR

Mr. BYRNE: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the report in today's newspaper that the Western Australian A.L.P. has decided to do away with the office of Governor? Will he outline the effect of this decision? Is he aware of any intention by the Queensland A.L.P. to pursue a similar line should it be elected to Government?

Mr. KNOX: I know the Premier's views on this matter. I am sure that honourable members generally support the Government's views on the position of Governor. It is well known, of course, that the A.L.P. desires to abolish the position of Governor in all of the States, not merely Western Australia.

Mr. Marginson interjected.

Mr. KNOX: It is part of the A.L.P.'s platform. The honourable member should read it. The honourable member's leader has said that he wants to turn Government House in Queensland into an old people's home.

Let us get our facts straight. It is part of Labor's policy. Labor members try to hide it—they don't want anybody to know about it—but now it has come out in the open in Western Australia. The A.L.P. has made a firm decision that when it becomes the Government of that State the position of Governor will be abolished.

Mr. Wright: He is a waste of money.

Mr. KNOX: The honourable member says that but who else is to stand between the tyranny of government and the people than the Governor and the Governor-General!

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind all honourable members on my left that I will not tolerate persistent interjections.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will not interject while I am on my feet.

Mr. KNOX: I am quite certain that, if the socialists ever get into power in Queensland they will abolish the position of Governor and thereby take away the only protection that a citizen has against the bureaucracy. The rights of the citizen are protected as long as there is an independent

person as the Governor of this State. By virtue of his presence no Government can get too big.

It should be remembered that Governments—I am not speaking of Parliaments—can act quite capriciously and tyrannically without reference to Parliament once they know that the check and balance have been removed. Let us understand quite clearly the sinister motives behind this move. The A.L.P. is to establish a socialist republic; it is to establish a dictatorship of socialist origin so that there will be no recall, no discipline over the Executive by the Governor, and so that there will be no appeal against the Executive by the citizen to the Governor. By establishing puppets of the Government, as honourable members in the A.L.P. would dearly like to do, the rights of the citizen—

Mr. Marginson: We have the greatest dictator of them all here in Queensland.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KNOX: I will accept the interjection. What was it?

Mr. Marginson: We have the greatest dictator of them all here in Queensland.

Mr. KNOX: That is unacceptable to me. I thought the honourable member was making an intelligent comment.

The fact of the matter is that the A.L.P. wants to abolish the protection that the people have. The A.L.P. regards the Governor as merely a symbol, but the people do not. The A.L.P. regards the Governor as an unnecessary expense, but the people do not. I assure the honourable member on behalf of the Premier and the Government of this State that there is no move in Queensland to abolish the position of Governor. In fact, I should like to see the position of Governor entrenched by this Parliament so that it cannot be abolished capriciously by people like those in the A.L.P.

INCREASED INQUIRIES TO PURCHASE HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES

Mr. BYRNE: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: What increase has there been in inquiries directed to the Housing Commission following his enlightened statement in relation to the increased capacity of people to purchase homes on lower deposit with a higher borrowing allocation?

Mr. Houston: You cannot get a home.

Mr. LEE: In answering the honourable member, I should firstly like to answer the honourable member for Bulimba. Under this Government people can get a home. That is the first thing.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask all honourable members to desist from interjecting. If

they continue to make persistent interjections I will have to deal with them. I ask for the co-operation of all honourable members.

Mr. LEE: The position under the A.L.P. was that people could not obtain a home. We have changed that. Whereas in the past we were receiving 30 applications a month, we are now getting 30 applications a day. The number is building up.

A question was asked of me earlier about whether we would be building up staff or putting in a special section. I can assure honourable members that action along those lines will be taken.

DISMISSAL OF TEACHERS CONVICTED ON DRUG CHARGES

Mr. HALES: I ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: Is he aware that the staff of two schools in Rockhampton have voted unanimously to condemn the Queensland Teachers' Union for its action in the teachers' strike? Is he also aware of any other teacher condemnation of that strike?

Mr. BIRD: I am aware of the decision of the teachers at two Rockhampton schools. It does not surprise me in the least. I predict that in the very near future the teachers of many more schools will be making that decision and advising my office and me of it.

The second part of the question was what?

Mr. Wright: He forgot to ask that. You have been caught out!

Mr. HALES: For the benefit of the honourable member for Rockhampton—I asked whether the Minister is also aware of any other teacher condemnation of that strike.

Mr. BIRD: To continue my answer—I am certainly aware of that. In the past I have had what might be called a trickle of inquiries from teachers asking, firstly, whether it is necessary to belong to a union and, secondly, whether it is possible to belong to a union other than the Queensland Teachers' Union. That trickle has grown to a flood in more recent times. My office, my home and my electorate secretary have been inundated with calls from teachers expressing their concern about the action of the Queensland Teachers' Union and most emphatically wanting it to be known that they do not condone it.

At 12 noon,

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SECOND ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 26 August (see p. 94) on Mr. Brown's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. SIMPSON (Coorooora) (12.1 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to support the motion of the honourable member for Clayfield, which expresses continued loyalty and allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and His Excellency the Governor. I believe that this is a time when allegiance should be hung out for all to see.

We have had from Labor an indication of its idea of the Crown and what it stands for. The Constitution, the rights of the people and balance in government are well and truly at risk. Labor talks of getting rid of the positions of Governor and Governor-General. We have witnessed violence and disruptive actions in public places against the Governor-General. We have seen at work Labor's policy of trying to break down the old system of democracy and replace it with what would appear to be a Marxist system of dictatorship. Today, the democratic system is at risk.

I congratulate the new Deputy Premier and Treasurer on his attaining that position and agree with his statement earlier on how vulnerable the positions of Governor and Governor-General are today when control is in the hands of unscrupulous people who do not know what the word "democracy" means. It is time that we laid it clearly before the people that only by referendum can there be any alteration in either those positions or the Constitution. Moves are being made in Western Australia to get round the referendum question by simply not appointing a Governor and making the position redundant. That is what would happen in Western Australia if Labor gained power. We in this Parliament should ensure that we uphold democratic government and the Constitution, and thus maintain the way of life that we believe the people of this country desire, not a way of life created by back-door methods and methods not democratically determined.

I hope that the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Sir Gordon Chalk) will, in his retirement, enjoy all the happiness that is his due after so many years of valuable service to this State.

I record the allegiance of almost all people in my electorate to both the Governor and the Governor-General. I congratulate the Governor-General on the wonderful way in which he is performing his duties in spite of the physical and verbal attacks made upon him and his wife and also the mental stress they must be under. The attacks are of no small consequence and, as I said before, are well organised in an effort to obtain what I referred to.

The problems we have to consider include unemployment. This concerns me greatly in my area, although it has not increased appreciably there; and I would not expect that in a rapidly growing area. I think of the demoralising aspect of unemployment and the misery that it brings to families, and also the unnatural denial of fulfilment that comes to young people, and indeed people of all ages, when they cannot get jobs.

This brings me to the questions how to overcome the problem of unemployment, how to relieve immediate problems and how to bring about improvement in the long term. I believe that encouragement must be given to small businesses to employ people. We must support at the very embryonic stage the sense of enterprise that will build our free-enterprise system and provide employment for tomorrow. Often Governments do not help small businesses and this is a situation that we must rectify in this place.

I also believe that we should consider those factors providing employment opportunities that are outside the avenues of government. The mortality rate in small businesses is very high—about 50 per cent in the first five years. I refer to the giving of assistance in fields such as accounting and management. There are in my electorate people who have volunteered to help small businesses in this way. They have been very helpful in assisting me to put on the right track small businessmen who have come to me for assistance. I believe that this would be more correctly done by an independent body appointed by a corporation or a subsidiary of the Government.

Mr. Wright: Your point is well taken, but do you not also agree that big business is one of the main causes of the failure of small businesses?

Mr. SIMPSON: No, I do not. I would say that the economic policies of the previous Federal Government have been the main causes of unemployment. I shall pursue that line of opinion and tell the House why I hold it.

The support given by the Labor Government to wage increases in effect priced labour out of the market. Many businesses could no longer afford to maintain the labour content in their activities. They therefore reviewed their operations and reduced their labour content, and this accounts for some of the present unemployment. That, in turn, has had a compounding effect on other businesses, resources and services. Saying, "Now that we have unemployment we will employ all those out of work in the public sector and everything will be happy and rosy" is a fool's way of looking at the problem. The public sector is financed principally from the profits of free enterprise, not by the printing of money or by any other means. There have to be businesses viable enough to be taxed before the public sector can support a system under which the young, the helpless and the unemployed are looked after.

This makes the point that unless there are viable and active small businesses that are employing people, the vicious wheel will continue to grind its way to a top-heavy public sector. The necessary move has now, I believe, been made and time and confidence will bring about a return to saner conditions.

There will be an easing in the escalation of wages and costs and, in turn, prices which have forced inflation on this country.

I move now to the subject of education. My concern is that the education system is not directed towards job satisfaction to the degree to which I think it should. In my area there is a need for technical and adult education colleges which will train young people and encourage them to continue to live and work on the Sunshine Coast. I believe we have to develop a better apprenticeship system which, while educating young people, will support the local industry which will finally employ them. In other words, the system should train these young people to be of more value to those who employ them as apprentices than they are at present. At the moment in my electorate there are over 3,000 students and staff at three schools all situated on the one area of land, which is only 14 acres in extent, and they are all competing for more space in that area. It concerns me that we have to face the delays that we do before we can get a new high school in or near Nambour to overcome this problem. The difficulties in providing education are compounded when our resources in this area are being strained in the way that they are. I believe the students and staff do not get adequate facilities—in the case of teachers, the best conditions under which to teach, and in the case of students the most receptive conditions in which to assimilate that teaching.

The condition of primary industries in my area is much the same as that in other areas although it concerns me less than it does other honourable members because I am fortunate enough not to have the same number of primary producers in my electorate as members further west and further north have. However, imports of pineapples, fruit juices, vegetables and so forth concern me at this time when producers of these products are facing viability problems.

An inquiry is presently being conducted into the dairy industry. I am very thankful that the Minister saw fit to set up that inquiry. I certainly hope that it will result in a more efficient marketing system which will provide a fair share of the market for all dairymen and a more efficient manufacturing sector on land that is best suited for the purpose. I believe that applies to local government zoning requirements as well in order to ensure that we receive the best product at the lowest price.

I believe that the housing industry is one Queensland industry which has been dealt with unfairly by the Federal Government and representation should be made to it in an endeavour to catch up the backlog in housing construction because the housing industry supports so many trades that are in trouble at the moment. We are a growing State—we are growing at twice the

rate of the rest of Australia, and this is significant—and a lot of people want new homes; but in the next 12 months we will fall even further behind in the rate of housing construction. I believe we should make representations to the Federal Government for assistance to improve the situation and to help us catch up with the backlog which has occurred because of the finance allocated to Queensland in past years.

On the question of allocations of this type, let me say that I believe that consideration should also be given to returning to the State more of the money paid in taxes by road users. At the moment, only about 50 per cent of that money is used for the benefit of road users, and that is a very significant reason why in many instances roads are deteriorating more rapidly than they can be repaired. The Federal Bureau of Roads believes that Queensland should receive an allocation greater than that which it is now receiving, and the Government of Queensland should raise the matter with the Federal Government and endeavour to obtain an increased allocation.

Those who travel by road to the Sunshine Coast soon become aware of the urgent need for a four-lane highway to that area. Admittedly, the funds allocated are being used predominantly for that purpose. However, under the present scheme there is to be a four-lane road only as far as the Bribie Island turn-off, and nothing is known about what is to happen after that has been completed. In my opinion, that is an antiquated approach, and there should be an on-going programme of budgeting and allocations to ensure that the Sunshine Coast is not disadvantaged in the construction of that four-lane highway.

Commerce and industry would benefit if that approach were adopted, and the paramount importance of the safety factor must also be kept in mind because many people who experience the adverse conditions on the road at present will not return to the Sunshine Coast. Unfortunately, the Minister for Main Roads and Local Government is not in the Chamber at present, but I say to him that he should be mindful of the need for a four-lane highway to the Sunshine Coast before he undertakes further work on the four-lane highway to the Gold Coast.

I express my concern about the Federal Government's continuing the policy of phasing out the nitrogenous fertiliser bounty, which will probably mean an increase in prices of primary products to the housewives. That policy will affect the price of bread, milk, vegetables, fruit and sugar, to mention only a few items. Its implementation would not be wise from the accounting point of view, either, as was determined during early hearings relative to the phosphate subsidy.

It has been found that productivity can be increased by showing primary producers the benefits of using larger quantities of fertiliser, and that, in turn, brings additional

profits. As I said earlier, the greater the profit, the greater the tax; in fact, the net cost to the tax payers of such subsidies is little or, at times, nothing, and that certainly applies to the phosphate bounty. The Federal Government should not abolish that bounty, the payment of which could eventually have the effect of reducing taxes. Primary producers should continue to be encouraged to make greater use of fertiliser, because this will not only increase quantities of products for export but also improve the quality of those products.

Other honourable members have referred to the question of the preservation of democracy, but I must refer to it again because the question has arisen in Australia whether we are to have democracy here or whether we are to be subjected to violence and intimidation that will result in a change of the existing parliamentary system. We should make it abundantly clear to the people we represent just where we stand in relation to the Commonwealth Constitution, accepted rules, loyalty to the Queen, the Governor-General and the Governor, and whether we believe in the present system of democracy or some other form of government. I believe that the people of Australia, the people of Queensland, and certainly the people of my electorate, will not entertain any other form of government. It gives me great pleasure to support the motion.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (12.21 p.m.): I was pleased to note in the Governor's Opening Speech a positive reference to the Honourable Sir Gordon Chalk. Although members of the Opposition would disagree with his particular party-political ideology, all would agree that he made a significant contribution to this Parliament and, on a broader basis, to the State of Queensland generally during his 29 years as a member of this Legislature.

Sir Gordon demonstrated time and time again that he was prepared to put aside party politics for the good of the State, as he saw it. Often he was at loggerheads with the Premier, who seems to have a very narrow, strict and parochial view. Before the last federal election Sir Gordon took a hard line against what has become known as Fraser's federalism. I was pleased to note from the coverage of a recent Press luncheon that he had stood his ground on that issue.

I do not wish to categorise Sir Gordon as a prophet of doom, but it is interesting to note that like those of so many A.L.P. opponents of the new federalism his criticisms have been and are still being proved to be correct. He, like so many others, warned that Fraser federalism would, in the long term, destroy the financial viability of the States and that, irrespective of all the assurances given by the National Party during the last election campaign, it would finally result in a dual or double-tax burden on the people of Queensland.

The outcome of the Premiers' Conference in April this year, the mini Budget brought down by Mr. Lynch, and now the official Federal Budget, proved beyond any doubt that the States have been conned and are now in an economic dilemma. The theory behind Mr. Fraser's federalism was supposed to be that the States would be in a better financial position because of their new direct access to the national personal income tax pool, and, secondly, therefore, that they would have greater freedom in economic management because of the alleged increase in untied grants at the expense of tied grants. It will be recalled that the scheme was publicly praised when it first came out, especially by the Tory Premiers. It was praised even more so by our own Premier. But now that the clamour has died down, and the theory has been put into practice, it is interesting to read the caustic remarks of the same Premiers, who now realise that they have been taken for a ride.

The theory sounded wonderful to the State rightists, like our own Premier here, but the reality of the proposal is totally different. Under the new personal income tax sharing scheme, according to a paper circulated by the Commonwealth on 10 June, the States are to receive 33.6 per cent of personal income tax by way of Financial Assistance Grants each year. In actual hard cash terms it was promised that the States were not to receive less under the new arrangements than they would have received under the pre-existing financial assistance grants formula. The Financial Assistance Grants given to the States in 1975-76 totalled \$3072.8 million, which when related to the total income tax collections of that year of \$9,150 million explains how the percentage figure of 33.6 was arrived at.

I suppose it is understandable how the States were conned because, after all, they believed that the estimated personal income tax collections for 1976-77, excluding the revenue collected through Medibank, would rise to in excess of \$11,000 million. If the percentage formula of 33.6 had been applied to that figure, the entitlement to the States would have risen by something like \$638,000,000 to \$3,711 million. But the States should have learnt by that time that Mr. Fraser could not be trusted. They should have seen through this scheme and realised it was simply a method of putting a burden on the States—a burden which would place an unprecedented financial responsibility on all State Governments.

As predicted by Labor leaders, Fraser's new federalism has turned out to be a guise for the transfer to the States of full responsibility in a variety of service areas without adequate Federal financial support. As predicted, the State Premiers have been tricked into thinking that they would get a greater share of Federal income revenue than will be the case.

It is now evident that this was all part of a cool, calculated plan, and that from the very outset of that Premiers' Conference held in April the Fraser Government intended to con the States. At no time was the Federal Government's estimate of increased income tax revenue valid or accurate. It knew that tax indexation would markedly decrease the stated increase rate. It knew that, because general-purpose revenue would grow more slowly than State requirements, the States would be forced either to seek additional sources of income or reduce their services. Is it any wonder that many States have now announced that they have been forced to cut back social welfare services and that there will be massive reductions in expenditure on schools, roads, hospitals and transport facilities as well as on other capital works programmes? Throughout the nation, State administrations are already sacking employees, and from statements that have been made that is only the beginning.

The reality of Fraser's federalism is that the States either reduce their expenditure and increase indirect taxes or implement their own personal income-taxing schemes. It is not surprising that Sir Gordon Chalk questioned the Fraser proposal. It is little wonder that he timed his retirement so that he would not be in the position of having to forsake his principles and impose a dual-tax system on the Queensland people—a system that he opposed bitterly.

The Tory Premiers and Treasurers who accepted the Fraser package at the Premiers' Conference have no excuse. They knew that under stage 2 of the scheme each State would have the power to legislate to impose a surcharge on personal income tax in the State in addition to that imposed by the Commonwealth. Surely they must have known that the Federal Government would not give them such a power unless it was going to be necessary for them to find additional revenue. Surely they should have twigged to the fact that the only reason they would have to find additional revenue was that their general purpose revenue derived from the Commonwealth personal income tax pool was to be less than promised. As I said, they have no excuse. They should have wakened up, especially when the original percentage of 35 was reduced to 33.6, and when they knew that tax indexation would affect the total income tax receipts.

To make matters even worse, part of the agreement is that the specific purpose grants will be phased out gradually. When honourable members realise that, at the moment, these grants by way of specific purpose payments for recurrent expenditure and for specific purpose capital programmes constitute 48 per cent of the revenue from the Commonwealth to the States, it is understandable why they will have major cuts in capital works programmes in the roads, transport, sewerage and hospital areas I referred to earlier. It is understandable, too, why the unemployment problem has escalated.

Figures released by the Commonwealth Government show that total specific purpose payments to the States will increase by only 10 per cent this year, which in no way caters for the inflation rate of 13 per cent. Nor does it allow for the commencement of any major initiatives. Last year, under the Whitlam Government, specific purpose grants within the total rose by 5.2 per cent. This year, under Fraser's so-called new deal, they will fall by 6.9 per cent. Those figures are indicative of the over-all trend. Total funds for capital purposes rose by 10.8 per cent under Labor. This year they fall by 2 per cent. Payments made direct to local government authorities, as distinct from those passed on by the States, increased by 103 per cent last year under the Whitlam administration, yet under Fraser in 1976-77, they will fall by an enormous 84 per cent. In actual cash terms, that is a reduction from \$109,400,000 to \$17,400,000. In 1975-76, total payments to the States for recurrent purposes, both by way of general revenue funds and specific purpose grants, were budgeted to rise by 43.7 per cent. Now they are to increase by a mere 12.9 per cent.

When all these avenues of revenue are pooled, it is seen that whereas in 1975-76 total payments by the Whitlam Government to the States rose by 32 per cent, this year the over-all increase will be less than 13 per cent. Is it any wonder that top economists throughout this nation are now saying that the States were duped at the April Premiers' Conference?

In terms of real growth in funds going to the States, taking into account the effect of the present inflation rate, the States have dropped from nearly 18 per cent last year to virtually zero growth for 1976-77. Yet the Premier of this State and his counterpart in Victoria (Mr. Hamer) had the gall to say in April this year that the new financial arrangements were a victory for the States against centralism! Little did they realise that this agreement will in fact centralise economic power in Canberra as never before, for under that agreement it is the Fraser Government that will call the economic tune played by all levels of government for the next few years.

It is certainly not a matter of co-operative federalism, as originally espoused. Instead, it is a case of, "Cop it, or else". Mr. Fraser has cunningly seen to it that the economic philosophy of shifting resources to the private sector is followed exactly by the States, irrespective of the damaging effect it must have, in the long term, on the Australian community and, in the short term, on the political fortunes of the various State Governments.

While one must accept the vitally important role played by the private sector within the present political system in the sphere of employment, especially, and productivity, there has been no cognisance of the fact that it is the public sector that provides the

bulk of welfare services and the medical, educational and transportation needs of the community. These are the areas that will be affected by the cuts in public sector spending. Moreover, what Fraser and his cohorts have overlooked is that many elements in the private sector depend heavily, if not totally, on State contracts and State capital works programmes for their livelihood, and they will have no alternative to laying off employees if those contracts are not forthcoming.

Today, unfortunately, it is mainly the private contractor who builds our roads, schools and our hospitals and who is involved in our State works programmes; but it is public money that funds those projects. If that finance is slashed, not only will the community suffer through lack of facilities, but the private contractors will go to the wall.

Mr. LINDSAY: I rise to a point of order. I was under the impression that this was a debate. The honourable member is reading a prepared speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member is referring to copious notes, but there are numerous figures among them. Nevertheless, I would ask him not to read his speech.

Mr. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I accept the point of order. I have very important statistics to bring before the House.

The point is that the private contractors will go to the wall financially and tens of thousands more Queenslanders will join the dole queues unless greater finance is placed in the public sector. Personally, I don't think Mr. Fraser cares two hoots about the unemployed. I don't think he cares two hoots about the under-privileged, as long as he can turn back the clock in the areas of social reform. The underlying philosophy he has maintained has always been totally tied to the free-enterprise economy and the free-enterprise society, and it seems that he is prepared to go to any lengths to achieve his own goals, irrespective of the effect it has on the ordinary people. He has taken it upon himself to turn this nation back two decades, and he has effectively destroyed the gains of the Australian people not only at national level but also at State level—all under the guise of co-operative federalism.

The joke is now on the likes of our own Premier and the National and Liberal Parties in this State, because they were party to that initial plot. They were the ones who said the State needed direct access to the personal income tax pool. They were the ones who asked for greater economic and administrative freedom for the State. But now that is a complete myth. Not only will they not be able to maintain the previous general revenue that they received under the original Financial Agreements and not only will they lose access to specific purpose grants, which are

to be phased out, but eventually—and the Treasurer (Mr. Bill Knox) the other night said straight out that he was concerned—they will be affected by a cut in the Loan Council borrowings. Mr. Fraser has clearly demonstrated that he intends to cut State expenditure further by keeping Loan Council borrowings to the lowest of low levels.

If we want to add more to the wounds here, let us consider the imposition the people of Queensland will now suffer in paying 2½ per cent of their incomes into the Federal coffers for Medibank.

Dr. Edwards: Your Government was going to do it.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, but you opposed it, and now you haven't the intestinal fortitude to get up and oppose the 2½ per cent levy.

Dr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. That is not correct. We did oppose it, and there is a record that the Premier opposed it. I ask that the honourable member withdraw that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! I ask the honourable gentlemen to accept the Minister's explanation.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept the Minister's explanation.

The point is that the people of this State are paying for the Queensland hospital scheme. It is supposed to be free, but they are paying for it indirectly through their indirect contributions to State revenue. Now millions of dollars will leave the pockets of the ordinary people in this State and go into the Federal coffers. The State will have no share of that money because it does not come within the new financial arrangements. But this Government will still have to find the funds to pay for the hospital system that we have here.

Under the Whitlam Government, this State refused to accept the specific purpose grants that were tied to growth centres and development in regional areas. We said we would not have it, but, now that all of these funds for those purposes will be absorbed in the State revenue allocation, at least the other States will benefit whereas Queensland will get nothing. Alternatively, if we study the per-capita payments that Queensland has benefited from in that it has received 1½ times the amount received by New South Wales and Victoria, we find that they will be reviewed in two or three years' time. It is commonly expected at all levels of Government that the per-capita grants or payments will diminish because of the pressure from New South Wales and Victoria.

So the Premier has the freedom that he wanted. He has the freedom to impose an additional State tax on the people here. He has the new freedom to supply the basic services to the Queensland community—without the much-needed financial assistance coming from the Federal Government!

Unless State projects are scuttled and services downgraded, the effects of Fraser's federalism will be that the people of this State will be forced to accept increased indirect taxes or to accept a dual tax system on personal income. So the dilemma is there.

Moreover, as the Federal Government opts out of various areas of administrative responsibility, administrative duplication between the States must develop resulting in an increasing dislocation in the activities which go beyond State boundaries.

There has been a slashing of the direct assistance from the Commonwealth Government and the indirect assistance from the State Government to local government. This must create economic nightmares for the local authorities in Queensland. We know that already they have had to increase sharply general rates and charges. We know that they have had to cut back on works programmes. We know that staff have been sacked and that additional employment opportunities are nil. To say the least, the future is gloomy. It is the ordinary citizen who must suffer. He will surely suffer in the long run through cutbacks or reductions in the field of State assistance to local government, just as he suffers because of cutbacks in finance for roads, housing, education, health—and I could go on and on.

What does Mr. Fraser care, as long as his private-enterprise friends are declaring massive profits and the overseas companies that supported his personal election campaign are paid off?

One thing that Mr. Fraser can be given credit for is the way he fooled the Australian people before the last election. He fooled them, but fortunately they are waking up. They are waking up day by day and realising more and more that Mr. Fraser is a dishonest man, a man who cannot be trusted to keep his promises even to his own Government colleagues.

He promised to rid this nation of inflation. This has not occurred. He promised to get rid of unemployment. It is now 5.18 per cent, and six out of every 10 school-leavers face the dole queue. He promised to maintain the benefits in social welfare that were won under the Labor Government. His promises are as empty as the economic package he presented to the States.

All honourable members recall how he promised to increase pensions, but he delayed the increase for months and months while he appointed another butler and tried to extend an airfield so that his new V.I.P. jet could land near his home. Within a few months of taking office, the Fraser Government increased interest rates directly and indirectly and caused five building societies in this State to go to the wall.

To show the Liberal and National Party lack of concern for the sick—the pharmaceutical contributions payable by ordinary people for medicines under the National Health Scheme have been increased from

\$1.50 to \$2. That is an increase of 33½ per cent. In addition, the range of drugs now available to the ordinary folk has been diminished.

Next, Mr. Fraser demonstrated his attitude to the aged. What did he do? He robbed them of the miserable \$40 funeral benefit. Then he cut back aid to handicapped children and the deaf. He cut back expenditure for housing for low-income people. And he cut back in the important environmental areas.

To show his interest in sport and recreational groups, he cancelled a promised contribution of \$200,000. Wage indexation has been undermined. The land that was purchased by the Labor Government for low-cost housing for families has been sold to land developers. Similarly, the initiatives taken by the Labor Government to acquire an interest in drug-producing firms and uranium mining have been destroyed. In the legal aid field, the Australian Legal Aid Office is under threat of extinction, whilst massive indirect taxes have been placed on the divorce courts.

The restrictions on the sale of natural gas abroad have been removed, thus prejudicing Australia's future energy fuel supplies. Pressure is being exerted on the Australian community to agree to the overseas sale of our uranium. It seems to me that some Government Ministers in the Federal sphere have become nothing more than toadies for foreign groups who are interested in the exploitation of these reserves.

In the industrial arena every trick is being used to stir up industrial unrest and turmoil. We have it in this Queensland Parliament, too. At this moment the Government parties at both State and Federal level are propagating restrictive and punitive legislation against unions.

I come now to the attack being made on education, particularly at university level. It is clear that the Fraser Government wants to reverse the clock and once again make tertiary education the private domain of the wealthy. What have the former school-teachers in this place had to say about it? What have other Government members had to say about the fact that approximately 7,000 students leaving secondary schools this year will not be proceeding to tertiary study?

At a time when hundreds of thousands of people throughout Australia are crying out for better housing, let alone homes of their own, the total expenditure in this area has been curbed. High interest rates have been maintained to ensure that the building industry remains in the doldrums while rental costs continue to increase.

The Fraser Government pretends to be concerned about unemployment, yet in the Budget the unemployment relief grants to the States have been eliminated. The special assistance given to the sick and the unemployed has been reduced by 25 per cent,

whilst staff ceilings have been placed on the Commonwealth Public Service which will result in a reduction of approximately 3.7 per cent and a loss of thousands of job opportunities for people in this nation.

Direct assistance to Aborigines has been cut by \$33,000,000. Aboriginal housing expenditure has been slashed by \$15,000,000, and health care expenditure reduced by 5 per cent. Once and for all these actions have totally exposed the racist tendencies of the Federal Government. They show what little concern the Liberal and National Parties have for the plight of minority groups in this nation.

Possibly the greatest backward step by the Federal Government was the slashing of \$152,000,000 from last year's allocation for urban and regional development and the environment. Such issues do not concern the wealthy who live in the prime suburbs of Sydney and Melbourne, so I suppose Mr. Fraser says, "Why should we waste money on these areas?" But gone are the hopes of thousands of people—the average Australian families—who wanted something better than a life in an inner city slum. Gone are the dreams of many people who saw one answer to Australia's quality-of-life problem in the development of the less populated areas of the Commonwealth.

Even the primary producer, who is allegedly represented by so many people in this Chamber, has been left wondering what he must have done to incur Mr. Fraser's budgetary wrath. It is true that a new scheme allows farmers to even out the effects of fluctuating incomes on their tax liability over a period, and I know that rural reconstruction will be continued and some subsidy schemes will remain. The honourable member for Cooroora spoke about the nitrogenous fertiliser subsidy, and this was mentioned by others, too. Again promises have been broken. Nothing has been done about overcoming the problems of transport, high fuel costs and the generally exorbitantly high cost of living.

During the Federal election campaign, repeated promises of assistance were made as an election ploy, but nothing has been done about them. Regardless of the assurances that were given about assistance to the beef industry, nothing has been forthcoming to help beef producers in their plight. Instead, the Fraser Government has invested approximately \$750,000,000 in big business on the pretext that that is the only way of combating inflation. It matters little to him that 315,000 people, or 5.18 per cent of the work-force, are unemployed. They can go to Hades for all he cares.

He has cut back massive amounts in Commonwealth payments to nursing homes and for school dental services. This further indicates the Liberal and National Parties' lack of real concern for the health needs of the ordinary people, and, regardless of all the pre-election bleatings about the special problems concerning families in country

areas, over \$1,000,000 has now been cut back from the assistance given to isolated children. While the Fraser Government has been directly responsible for these actions, this State Government must share the blame. By its inaction and its silence it has condoned every regressive policy of the Fraser Government. As my leader so clearly pointed out, it has capitulated, and it must face the consequences.

If it is said that the Whitlam Government moved too quickly in social reform, then it is true that the Fraser Government has tried to reverse the tide at break-neck speed. As I said before, I accept the importance of the private sector in any plan to resuscitate the economy but, as I have already pointed out, it is not the only factor to be considered. There is merit in the concept of reducing Government expenditure as a means of combating inflation but not in the ruthless way the Fraser Government has gone about it. Private enterprise did not respond to that 40 per cent investment allowance that all honourable members opposite supported, and I do not believe it is going to respond to the latest measures. These measures will not guarantee the confidence that is being sought.

The importance of the building and construction industry has already been mentioned, but this has been totally disregarded by Mr. Lynch, as I mentioned in the debate the other day on the Appropriation Bill. Federal expenditure in this area has been drastically reduced. The Fraser Government could easily have adopted a progressive policy of injecting funds into this industry, but instead it slashed the Budget allocation for even Aboriginal housing, which surely must have rated priority in any Aboriginal assistance scheme.

The sad aspect of this situation is that it is the ordinary people—the lower-wage earner, the pensioner, the disadvantaged and the deprived—who must suffer from the Liberal and National Parties' inability to come to grips with the economic problems confronting Australia, and Government members must be shaking at the knees knowing that within about 12 months they have to face an election. They know that only a few months ago the New South Wales people threw out a Tory Government, and if the last election is any indication it will not help members of this Government to blame the Federal Government for its own wrong doing; the people just will not accept it. It will not just be the low income families, the deprived and the rural folk whom the Government has sold out—the deprived minorities alone—who will oppose them; they will find widespread malcontent in the whole community.

At the tertiary level in education thousands of students will find next year that they cannot go on to university or colleges of advanced education. The miserable 2 per cent increase in expenditure at this level

is a further indictment of the Federal Government, and the Australian Universities Commission has predicted that 1977 will be a year of no growth for the nation's universities. It was previous practice for this commission to make its own recommendations to Government, but it has been admitted publicly now that it was in fact forced to keep very strictly to the guide-lines set down by Mr. Fraser and it cannot even bring down equipment grants equal to those we had in 1973-75. Under the restrictive guide-lines set by the Fraser Government the total recommended operating expenditure for Australia will be \$531,200,000, and of this figure Queensland is to receive \$63,671,000. This will have a drastic retarding effect on tertiary education standards.

Not only will development and expansion programmes be shelved but there will be major cuts in recurrent expenditure in areas such as staffing. Hundreds of lecturers, tutors and staff personnel whose contracts expire next year will not be re-employed, and one can see the effect this will have on student intakes and also on the standard of education.

But there is one area of particular concern to me, and I know that this concern is shared by at least some members of the Government, who went with me to the university to discuss it, and that is the area of the Department of External Studies. At present over 3,500 people are involved in external studies throughout Queensland—people who, because of occupational commitments and geographical reasons, are forced to obtain their tertiary qualifications by studying externally. They comprise teachers, public servants and professional people who are striving to improve themselves academically, and those in this Assembly who have been external students know that it is no easy task. Last year the department was cut back by eight staff members, and already this year the mailing of lecture notes has had to be changed from weekly to once every three weeks. Vacation schools have been disbanded; library facilities have suffered, and the workload on the remaining staff members has risen out of all proportion. Moves to expand the variety of courses available have been shelved, and it is patently clear that, if the trend continues, external studies will become a fifth-rate tertiary education programme.

For 66 years the University of Queensland has provided a means for people in country and provincial areas to pursue academic study at the tertiary level, but now it seems that the death-knell has sounded. Irrespective of the in-depth recommendations put to Government in the Open Tertiary Education Report, and irrespective of the sound submission made by Queensland to the committee inquiring into open universities, 3,600 people in this State stand to be treated as though they do not even exist.

The external student has always been at a disadvantage compared with his internal counterpart. For geographical reasons, he has been unable to participate in the wealth of cultural facilities and activities available within the university complex. He has had to contend with professional isolation, poor study conditions and irregular contact with lecturers, as well as the normal family and vocational responsibilities. Because of sheer lack of finance, the department has been severely limited in the variety of subjects that could be offered, and many a student has been forced to undertake an inappropriate course simply because there were no alternatives.

In recent years the department has made every endeavour to overcome some of the problems of isolation by establishing university centres, and I give credit to Mayor Pilbeam in Rockhampton for the assistance he gave in establishing a university centre there. The department also set up area study groups and arranged for country vocational schools. It has gone to great lengths to try to overcome the problems. Now there is to be a further reduction in the money available to it, not only for these services in country areas but also for recurrent expenditures. There will be fewer tutors in country areas to overcome the lecturer-student vacuum. It will not be possible to employ many of them.

I have always held the view that the university itself was partly to blame, because it seemed to me, during my many years as an external student, that it reduced the activities of external studies before it was prepared to prune allocations in other departments. That may still be so to a point, but it is obvious the real blame must be placed fairly and squarely at the feet of the Federal Government.

I admit that I was disappointed when Mr. Hayden, the Labor Treasurer of the day, shelved the recommendations of the open university report. As he said, he was trying to meet other needs. However, the effects of the Lynch Budget will be disastrous. Instead of expenditure being pruned in this area, special grants should have been given to upgrade the open university facilities, and more money should have been given to make sure that there were more tutors and a greater variety in the courses. I believe that it is not yet too late, because Senator Carrick said publicly that the whole question of tertiary needs will be under constant review.

One immediate measure that could be adopted would be action to reduce the huge cost of postage of lecture notes and correspondence material. Any businessman or any citizen can send out letters for 12c each if they number over 500. Surely the Department of External Studies could be given the same privilege. This would save a significant amount of money, as the mailing of lecture notes and books is the very basis of the external studies programme.

Additionally, special grants should be given to allow the department to expand the number of subjects available for study—the courses that students may choose from—to at least somewhere near that offered by the smaller universities. Finally, direct allocations should be made to allow for the employment of more internal lecturers and country tutors, to allow a reasonable standard of education to be maintained.

If the Department of External Studies is not given special treatment, not only will 3,600 students suffer but there will also be a flow-on effect in the community. Teachers and other public servants in country and provincial areas will be put at a promotional disadvantage, because their only avenue of tertiary study will have been downgraded. Many will think twice about accepting transfers away from the areas with universities. They will know that by going to these places they will be restricting their own opportunities for advancement, as they will not be able to obtain the necessary qualifications for promotion. In the long term it will have an effect on the quality of education available to children in these areas, and the community will be the poorer for the absence of highly qualified teachers and Public Service personnel. The external studies dilemma must be tackled by the Federal Government. This State Government has a responsibility to use what pressure it can apply on its Federal counterpart to ensure a better deal for the teachers and public servants it employs throughout the State.

I had intended to talk about the community colleges in the few minutes I have left, but in view of statements made about the teachers' strike during question-time this morning, I shall make some comments on that matter. I believe that the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities and the Premier have been totally irresponsible in their actions.

One accepts the need for action against teachers who use marijuana. No-one says that they should not have been convicted, but let us come back to what the Queensland Teachers' Union has said. It asked for one of four forms of action. First of all it asked for reinstatement of the teachers in their own classrooms. What happened? The answer was, "No." I do not agree that the children should have to put up with that course. I believe that if the parents do not want those teachers there, they have the right to say so. The second suggestion was transfer of the teachers to another school. Again one can understand the public reaction. The conservative from Everton said that he would not have them in his area. O.K., one can accept that. Next it was said, "Let us put them in a non-teaching capacity within the department." That has been done before.

Mr. Lindsay: Where?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will not start using names. It has happened many, many times. I know of people who have been brought back to the main office or the regional office. Irrespective of the fact that the Minister said, "No, we are not going to employ them in the Education Department, because we do not want them in front of classes and we do not believe they should still be teachers", the final compromise put forward by the union was that they should at least remain in the Public Service. What excuse has the Government for not agreeing to that compromise?

Mr. BIRD: I rise to a point of order. I am amazed that the honourable member for Rockhampton—

Mr. Wright: What's your point of order? There's no point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order! I will be the judge of that. I ask the Minister to come to his point of order.

Mr. BIRD: I am amazed that he does not know that I do not control the whole of the Public Service. I am responsible for education only.

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

Mr. WRIGHT: I take his point. Let us not forget that this is the same Minister who, with the Premier, virtually forced the Public Service Board to make the dismissal decision.

Mr. BIRD: I rise to a point of order. I make the absolute and unqualified statement that there was no pressure brought to bear on me at any time, by the Premier or anybody else, to make the decision I did in this matter.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept the point of order. The point is that public statements were made by the Minister that completely prevented the Public Service Board from arriving at an independent opinion.

That was the final compromise suggested by the union, but it was not accepted by the Minister. There is no reason why those teachers should not be employed in the ordinary Public Service. If the Minister was dinky-die about his attitude of not having them in front of classes, and interested in the fact that it cost the State many thousands of dollars to train those teachers, he would have assisted.

There is a final point here. The issue here is not the fact that these teachers smoked marijuana. I do not condone their actions; they were rightly convicted. The issue here is the lack of a right of appeal for public servants and teachers alike against decisions of the Public Service Board. This right must be fought for. It is totally wrong that there should be a dual-judgment system facing public servants and teachers. They go before the courts, but then they also go before the Public Service Board, from which there is no appeal.

That is the issue I stress, not the emotionalism of drugs and everything else that Government members have tried to espouse. The issue concerns the rights in law of ordinary people, the rights in law of public servants and the rights in law of teachers. They have no rights here. This Government needs to reconsider its total stand here, and introduce some machinery provision to allow appeals from the Public Service Board.

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

Mr. BYRNE (Belmont) (2.15 p.m.): Prior to the luncheon recess we heard the raving raconteur from Rockhampton, that righteous Mr. Wright, explain to us in elaborate manner the ways in which things that had been promised had not yet been achieved. He stated quite clearly that he was opposed to tax indexation, arguing with the unreality demonstrated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Supply debate a couple of days ago when he put forward his absurd panacea. The honourable member for Rockhampton pointed out that tax indexation was making it harder for the Federal Government to provide funds in other areas. If opposition to tax indexation was not his point of view, he in no way attempted to explain in his 40-minute raving where the funds necessary to fulfil all the pie-in-the-sky dreams that he and his Federal counterparts had were to come from. It appears that he believes that, if he had an overdraft, the way to solve his economic problems would be to spend his way out of them.

I wonder if in the last three years, while the Federal Labor Government increased personal income tax by 125.4 per cent—and this was a Government which, presumably, was there to represent the workers, the people who contribute pay-as-you-earn income tax—the honourable member for Rockhampton increased by the same proportion his generous donations to charities, sporting organisations and voluntary groups. If it was felt that the Federal Government was providing in a sensible manner those things that were necessary for the community, I can only say that I believe it fell short of that. At that time the Federal Government increased its outlays by 114 per cent and the heaviest burden fell in the area of income tax.

The question that has to be asked continually is this: if there is a desire by the present Federal Government to spend funds elsewhere, where are they to come from? The only place money comes from is the pockets of the Australian people. That is something which, I am certain, the Australian people are extremely aware of.

Mr. Wright: Where is the \$750,000,000 going to private enterprise coming from?

Mr. BYRNE: I accept the interjection. The honourable member wants to know what the \$750,000,000 going into private enterprise will do?

Mr. Wright: No, where is it to come from, other than out of the public sector?

Mr. BYRNE: If I may explain a very simple premise to the honourable member, I point out to him that the total economic resource of a country comes from its capacity to be productive. The salaries that workers receive come from the capacity of the company employing them to be productive. The economic resource, the taxation, and the profitability that they provide come from the ability to be productive. If a Government does not give priority to the productivity of companies—that is, \$750,000,000 out of a Budget of some \$25,000 million—if it does not give priority to ensuring that companies maintain productivity, it will cut its own throat, just as the last Federal Government did, by trying to impose on false premises—on non-existent productivity—an increase in taxation. It simply cannot work. It is pleasing to note that the Government appreciates it must put money into productive areas rather than let it be frittered away on various panaceas and dreams.

Mr. Wright: At the expense of Government programmes?

Mr. BYRNE: No, not at the expense of Government programmes.

Mr. Wright: Didn't you listen to your Treasurer?

Mr. BYRNE: The honourable member for Rockhampton has on two occasions now—in the Address in Reply and in the Supply debate—put forward a most absurd point of view. He has on both occasions presented the argument that insufficient money has been spent. He has stressed the fact that the previous Federal Government paid out enormous amounts for capital works and in many other areas.

Mr. Wright: And in services.

Mr. BYRNE: And in services, yes. He now complains that the present Government is not providing funds at the same level. I agree that it is not. However, I ask him to consider this situation; if he goes to his bank manager and says that he has \$5,000 in the bank and wants to spend \$25,000 without putting forward security or assets, the manager's reply would be, "I don't think you have a very solid case."

Mr. Wright: The analogy is not there.

Mr. BYRNE: The analogy is there. The analogy is real; you cannot spend beyond the means you have.

Mr. Wright: We are talking about a reallocation of resources.

Mr. BYRNE: The resources which existed in those few years were found to be diminishing, because the attempt to gain revenue from them was not balanced in any way by an attempt to increase productivity.

However, I will take up another point mentioned by the honourable member for

Rockhampton—Medibank. He put forward the absurd story that has been told from that side throughout: Medibank is free. Can anyone tell me of a specific service that is provided by any Government that does not cost anyone anything? There isn't any. Every single service, no matter how it is provided, costs money. The imposition of a levy by the Federal Government was its means of saying, "The scheme has to be paid for. We are not going to print money or get it out of watermelons in order to meet the payments for Medibank. We are saying that the money for Medibank is to come from this specific levy."

Mr. Wright: To pay for a free State hospital system.

Mr. BYRNE: To pay for the medical services of a nation. They have said that this is where the money is to come from.

Mr. Wright: Relate that to Queensland's special case with free hospitals.

Mr. BYRNE: The free hospital system in Queensland is serviced by money that comes from the people. The money that is being transferred to it would be coming out of money for services provided elsewhere.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very true to say that truth will be ever unpalatable to those who are determined not to relinquish error. As the days have passed in this Parliament since the previous Federal Government was defeated, there has been a continuing cry that what they did was good, that what they achieved was marvellous and that the greatest disaster Australia is facing is that the present Government is not continuing along the same lines. The electorate in December of last year pointed out quite sincerely and quite honestly that that form of economic analysis was very much wanting.

The public was not told at that election that in six months we would have Utopia. It was not told at that election that the problems created in three years would be solved in six months. The present Government leaders did not say that the inflationary problems would be solved before the first Budget. They did not say they would overcome unemployment before the first Budget. They made no such promise. On every occasion when the present Prime Minister spoke, he said he wanted a full three years, and I think it is fair enough that he should have three years to remedy the ills caused by the three years of Labor Government, which destroyed the achievements of over 50 years of good management by previous Governments.

The argument presented by members of the Opposition—and one that they continually persist in raising—is that those things that the Labor Government operated upon—the economies of scale it worked upon and the economic thesis on which it operated—were all successful. They were totally unsuccessful. The policies did not work.

So it is time to rethink. It is not time to come out and say, "You are not continuing with everything that we had before." The Opposition is wasting its time. The public were not prepared to accept it at that time.

It is most important that we appreciate that high interest rates, unemployment, inflation, high postage costs, high fuel costs and such other imposts came about in the three years of the Federal Labor Government. If we are asked why we have not done something about reducing postage or fuel costs, why we have not reintroduced the milk subsidy scheme, why we have not solved unemployment or inflation, or why we have not brought interest rates down, the obvious reason is the total chaos and disaster created in a three-year period through wantonness and lack of preparation for the future.

The honourable member for Bulimba said the other day on the same theme, "What about today?" The argument that we have to put forward is that the Government is here not only for today but also for tomorrow and, if today it does not prepare for tomorrow, it should not be in Government.

The honourable member for Rockhampton had the hide to blame the Federal Government for the failure of five building societies, which the honourable member for Archerfield had been working on for 12 months in his endeavour to bring about the total collapse of that industry. If it had not been for the hard work and efforts of this Government, and in particular, Sir Gordon Chalk, in spite of the attempts by the honourable member for Archerfield to crush the economy of Queensland, the condition of that industry would be far worse than it is. The people with money invested in building societies would be far worse off.

The honourable member for Archerfield showed no concern for the people certain to be affected by it, no concern for the pensioners, the aged, and others who had invested superannuation funds to secure their future. His only concern was to bring about the fall and collapse of a most important economic enterprise in this State by creating fear in the community. If he had been really concerned about those people, he could have gone about things in a very different manner. But his primary concern was destructive, not constructive. As long as members of the Opposition pursue the line of being destructive in their criticism of economic circumstances and of systems, they will find themselves in the same depressed situations.

The honourable member for Rockhampton, in his endeavours to mislead the House, said that the Federal Government had abolished the funeral benefit. That is not so; it was not abolished. The proposal was put forward and senators of my political persuasion and complexion were enabled, by expressing their

individual rights—something that does not occur on the Opposition side of the House—

Mr. Marginson: Only seven of them.

Mr. BYRNE: Whether it was one, seven, or 100—seven members of our political complexion were sufficient to have that point of view expressed in the Senate. Members of the A.L.P., of course, find it more difficult to express their individual and independent point of view when they have one.

One other matter of particular importance, which was raised by the honourable member for Rockhampton towards the end of his speech, concerns the conviction of teachers for criminal offences. I wish to put forward a scenario of the difficult circumstance in which the Government and the people of Queensland find themselves on this. While the smoking and possession of marijuana are illegal in this State and while the majority of Queenslanders support the maintenance of laws prohibiting the smoking and possession of marijuana, its possession and use will always be a criminal offence.

Mr. Lindsay: It will always be illegal as long as I am here.

Mr. BYRNE: Yes, it may always be illegal.

The first premise is that it is an expression of the feeling of the majority of Queenslanders that the possession and smoking of marijuana are criminal offences.

The second premise is that the majority of Queenslanders, including members of this Government, believe that public servants should be people of the highest integrity. I am quite certain that the public would not want a situation where people with criminal convictions were enabled to enter the Public Service with ease. Indeed, the Government would find itself in difficulties if it tried to amend that part of the Public Service Act. So the quandary is quite clear. The people of Queensland have said two things through the expression of their Government: one is that the possession and smoking of marijuana are illegal and shall be a criminal offence and the other is that they do not desire to have, in the Public Service, people with criminal convictions. Unless one of those circumstances is changed, or both of them, by the outward expression of the people of Queensland, the Government can pursue no other course of action than the one it has taken. If it took any other, it would be showing itself not to possess the confidence of the people and not to be fulfilling the legal requirements that this Parliament has imposed on it.

I now move to the third point of my address. It was only a few days ago when Parliament opened that a writer in "The Australian", Mr. Max Jessop, decided to use some of his naive means to try to discredit political systems and structures in Australia.

"The Australian" is a nation-wide newspaper and in it this writer expressed a political point of view about our democratic system.

Mr. Greenwood: Is that the same Mr. Jessop who is an active member of the Australian Labor Party?

Mr. BYRNE: It is the same person. It is to its credit that, when Max Jessop stood for preselection for the State seat of Ipswich, he was not graced with that selection. I am surprised that he did not get it but the fact is that he did not. When he takes the hypocritical stand shown in his article, and speaks of members of Parliament and the political system in Queensland in a most derogatory manner, at the same time displaying his own ignorance of the situation, one important point is brought to light. There are too many academics and members of the media in this country who are grossly irresponsible. We as members of Parliament have to face the people every three years. Whatever we say and do comes up for their judgment. Every three years the public is able to say "Because you said this or that, and because you did or did not do this or that, we now by our vote express our point of view and our will." But academics and members of the media are able to express their points of view without having to accept any responsibility for what they say. If they have any responsibility at all, it is very little indeed. They can be whimsical and they can try to create a situation of anarchy in a country, and by slow and progressive means they are achieving just that. The more they criticise our political systems and the representatives elected by the people, the more they break down respect for those institutions and the greater the move towards an anarchical structure with elements of violence.

Certain academics, members of the Press and the other media, union leaders and leaders of political organisations are endeavouring slowly but surely to break down the democratic political structures in this country. If their endeavours are successful, the people of Queensland, and indeed the whole of Australia, will be the losers. It is the people who will miss out. It is therefore important that we as members of Parliament expose them. It is important that we get across to the community that we are not as some people describe us.

I should like to refer to a couple of the statements Max Jessop made in his derogatory article about the Queensland Parliament. He said—

"Some members from country seats, who have not been near Parliament House since the last session ended in May, will blow the dust from their desks and renew acquaintances with their colleagues and opponents.

"Beer will be drunk in the gloomy members' bar, snooker and billiards will be played, and many four course meals will be eaten at \$1 a head.

"Heavily subsidised eating is one of the perks in the life of a Queensland MLA."

Of course, he fails to point out that he himself is subject to this same kind of perk, as he calls it. He fails to point out that in 1972 he was quite prepared to take on the responsibility associated with being a member of Parliament, but he likes to decry it, he likes to denigrate it and he likes to see that those people who hold office in this State are denied respect. He likes to see that it is not understood what individuals in the community have to do, that it is not understood that members of this Parliament, from whatever party they might be, actually have to work and have to work far harder than he has to gain his living, and, what is more, have to be far more responsible to the community than he has in any manner, shape or form.

Mr. Moore: He gets \$3 meal allowance, pays \$1 here and makes \$2 profit.

Mr. BYRNE: I am not surprised. That does not surprise me in the least. As a student of journalism at one time, I have always thought that the media should endeavour to put the truth across to the public.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton has had his opportunity.

Mr. BYRNE: He says further—

"In Queensland this doesn't happen because if a question without notice is longer than about 20 words the Ministers can't remember enough of it to answer and it goes on the notice paper anyway."

That is factually incorrect. It is an endeavour to break down respect for parliamentary structures and to ridicule people who hold public office. If that attitude of ridicule is allowed to persist in this country, those people who indulge in it, who tell those lies and who try to gain benefit at other people's expense and at the expense of the parliamentary institution, must suffer their own denigration.

I conclude with a reiteration of the three points I made. The first dealt with the diatribe from the honourable member from Rockhampton, where he once again, as he has on previous occasions, endeavoured to explain how the Federal Government has failed and why it has failed in the six or eight months it has been in office—totally failing to grasp the principles and totally failing to grasp that the philosophy and policy upon which the Government of his complexion operated was totally unworkable, and that imposing those same rules and those same ideas upon this Government certainly would not be beneficial in any way to the people of Australia.

As my second point I dealt with the crisis now involving certain teachers in Queensland. A dilemma exists. The two premises are simple. The smoking of marijuana and

the possession of it are criminal offences, and the Public Service Act does not allow people convicted of criminal offences to remain in employment within the Public Service. The dilemma? If the public want it changed, they will change it.

My third point was that it is imperative that we as members of Parliament work to see that certain academics and certain members of the media and certain other people in the community who desire to try to break down our political structures and democratic institutions by ridicule and by lies are exposed and that the Parliaments in Australia have accorded to them the respect they deserve.

Mr. GIBBS (Albert) (2.39 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to rise and pledge my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen through His Excellency the Governor, Sir Colin Hannah, and I say that for all the people I know and most of the people I represent. I would like to state at this stage that Sir John Kerr has my full support in his activities, and I absolutely condemn the Left-wing oriented people in Australia for the actions they have taken against Sir John Kerr, a man appointed as Governor-General by the Labor Party, a man who has honourably carried out his duties as Governor-General. He has proved to be a real Governor-General and not just a man who goes around opening buildings and fetes. He is a man who takes his job seriously as he showed when he sacked the Whitlam Government. He did not shy away from that course when he saw that he had no other option; but he was then condemned by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Gough Whitlam. I state here and now my strong support for the Governor-General in the job that he has done for Australia.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the comments made by members of the Opposition, and I should like to refer particularly to those of the honourable member for Archerfield. "Hansard" shows that he said—

"The honourable member for Windsor asks why I do not pledge my loyalty to the Crown. I repeat what I said in the Address-in-Reply debate last year. I am a republican, and the sooner Australia becomes a republic, the better. As far as I am concerned, the monarchy and all its appendages, such as the offices of Governor and Governor-General, are political anachronisms and should be abolished."

That is typical of the views of many—not all—A.L.P. members. It is the policy of the party, and they are bound to adhere to it wherever possible.

I should like at this stage to welcome the two new members of this Assembly, Mr. Ivan Brown, the member for Clayfield, and Mr. Bill Prest, the member for Port Curtis, and say that I will do anything I can to assist them.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Bundaberg must not interject from other than his usual seat.

Mr. GIBBS: The honourable member for Port Curtis does not seem to hold views as far to the Left as those of some of his colleagues in this Chamber.

I wish to mention education and refer particularly to the hassles the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities has had over the past few weeks with pot-smoking teachers and to the decisions he has had to make and stand by. I assure him that the people of Queensland who support democracy fully support his actions. I ask him to adhere solidly to those actions, and I let him know that he has the full support of Government back-benchers.

It is interesting to note that the headline in the "Telegraph" today indicates that a number of teachers have been strong enough to take a stand—"Teachers Defy Strike Order". It is good to see that teachers have come out strongly on this issue and are willing to stand up and be counted, so that the respect that they have built up over many years in Australia, and in Queensland in particular, is not eroded. They are people who take their job very seriously.

In his speech yesterday, the member for Isis quoted from the code of ethics of school-teachers that appears in the "Queensland Teachers Journal". I ask all honourable members to read it, but I draw attention particularly to item 6 which says—

"A teacher shall act within the community in a manner which enhances the prestige of his profession."

I think that is self-explanatory, and it explains the attitude of many teachers to the present situation. They are looking for a way out and an opportunity to join a union that is not under the cloud of the Left-wing attitude of the Queensland Teachers' Union under the presidency of Mr. Costello, whose handling of the situation is as bad as it could possibly be. He has taken many teachers down the road with him in loss of respect, and I hope that the teachers in my electorate will support the teachers who, according to reports in today's Press, have been strong enough to oppose Mr. Costello and the illegal strike he is forcing upon the union because four teachers have broken the law.

Let me turn now to some of the schools in my electorate. Mabel Park School, which is fairly new, has a few problems. Earlier this year the Minister for Works and Housing visited the school, and I am pleased to say that he took action immediately and allocated about \$30,000 to fix up some of the drainage and clear some of the trees and rubbish that had been left lying about during the construction of the school.

That brings me to the point that in future a more realistic view should be taken in the planning of schoolgrounds. The schools

themselves these days are built to a very high standard, but there always seems to be some lack of schoolground work. The grounds should be left in reasonable order so that the p. and c. can undertake its responsibility, which it is so willing to undertake, to bring them into good order on a subsidised basis. A lot more money needs to be spent to bring the Mabel Park school area to an acceptable standard for schoolgrounds in 1976.

Not far away from that school is the Loganholme school. A very nice school has been built there to replace the old building, but the grounds have been left in poor condition. The land has been left too low and insufficient drainage has been provided. It will be an intolerable situation for the p. and c. We have to prevent that sort of thing in the future. I am very pleased with the attitude of the new Minister for Works and Housing (Mr. Lee) who has been out to inspect most of the areas I am talking about. He agrees that that type of thing should not happen in Queensland. I will certainly be on the back of everyone to try to overcome these problems.

Most schools have some problems—some large, some small—but they are being gradually overcome. We will be working hard to see that all the schools are upgraded.

It was interesting to read in "The Family Pages" of today's "Courier-Mail" an article about the Beenleigh and Woongoolba State Schools. It is pointed out that after 18 months' work, 21 grade 7 students at Woongoolba State School have virtually eliminated nut grass from their garden plot at the school. I have inspected that project several times. This successful experiment with nut grass eradication is a wonderful achievement by those young children living in a rural area. Nut grass is always a great problem and they eradicated it in that short time. There is a photograph showing roses in the prize-winning garden at the Beenleigh State School. Project club members were interviewed yesterday and their photograph appears in today's newspaper. I am proud, as I am sure they are, to see their photograph there today.

I must refer to the role of the Works Department and the Education Department in the securing of school sites. Many school sites are needed, particularly in the growth areas around Brisbane. I am pleased to know that a site in Bryants Road, Loganholme, has been purchased and set aside for the building of a school. It will be integrated with the existing Loganholme School. It is important that that school be proceeded with fairly soon because a busy highway virtually cuts the area in half. The sooner children do not have to cross the highway each day to get to school, the better it will be. Over the years that road will become increasingly busy. Land has been purchased at Eagleby as a primary school site. I am

very pleased about that because there are many Housing Commission homes in the area.

Mr. Moore: What would you say about people being able to buy those Housing Commission homes without any deposit?

Mr. GIBBS: That is a tremendous forward move by the Minister for Works and Housing. He has taken steps to try to get Queensland back to home-ownership. When the new Housing Agreement was drawn up in 1973, the Whitlam Government tried to stop people from purchasing homes. After a fight our Government was able to convince the Commonwealth Government that the commission should be able to sell 30 per cent of the homes. That was just not good enough. It is good to see that the Minister has taken a stand so that any house built prior to the 1973 agreement can be bought on a minimum deposit. Under this decision anyone who wishes to take the plunge is given the opportunity to purchase his own home.

With the increase in loans from \$18,000 to \$25,000, and the reduction in deposits to \$200 or \$300, everyone is given an opportunity to plan for home-ownership. The former limit of \$18,000 was insufficient to allow an average income earner to become a home owner. It is good to note the improvement. Wherever possible, I have encouraged Housing Commission tenants—if they feel at all secure—to take the plunge.

Anything I can do as their representative to help them in attaining home-ownership shall be done with the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. Moore: It is a good policy.

Mr. GIBBS: It is. It is the policy of our free-enterprise Government. Now that we have such a Government in Canberra, the next Housing Agreement will no doubt overcome home-ownership difficulties and we will once again gain the benefit of the free-enterprise system.

The Minister has done a good job in altering house designs—something which many back-benchers have been urging for a long time—and some very good designs have been prepared for brick-veneer, tiled-roof houses. Similar designs are available in other types of material for the western and northern areas where material is not as readily available as it is in the city.

Much more planning is required for school sites in future growth areas. Sites for high schools and primary schools are required south of Beenleigh and in the northern area of the Gold Coast. I have been urging that this be done for some considerable time. Although some action is in progress, it is not the right action. The experts are not thinking far enough ahead. They are not buying enough ground to overcome satisfactorily the need for future school sites in

growth areas. A lot more liaison is required between the departments, the councils and members representing areas.

In the next 12 months I should like to see much more planning to avoid a repetition of the trouble in the Kingston-Woodridge area. In this area we have many problems caused by big schools with too many pupils. Large school attendances create extreme difficulty and prevent teachers from doing their best. The Education Department and the Works Department have done their utmost. I know that \$9,000,000 has been spent, and that another \$5,000,000 has been set aside for expenditure in this area. However, little good is served when jobs remain on the drawing board. Action is required in this area to overcome the growth-factor problems.

I turn now to the problems in the private sector created by the former Federal Government. I refer to inflation and unemployment. We know that 25 per cent of the population is employed in the public sector, 42 per cent in small business and the rest in big business. Those in the small business section are an important group of people, who have been affected very badly by inflation. I endorse everything that has been done by the Fraser-Anthony Government to attack inflation. Control of inflation is the key to employment and security for our school-leavers. If every small business employed one additional person, it would more than absorb those unemployed in the work-force.

I emphasise that control of inflation will help to soak up the unemployed and get our school-leavers into the private-enterprise section. To achieve that, I believe we have to take some positive action. I would like to see a corporation set up outside the Public Service to help private enterprise and assist small business. Business should not be wrapped in cotton wool, but it should be assisted to stand on its own feet. Advice on management and accounting, when necessary, could be given in an effort to overcome some of the problems that have been accentuated—there have always been problems, but they have been accentuated—by the socialist policies of the Whitlam Government. Taxes are far too high. We heard the Treasurer say this morning that tax is far too high on the working man and far too high on small business. In fact, many small businesses these days are not making sufficient to cover interest payments. That results in insecurity for the working man, who relies on private enterprise, a good flow of trade and not too many of the industrial problems that we have faced over the years.

We have to assist small business to engage apprentices. Apprenticeship must be encouraged, perhaps by a refund of pay-roll tax on apprentices—if not throughout Queensland, then in what are recognised by the Government as decentralised areas. If something positive is not done in the field of apprenticeship, we will be short of

tradesmen in the near future. Because of the great setback that the private sector has suffered, I believe there will be an over-supply of people such as engineers, architects and others involved in development. What hope is there for men and women coming out of the university and the Q.I.T.? What hope do they have of getting a job when the private sector in the development field is so far down the drain? Until activity picks up, there will no security whatever for Queenslanders or Australians.

Some incentive should be given to small business by raising the level of exemption on pay-roll tax to \$100,000, with the rates for the next \$100,000 being on a sliding scale. That action should be taken as soon as possible. I do not know whether it can be done in this year's Budget, but we have to be fair dinkum about it because, without the private sector in good health and without security for the working man, we are really not going to get anywhere. Let us face it: once the wheels are turning properly and private enterprise is mobile and paying its way, any incentives given are more than recouped through taxation. The plug must be pulled out and business given its head. Business must be put back on its feet and security restored for the work-force.

In turning to local government, I refer to the job done on the roads in my electorate by the Minister for Local Government. More work has to be done. Some turn-offs in busy areas are becoming dangerous, but I know that plans are under way for them. I give the Minister full credit for the job he has done on the four-lane highway in my electorate. As well, the freeway is heading out of Brisbane towards a link-up with my area, which will facilitate a much faster and safer journey into and out of Brisbane.

I wish to speak briefly about the Fraser-Anthony policy on set grants to local authorities. Under the former Federal Government, the Gold Coast City Council got absolutely nothing from the Grants Commission. The Albert Shire received an amount, but it was just the minimum. However, under this Government every council will get something. There will also be a topping up for authorities that are felt to be in need. We were a little disappointed about the money that came through to assist with sewerage, but we may at a later date get a little more to further overcome the backlog. The Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council need more money for those things.

The Camp Scott Furfy report on sewerage has now been published. It cost the Government something over \$200,000. It will help overcome the problem that has been experienced for many years in the Albert Shire and Gold Coast City. It is pleasing to hear that the report on the

investigation into disposal of solid waste, which is a real problem in growth areas, will be available shortly.

I congratulate the Premier on his stand concerning police action in the illegal demonstration in Brisbane not long ago. I believe it has had a direct effect on those people who would normally have demonstrated against the Governor-General when he visited Queensland. The law and order policy in Queensland has paid off and will continue to pay off as long as we are fair dinkum. It is the least that the people of Queensland expect us to do.

I should like to touch briefly on the Beenleigh area, particularly the planning of the central portion adjacent to the railway line. I hope that we will soon be able to overcome the planning problems so that the Albert Shire Council can get on with the provision of parking areas in the central area of Beenleigh.

At the moment it is planned to establish a Meals on Wheels service in Beenleigh. With the help of Woodridge, the scheme will be implemented right throughout that area.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (3.2 p.m.): First of all, on behalf of my constituents and members of the Opposition, I express loyalty to the Queen. We pledge our loyalty unstintingly and unreservedly.

It is rather tragic that Her Majesty's representative in Australia—the Governor-General—is not held in the same high esteem.

Mr. Lamont: That's a bit shallow.

Mr. MELLOY: It is a bit shallow, yes, but that is the situation as we see it today. In acknowledging our loyalty and allegiance to the Queen, it is necessary to record the actual situation concerning her representative in Australia. Many people in Australia do not hold the Queen's representative in Australia in the same high regard as they hold Her Majesty.

I congratulate the new Minister (Honourable J. W. Greenwood). I do not know whether he was ever a front runner for that appointment. He would have been a 100 to 1 shot, but he came home and paid a decent dividend, principally for himself. It is a rather surprising appointment, having regard to the sentiments expressed by the Premier, in referring to the Police Force, about the value of experience. He adopts a completely different attitude when selecting someone for appointment to his Cabinet. All in all, I think that the new Minister will do justice to the position.

An Honourable Member: He should have been Minister for Justice.

Mr. MELLOY: He should have been.

I express my sympathy to the new incumbents of various portfolios. The Honourable A. M. Hodges gets my sympathy, as do the Honourable W. E. Knox, the Honourable T. G. Newbery and the Honourable W. D.

Lickiss. They have accepted responsibilities that they will find very onerous under the present set-up in the Cabinet, with the heavy hand of the Premier on them all of the time. I think that they will find the going very difficult and that there is a very great strain on their capacity in dealing not only with their portfolios but also with the pressures that will be placed upon them.

I pay a tribute to the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Sir Gordon Chalk). He did an extraordinarily good job in this Parliament. He could take it, and he could take it cleanly. He could take the bucket if it were tipped on him and throw it back on us if he wanted to. He was not like some back-bench Government members who cannot do that. As Minister for Transport and as Treasurer he was one of the few Ministers able to answer a question without notice without any difficulty. He did not ask to have questions put on notice and he did not need to have departmental officers at his elbow when answering questions. He knew his job and he did it capably. He is a distinct loss to Parliament and a very great loss to the Government.

After the Cabinet reshuffle, if it could be so described, a surveyor now deals with law and a barrister deals with maps. It is rather extraordinary. The former Police Minister has been demoted to Tourism and the former Minister for Tourism has been promoted to understudy the Premier in the Police Department. In the result, the Premier has emerged from the changes with his foot firmly in the Police Department and his big toe in the door of the Treasury.

Quite a few problems confront the State and I propose to deal with several of them. They are all important and they confront not only this Government but many others in Australia and elsewhere throughout the world.

One of the most pressing problems is unemployment and it has to be dealt with more efficiently than has been the case up till now. In the 1930s I spent about 10½ months on relief work. I was a young married man and I worked for a day and a half a week at 13s. a day to feed my wife and young child. I received about £1 a week and at least I earned it. We certainly were not dole bludgers; we worked for the money that we received. I think that working for money received is something that is worth considering now as it would eliminate the rorts that are worked with unemployment relief.

Where, I wonder, is the much-vaunted concern of the National and Liberal Parties for those who are unemployed? Where is the much-vaunted concern of the National Party for those who live in the country? It was estimated in a survey released in Canberra last week that six out of 10 school-leavers will go on the dole later this year or early next year. It is estimated that in some country areas of Queensland the figure will be 10 out of 10; in other words, there

will be absolutely no employment available for young country school-leavers. This is a tragedy. Nothing could be more demoralising for young people than to find themselves seeking jobs that do not exist and becoming unwanted within the community. That is tragic for both the people directly affected and for the community.

After all his grandiose promises last year, the Prime Minister appears to have abandoned the unemployed. He has no practical solution to the problem of unemployment that faces this country today. There is very little the States can do while the Prime Minister remains unconcerned. He is content to have in this country the level of unemployment that there was in the 1930s.

Mr. LOWES: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has made two statements that are not in fact true. One is that 10 out of 10 school-leavers next year will be unemployed. That is not true—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): There is no point of order.

Mr. LOWES: He is also saying that the Prime Minister is not interested—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot take a point of order on behalf of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MELLOY: It is ridiculous the way some honourable members opposite try to excuse the Prime Minister, but as usual there is no substance to their points of order and no substance to their interjections. The Prime Minister is content with the type of unemployment that will wreck the careers of young people for the remainder of their lives. Last year the Prime Minister promised to tackle inflation in conjunction with unemployment. Now he is prepared to separate the two issues, leaving thousands of Australians to fare for themselves in their hunt for jobs.

Mr. Lester: The Labor Party started all this.

Mr. Frawley: Who wrote that rubbish for you?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MELLOY: Young people do not want to join the dole queues. They want and expect more from the country and they expect more from the Government. It should provide them with the opportunity to learn trades and take their place in the workforce of this country. They are being conscripted onto the dole queues by the Government supported by honourable members opposite.

Where is the National Party in all this? We do not consider the Liberal Party because it writes itself off. The National Party is no longer the old Country Party we had in this House, this State or in the Federal Parliament. Today its members are more interested in foreign mining companies than they

are in the man in the country. This is a different party from the one the people of outback Queensland knew in the past. The party at least was prepared to concentrate its efforts on their behalf. The National Party talks of decentralisation but chases young people from the rural areas by its failure to provide jobs.

Mr. Lester interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Belyando!

Mr. MELLOY: The country people of this State were 100 per cent better off when they were represented by members of the Australian Labor Party before they were gerrymandered out of helping those areas of the State.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Persistent interjections will not be tolerated. I warn the honourable member for Murrumba and the honourable member for Belyando that if they persist I will have to take further action.

Mr. MELLOY: If it affects their ego at all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a matter of fact I did not hear them.

The National Party today is more concerned with destroying the Liberal Party—it will never destroy the Labor Party—by its intrusion into—

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. That is a deliberate misrepresentation. The National Party is not concerned with destroying the Liberal Party.

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

Mr. MELLOY: They are more concerned with winning seats in Brisbane than they are with country employment problems. The displacement of Government workers is a very serious problem. The sacking of Works Department employees is a major factor in the unemployment problem in the building industry today. These men swell the ranks of the unemployed in a very important area of employment in the State, the building industry. Figures released this week show that building levels in Queensland for June were down by 14 per cent. With the building slump at its worst, the Fraser Government has reduced Federal money available for housing. The Fraser Government does not want employment. It does not want families to have the opportunity to own their own homes.

It is trying to stand over the Newcastle shipyard workers. They are being blackmailed into accepting a complete breakdown of industrial standards in return for their jobs. Unless they surrender to the terms that Fraser has failed to win under industrial law, their jobs will be exported to Japan. This is all part of the Federal Government's plan to coerce workers into accepting lower

standards in their employment, lower standards in working conditions and lower wages. If Fraser succeeds in Newcastle, it will lead to an opening of the gates and it can be expected that similar pressures will be applied in other industries in Australia. If this form of coercion is exercised throughout the industries of Australia—and it will be if the Prime Minister succeeds in Newcastle; let there be no bones about that—I say that it is a pernicious act by the Prime Minister to destroy the workers of this country.

There is another aspect that I should mention. Not only are more workers unemployed today; they are also unemployed for longer terms. That was demonstrated by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech earlier in the debate, when he pointed out that the average period of unemployment when the Labor Party was undemocratically removed from office by the Governor-General was 13 weeks and that the average period of unemployment has now risen to 17½ weeks. Under the present Federal Government, the period will rise even higher.

Mr. Lester: That's a bit like the Gallup poll; it's a fake.

Mr. MELLOY: The honourable member is the greatest fake that ever came into this Chamber.

I wish to refer now to Medibank and the tragic demise of Queensland's free hospital system. Despite all the side-tracking and all the red herrings of the Government, there is no denying the fact that the free hospital system and services that have been available without means test in Queensland till now under all Governments have been destroyed. The free hospital system in this State has been abolished.

Mr. Gygar interjected.

Mr. MELLOY: That is a question that does not need answering.

Mr. Gygar: That is absolute rubbish. They were never free; they were always paid for out of Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. MELLOY: From 1 October, the people of Queensland, whether they like it or not, will pay for health services that traditionally have been free in this State for more than 30 years. With the exception, perhaps, of some pensioners, they will pay the 2½ per cent levy. In country areas, many people will pay even though they do not have a local doctor or hospital. They will be paying the levy for nothing, because in many towns in Queensland no hospital services are available. People will be forced to pay the levy to provide something they will not receive.

The State Government has been a conspirator in the betrayal of Queensland's free hospital system. No matter what the Minister for Health says, after 1 October there will not be any free health services as we have known them in this State. These services will be available to Queenslanders, with the

exception of pensioners, only after the payment of a 2½ per cent levy. Where is the concern of the Premier for the welfare of Queenslanders? Neither he nor his colleagues raised a finger against the Federal Government's Medibank plans that were loaded so heavily against Queensland. They made a lot of noise about it; they protested under their breath; but they did not take any action to preserve the rights of this State.

In 1969 the Liberal Party's cry was, "Don't let Labor destroy Queensland's free hospitals." What a hollow ring that cry has now! The very people who raised that cry have completed the destruction of our free hospital system. They should hang their heads in shame.

Mr. Lester interjected.

Mr. MELLOY: The honourable member for Belyando is shooting off his mouth every few seconds, but nobody knows what he is talking about. I am very doubtful whether he knows himself.

As to the impositions of the Federal Government—the Queensland coalition tigers behaved like mice when they went to Melbourne to confront Mr. Fraser on this issue. The Prime Minister fobbed them off with the story that Medibank would be strengthened, and they fell for it. Mr. Fraser and the A.M.A. have taken Queensland for a ride as far as medical services are concerned.

Mr. Frawley: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. MELLOY: Nobody has to write a speech for me. Honourable members opposite would not understand that the speeches that are not written are the easiest ones to deliver. Half of them do not know what they are talking about when they read a prepared speech.

The Federal Government fixed the rates for Medibank insurance well before the private insurance societies announced theirs, and deliberately gave them the opportunity to undercut Medibank rates by calling on their massive reserves of some \$175,000,000. I do not think the present Federal Government has ever meant or means to let the Medibank scheme be successful. On the contrary, it has done everything it can to encourage the private societies to assume responsibility for medical and hospital benefits, with a view to cutting out Medibank. This attitude has been clearly shown in its actions as far as Medibank is concerned. One way or the other, it will destroy Medibank by default.

I should like the Minister for Health to answer the comments of Sir Gordon Chalk at the June Premiers' Conference. I will quote from the transcript of that conference at page 64. The then Queensland Treasurer said—

"We in Queensland had a free hospital system. We scrapped that because we believed that we had entered into a binding agreement with the Commonwealth Government. Because of that we did certain

things and we took certain actions. I must confess that what has happened of recent weeks has shaken my faith in the sincerity of making any agreement with any Government."

At that stage Sir Gordon Chalk was referring to the ploy of Mr. Fraser in using a legal loop-hole to place our whole hospital-care programme in danger. Honourable members might recall what the Prime Minister did at that time.

At various times last year the States entered into agreements with the Commonwealth Government under which the States provided free public-ward cover and the Commonwealth met 50 per cent of the recurrent costs. The Fraser Government suspended these payments under the scheme but condescended to give the States interim funding. Budget paper No. 7 now shows the Fraser Government's real intention. Figures on page 48 of that Budget paper reveal that in 1975-76 the Labor Government gave Queensland \$103,000,000. In 1976-77 Queensland will receive \$97,000,000, a reduction of \$6,000,000 and, in real terms of the fluctuation in the value of the dollar over the period, a cut of 20 per cent.

Throughout the election campaign in December 1975, Mr. Fraser and the Queensland Minister for Health (Dr. Edwards) said that Medibank would be maintained. But we have not witnessed the honest responsible government that was promised at the time; the Medibank scheme, as the people of Queensland knew it, has not been maintained. In fact, it has been decimated.

Mr. Frawley: You are reading that word for word.

Mr. MELLOY: The honourable member could not read it.

Last year the Federal Labor Government introduced a Medibank scheme that was clear, simple and straightforward. It has been replaced by a scheme that is untried, untested and unnecessary. Labor's scheme was designed to provide health care for everybody, but it would take a university graduate many hours of research to understand the present scheme, let alone make full use of it. The "Medimaze" grows more complicated every day.

Mr. Doumany: You will know what to do.

Mr. MELLOY: I know what to do. I have a little more brains than Government members.

At page 13, the latest Medibank booklet states—

"This gives only a broad outline to the rules about the levy and to the range of benefits which Medibank private insurance and other private funds will provide and to the cost of these benefits."

I am very anxious to see the detailed outline of the Medibank scheme. When that

is published perhaps I, and all Government members, will understand. If they do not, I will explain it to them.

Mr. Fraser said that the scheme was still universal. How can it be universal when no-one can understand it? Many unsuspecting people will take out the highest possible cover to ensure that they are not caught in any legal loop-holes that Mr. Fraser tries to find; others will simply pay the levy and never know that, for a few extra dollars, they could obtain the highest cover under the scheme; and some will pay the levy and the private health contributions until they receive their first accounts in January 1977.

I strongly advise everybody to study carefully all information available on the Medibank schemes. The best thing anyone in doubt can do is consult officers of Medibank agencies to ensure that they do not get caught by any contributions or payments they make. Quite a lot of pensioners will be affected. Those who earn a few extra dollars will be hit by the levy.

The cost of administering Labor's Medibank scheme was 4 per cent of the turnover; the administration of the private health funds cost 15 per cent of the turnover; but the new "Medimaze" will be an administrative monstrosity that could cost up to 20 per cent of turnover to administer. Fraser's new Medibank scheme will mean that, for every dollar a worker pays out of his pay packet, 15c to 20c will be wasted in administrative costs, pamphlets, new forms, staff and offices. That is the picture confronting the people of Queensland under the Fraser scheme. It is riddled with waste, confusion and bungling. My assertion will become evident after 1 October when people fully appreciate its full implications.

There is, however, a light at the end of the tunnel. When the Australian Labor Party returns to Government in Canberra in 1978, Medibank will be restored to its original stature, serving all the people of Australia and not just a few.

I shall now speak about the school dental scheme, something with which I have been closely associated. Eight years ago, when Dr. Winston Noble sought to introduce the scheme in Queensland—unfortunately, he did not get far with it—I went to Tasmania to study the scheme there. When Labor attained office in Canberra in 1972—

Mr. Lindsay: It made a mess.

Mr. MELLOY: No fear it didn't! If the honourable member were to ask his own Health Minister for his opinions on this, he would discover the fallacy of the Fraser approach to the dental scheme.

The Labor Party accelerated the plan to provide a free dental service to all primary school-children. Until the recent Fraser Budget, the capital costs of the new training facilities and clinics were fully funded by the Federal Government. Labor provided the States with the full cost of operating training

facilities. In the Health Paper on the school dental therapy programme, issued by the Minister for Health (Dr. Edwards), there was no mention of that great Labor achievement. Now the Fraser Government, with the consent of the Health Minister, has reduced its contributions for capital works from 100 per cent to 90 per cent.

Whereas the Labor Government funded 75 per cent of the operating costs of clinics, the present Federal Government will pay only 65 per cent. The result is that Federal Government payments for new projects in Queensland have been reduced from \$5,300,000 under Labor to the present \$2,400,000, representing a cut of 68 per cent. As a consequence, the training clinic project is clouded in uncertainty. The Minister himself does not know where it is going. He has made some progress in the provision of these services and training clinics, but what will happen to them now is anybody's guess. The Minister's recent statement further clouds the issue of these training clinics. He attempted to protect the move made by the Federal Government, while at the same time covering up for his own Government's embarrassment and weaknesses.

Let us have a look at the school milk scheme, which is another important aspect of health care of our children. The scheme has been completely scrapped. Last year the Government maintained milk supplies to schools in disadvantaged areas. The Fraser Government has also scrapped the TB programme. Except for pensions for TB sufferers and their dependants, there will be no Commonwealth funding after 31 December 1976. If the nation's health suffers as a result of the policies of the Fraser Government, there will be no savings for anyone.

Mr. Doumany: Do you accept the need for milk for school-children?

Mr. MELLOY: Somebody must have cracked a joke. He wants to watch that he doesn't crack his head.

Let me now deal with the Police Force in Queensland.

Mr. Lindsay: Keep it going.

Mr. MELLOY: I'll keep it going; there's no need to worry about that.

Mr. Young: He is talking so much rubbish that it just keeps flowing out.

Mr. MELLOY: You think that everything is rubbish. That is the only thing you understand. If what we say is not rubbish, you can't understand it; you are out of your depth. In any case, I don't suppose anyone would want to feed other than rubbish to you blokes.

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

Mr. Gygar: Don't get upset, Jack.

Mr. Young: There are none on your side.

Mr. MELLOY: Well, they are here.

Every day, we are confronted with fresh problems in the Police Force. Nobody will deny that. Every day, the proposed inquiry into the Police Force moves further and further into the distant future. Every day, there are fresh reports of murders, muggings, attacks upon the person, thuggery, theft, robbery—whatever you like, you name it—and they are on the increase, but they are not being solved. I know that the Minister has different definitions of "being solved" and "being cleared up". He is a bit confused on that. Under the present set-up, the Police Force in Queensland is quite incapable of enforcing the law and maintaining order. I do not want the honourable member for South Brisbane to come in or I shall refer him back to Hong Kong. He should have some knowledge of that.

Since Parliament last met, the Honourable A. M. Hodges has been sacked as Police Minister. The Premier has taken control of that portfolio and will retain his control of it. The Premier's idea of law and order is to bash a few students over the head when they seek better educational facilities.

Mr. Newbery: Do you approve of illegal demonstrations?

Mr. MELLOY: I will come to that.

The Premier sent 200 police to Ballymore Park to protect the Governor-General when there was not a single demonstrator there. It appears that protesters have priority over investigations into the burglaries, bashings, murders and rapes that are committed in this State. I should like to know when the judicial inquiry into the Police Force, which was sought by the Queensland Police Union and promised by the Government on 11 August last year, will begin. When will the Scotland Yard detectives—

Mr. Newbery: I told you the other day.

Mr. MELLOY: The Minister does not know yet. He thinks.

Mr. Newbery: I told you the other day.

Mr. MELLOY: He told me what he thought would happen but he does not know yet. He told me that when all of the cases are finished, they will come back.

Mr. Newbery: That is correct.

Mr. MELLOY: Exactly. Who in the world knows when these cases will finish?

Mr. Newbery: I said eight to ten weeks.

Mr. MELLOY: That is if no more come up. Inquiries will be conducted by these police officers all of the time. If we have to wait until no inquiries concerning the police are being conducted, the Scotland Yard detectives will never return to Queensland. I am beginning to wonder whether the inquiry will be swept out of the door as the former Minister for Police was.

I sympathise with the present Police Minister. He has a job on his hands, especially with the Premier's propensity for

dipping his fingers into every portfolio. He had a go at the Education Minister the other day. He said he could talk to the Queensland Teachers' Union and that the conference could proceed, but that it would not make any difference. Nobody, including members of the Opposition, supports violent demonstrations.

Mr. Lamont: How about Gerry Jones?

Mr. MELLOY: I said that we do not support violent demonstrations, and we do not.

Honourable Members interjected.

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

Mr. MELLOY: We say that there must be common sense and reason in dealing with demonstrations that are not violent. The students at North Quay were not violent. There was no violence there, yet a girl was hit over the head. The Minister for Justice admitted the other day on the radio that he had not even seen the film of that occurrence. This is where the Premier shows his instability.

Before World War II I saw films of Hitler addressing demonstrations in Berlin. At a given signal, all of the people put their hands up. These were orderly and non-violent demonstrations that Hitler addressed. That is what the Premier wants; he wants all the people to put up their hands when told to.

Let us consider what happened in Perth in 1974, when farmers kicked and punched Mr. Whitlam. Where was the Premier then? There was not a whimper out of him; he had nothing to say. I searched the Press at the time and found no statement from the Premier protesting against attacks on Mr. Whitlam.

In the few minutes of my speech that remain I wish to make a few comments on the building industry. The Government has already admitted that there will be less money available for housing this year than there was last year. It is expected that there will be a shortfall of 1,500 in the number of houses for young people and other hopeful home-seekers in this State in the next year. When the Government has a ready market in 8,000 families, which is the number on the books of the Housing Commission, it has the opportunity to spend a considerable amount of money. But the Federal Government has cut back funds available for housing by 18 per cent in real terms. The Minister for Works and Housing smiles; he knows he cannot provide the houses needed; the Federal Government has cut him off.

In addition, the money that will be made available will not benefit many young people; its cost will be beyond their means. There must be some method of subsidising building societies to bring about a lowering of interest rates. Even if societies still have to pay the same rates of interest to lenders,

they could, by means of a subsidy, reduce the rate of interest to borrowers. That would be of tremendous help to those wanting housing finance. I think that that is something that could be done if the Federal Government were prepared to provide the money to assist housing societies. But the Federal Government is the snag.

(Time expired.)

Mr. LINDSAY (Everton) (3.43 p.m.): It is with a deep sense of pride and a feeling of considerable achievement for the silent majority of the Everton electorate that I rise to speak in the second Address-in-Reply debate of the Forty-first Parliament of Queensland. I say, first of all, on behalf of the silent majority and myself that we again pledge our loyalty to our God, our Queen and our country.

After sitting through the speech just delivered by the ageing member for Nudgee, I must agree that he is in need of retirement benefits. I do not wish to be in any way rude to him but as he laboured on his voice cracked and it is a great pity that his party will not let him retire now. Labor members are, of course, fearful of a by-election in Nudgee because they know that we would win it. I am quite conversant with many of the problems of that area because many ex-servicemen in it approach me and I attend to their problems.

The ageing member is part of a political philosophy which in no way supports the concept of God, Queen and country, and the idea of service before self and duty first held by the servicemen of this country. Indeed, it was his party, the A.L.P., that went so far as to do away with the traditional school cadet system in Queensland and elsewhere throughout Australia. I am very pleased to stand up here and say that in the very near future, in fact at the beginning of next year, the majority of cadet units will be re-formed.

One thing I am particularly pleased to say to the people of Everton is that their putting me into Parliament has meant a lot from the point of view of meeting some of the very well-known figures in Queensland politics. In this regard it has been my pleasure during the past 18 months to have some association, and I would like to think it was a close association, with two great Queenslanders and I refer, of course, to Sir Gordon Chalk and Sir John Egerton. It was probably because I had as much interest in politics as they, together with an interest in racing and a love of racehorses, be they trotters or gallopers, that I got to know both men perhaps a little bit better than the average person would.

In referring to Sir Gordon Chalk, I want to read from an article in "The Sunday Mail" on 23 June 1968, which was long before I became involved in politics. In

fact I think I had just returned from Vietnam. The heading read, "Gordon Chalk . . . a man of winning ways". The article went on—

"Gordon Chalk, 55, is a man exempt from idleness. He invariably rises at 6 a.m. at his Indooroopilly home, works a long day to 6 p.m., attends an official social engagement, and more often than not finishes up completing the mail in the early hours of the following morning. However, he insists on turning in at 1 a.m. He claims five hours sleep is 'enough for any clear conscience'."

In an article in another newspaper on 16 February 1969—I particularly like this one—this was said—

"He will gag and laugh his way through some distinguished gathering in a way that some might think rather undignified. He is full of go at parties—he enjoys a bet and he does not shy away from a drink.

"It is just that Gordon Chalk enjoys life and politics."

He was a very fine politician indeed—a true professional—and one, as I watched his performance here in the past 18 months, whom I could not help admiring, especially his handling of a number of difficult situations. Perhaps one could quote the Field controversy in particular. He certainly will be greatly missed. It should be noted that a poll in a national weekly—not one conducted by Tommy Burns and his mates, saying how good they are—last year gave Sir Gordon a 79 per cent popularity rating, and I would like to be regarded as one making up that 79 per cent.

It has also been my privilege to have had some association with Sir John Egerton. He was born in Rockhampton. His father was a P.M.G. linesman and he went to school wherever his father worked. Emerald was a town he remembered well. The main street is named after his grandfather, who was a pioneer grazier in the area. Sir John Egerton believes, as I do, in postal and secret union ballots. I believe the only true way, the only genuine Australian way of electing anyone, be it a cricket captain, a football captain, a member of Parliament, a trade union representative or any representative, is by secret ballot. Sir John Egerton said—

"People are as entitled to the right of privacy in the election of a union officer as in the election of a Prime Minister."

Sir John Egerton's career traversed the Boilermakers' Union leadership to the presidency of the Trades and Labor Council in 1951. He was, of course, widely read. He had an extensive library in his Albion home unit. As did Sir Gordon Chalk, he had many sporting interests, and, in particular, the Fortitude Valley Rugby League team always had his support. In addition to his major positions as president of the Queensland branch of the Australian Labor

Party, national vice-president of the Australian Labor Party, president of the Queensland Trades and Labor Council, a director of Qantas Airways and a director of Mary Kathleen Uranium Limited, he also held a number of other important and unpaid posts in the community. These included: chairman of Labor Enterprises Pty. Ltd. and Labor Broadcasting Pty. Ltd.; member of the Griffith University Council; member of the Duke of Edinburgh study conference committee 1967-74; vice-president and director of the Queensland Rugby League Club. Many of these positions, of course, were unpaid. He wanted the Prices Justification Tribunal abolished because it was granting price increases too easily.

My people in Everton—the silent majority—are neither one thing nor the other. They are middle of the road Australians, and they believe—and I believe—that the union-dominated A.L.P. members, the men who must always "caucus", are men who can never come into this Chamber and vote according to what they believe. In the last 10 years in this Chamber, there have been 96 occasions when members of my party, the Liberal Party, have crossed the floor on personal-conscience issues. Members of the National Party have done so 10 or 11 times, but not once, of course, has a member of the A.L.P. done so.

I point out to the silent majority of the Everton electorate the difference between an A.L.P. man and a Liberal man. They must realise the fact that when they vote for a man representing the A.L.P., they vote not for an individual but for the machine. It is what the machine says that counts. What the machine says is what the electorate gets, regardless of where people live and how they live.

This is the second occasion on which I have spoken in an Address-in-Reply debate. It is perhaps worth while, from my own point of view, to pause and have a look at what I said 18 months ago and ask myself—and I let the people of Everton judge—"Have I in fact lived up to what I set out to do?" I said—

" . . . I wish to make it perfectly clear to each and every member of this Parliament that I belong with the great mass of Australians, the silent majority, square in the middle of the Australian political spectrum."

I believe that everything I have said and done in this Chamber and in the 18 months that I have been a member of Parliament supports that contention.

My second point was—and again I reiterate this for the interest and information of the Everton electorate—

" . . . I point out to the people of Everton that they, in their turn, have an obligation to me. As the first Liberal ever to be elected from the area, I depend on them to let me know their views, not only as many are doing now, but throughout

the entire three years. The Everton Electoral Office at 5 Sizer Street, Everton Park, (Telephone 550999), belongs to all taxpayers of the electorate. It is not a party political office. There are no political party signs on the front door as was the case prior to my election. As far as I am concerned, people come to the Everton Electoral Office as fellow human beings. I have the obligation to do the best I can for each and every one of them regardless of party or whom they may or may not vote for in subsequent elections. It is an obligation that I intend to honour."

I believe that—to date, anyway—I have done my best in that direction, and I will continue to do it.

It is interesting to note that the Everton electorate is regarded as a safe Labor seat. The reason for that is that the boundaries have been drawn in a gerrymandered fashion so that they encompass the West Stafford Housing Commission Estate, whilst the Stafford electorate contains the Trout Estate and half the suburb of Everton Park. Because there were 1,555 Housing Commission homes within the Everton electorate and because the fellow—his name escapes me—who formerly fiddled round as the member for the area regarded himself as being in a safe red-ribbon seat, he did not do his homework.

When I began door-knocking I said that I believed in the concept of a man's own home and his own block of dirt. In this regard, it has been enormously pleasing to me personally that the Minister for Works and Housing has introduced a tremendous initiative for people in the electorate living in Housing Commission homes. I might add that the stage has already been reached where 50 per cent of the 1,555 homes are being purchased. The new initiative is tremendous. I now address myself directly to each and every person living in a Housing Commission home in the Everton electorate. I say to them—

"For a minimum deposit of \$200 you can borrow money from the State Government at 7½ per cent, repayable over 30 years, to buy your Housing Commission home. I put it to you people living in those houses that you are in an ideal geographical position in that you are close to the railway line. That line already shows signs of enormous development. It will be the first line to be electrified. The improvements at all the railway stations will have been evident to you people in the Everton electorate. With inflation running at 12 per cent you people in Housing Commission homes can borrow money at 7½ per cent. It is only a matter of time until you start to get further in front. I strongly urge each and every one of you to take advantage of this if you can afford it. Of course, I realise that many of you will not be able to afford it. In that case, you are far better off staying where

you are, paying rent each week. There are some 7,000 people applying to get into Housing Commission homes. People living in Housing Commission homes in the Everton electorate: If you can afford it, with inflation, now is the time to buy. I further point out to you that I asked the Minister today about the development of a particular branch."

Mr. Lee: I will do that.

Mr. LINDSAY: I say further—

"The Minister has just indicated that a special branch of the Housing Commission will be set up to handle inquiries and assist."

Mr. Lee: \$25,000 at 7½ per cent.

Mr. LINDSAY: I go on to say—

"\$25,000 at 7½ per cent. You cannot get the money from the banks. I am trying to do renovations on my home, but I cannot borrow anywhere near \$25,000. They will not give it to me. I would not have the collateral. Believe me, this is the greatest single initiative towards the concept of your own home and your own bit of dirt that any person in the Everton electorate has ever had. I strongly urge you all to take a good look at that one."

Queensland at the moment has the problem of certain teachers being associated with drug use. I do not have a monopoly on truth in this regard, but I am a parent and a taxpayer, and I would say that the great majority of parents and taxpayers do not want their children to be taught by teachers who have been convicted of drug offences. I do not want such teachers teaching my child. Today's "Telegraph" carries the headline "Teachers Defy Strike Order". That is most encouraging. It is indicative of the great sense of dedication, responsibility and love of children that members of the teaching profession have.

One problem which is perhaps worth mentioning here is the result of the trends in the adolescent subculture as such. I will concentrate my remarks on adolescents of our own western society, as I feel there is a vast difference between Asian and our own teenagers. With specific regard to Australia, I think it fair to say that no country with its initial small population could suffer such enormous casualties to the cream of its manhood without later generations being severely disadvantaged genetically, intellectually, artistically and politically. The development of what is loosely termed the "adolescent subculture", I feel, is also a by-product. Adolescents hunt for models of what and who they want to be in novels, history books and world events, and among those around them. That is why it is of particular concern that people who are part of the drug culture should not be put immediately in charge of them.

I add that the emphasis now, and in the future, will be diverted towards the colour TV screen. It is there that teenagers relate

directly to their own age-group, particularly as a pretty face and voice are the prime qualities for TV stardom. The persuasiveness and sophistication of the mass media are a powerful source of social transformation. In fact, many of our youth are Americanised nightly. Particularly important is the instant transmission of national and international events to an audience encouraged to passive reception rather than individual inquiry and action. Television will continue to ensure that youthful, formative attitudes and values of our society are in a constant state of flux as a result of innovations received from other societies. If we are to remain Australian to some degree there is a need for greater Australian content in both school and commercial audio-visual programmes.

In recent times, I have asked questions in this House about the Cornell University. It is a typically American university. I do not wish to denigrate it in any way, but it would seem to me to be totally unsuitable to draw on it for a clique of teachers or graduates at one of our colleges of advanced education. I believe that we are too Americanised in these colleges, and that it would be far better if we were to concentrate firstly on administrators and principals who had taught successfully in our own schools and secondly on Asians who had taught successfully overseas.

Pressures from the youth culture are also causing changes in the adult generation of teachers. How many teachers now expect the respect and courtesy that was paid by students 10 years ago? Why is this so? Are they aware of their own inadequacies or are they interested only in the easy way? Or is it simply a lack of personal courage?

If the lessons of American secondary schools are to be avoided teachers must take a stand. There are many people in society who would support them just as they are supporting the teachers at the Camp Hill High School who went to school today to honour their responsibility of teaching the children.

There is a noticeable improvement in standards of physiological health resulting in today's youth enjoying accelerated bodily maturation and associated earlier sexual maturation. Now that the age of consent is 16, and full adult rights are given at 18, it seems reasonable that the army of non-achievers retained in our schools be allowed to leave at the age of 14, with arrangements made for those who wish to continue to study in later life. The actual worker-population cohorts are in fact too small to cope with the on-coming larger student-population cohorts. The problem is further complicated by the increasing trend in longevity and the associated social service support, particularly with regard to aged females. If we wish to continue the necessary increasing capital investment for education we will have to tax ourselves out of our tiny minds. The alternative is lowering the school leaving age.

Experimentation in values and morals is now a dominant trend in Australian society perhaps best instanced by our getting to the stage where teachers themselves are experimenting with drug addiction. This is now a dominant trend in Australian society which is accelerated by the absence from home of the working mother when her teenage daughter needs her most. The trend to drug experimentation is increasing. I have no answer for this other than prayer and asking for God's assistance. I am horrified by the enormous number of married female teachers (on equal pay) who are developing—hopefully—the characters of other people's children. But one could wonder if their own are receiving adequate attention. The whole concept is both inflationary and self-defeating, if we are looking at innovations in education. Female students soon became women with psychological characteristics very different from those which typified their mother's generation. The pill would be one obvious factor in this. The stupidity of attempting to educate early-maturing females with males of the same age will presumably continue, but one wonders at what cost to society. The trend towards an elitist group is already evident from graduates of single-sex schools with a lower incidence of venereal disease and drug dependency. In this regard, people who believe in themselves and their ability to influence society develop a stake in things. Certainly, schools at which the majority of teachers avoid speech nights would seem to be in trouble, as the tendency is for those same schools to have a surplus of drugs, alcohol and cigarettes, with a proportionate deficiency in discipline.

A further point is that in 1947, 90 per cent of the Australian population was born in Australia and more than half the remainder was British. By 1970 fewer than 80 per cent was Australian-born and some 10 per cent was from non-British countries. That has affected national lifestyles and patriotic attitudes, and probably explains why the A.L.P.—which has sitting in the bleachers at the moment only the aged member for Sandgate—is easily able to assemble the rent-a-crowd, which regularly appears on our TV screens in the evening, to annoy the Governor-General.

It was the aged member for Nudgee who brought together the terms "democracy" and "the Governor-General". Let me say this: what the Governor-General did for Australia last year was to give the people a chance to vote on the issue of whether he was right or whether he was wrong. Democracy requires a commitment and activity by the demos—by the people. It requires that the people demonstrate in a free vote—and they did in an enormous way. They threw out everything that the A.L.P. stood for. From that point of view, I think the silent majority would be the first to say thanks to the Governor-General.

We should realise that, with the world's population doubling in the next 20 to 30 years—mostly in Asia—the lucky country will experience considerable change. The need for Asian language and cultural studies commencing at primary level will become a necessity, not just a good idea as it is now. In recent times we appear to have responded to the criticism, "Why do we think that humane learning can go on in buildings that look as though they were designed to hold atomic secrets?" The need for the development of more places of learning in environmental conditions approaching the ideal at perhaps the Griffith University would seem to be entitled to a greater priority.

In summary—the new society is producing new people with different intellectual, emotional and material needs to which our formal social institutions have not adequately adjusted. It is of course easier to identify change within society than to know how to take account of it. Identification is the first step, to be followed by a rational, planned and effective adjustment to traditional approaches. We desperately need men and women who know who they are, who know what they want out of life and who can disclose their names when controversy rages. We need people who know what is significant and what is trash and who are not so vulnerable to demagoguery, blandness or safety.

At this point I wish to raise the subject of death duties. On Wednesday, 23 June, at the joint-party meeting it was decided that death duties would be totally abolished in Queensland from 1 January next year, regardless of the size of an estate. That is generally known, because the Premier—a man whom I respect tremendously; make no mistake about that—went on "This Day Tonight" and put his arguments for that decision. They were good arguments. However, while doing so, he mentioned me by name, referring to me as a junior member of the Liberal Party, and indicated that I was against the abolition of death duties. He did not give the reasons why I was against it; so, having been given that publicity on the matter and as I have been asked by an enormous number of people to do so, I will take this opportunity to expound my views.

My basic point is that I am not against the abolition of death duties as such. However, I am against their abolition when it comes to large estates. I have no objection to the abolition of death duties on estates of a reasonable size. I have already indicated in my speech that I am desperately trying to get as many people as possible into their own homes on their own block of dirt. It is fair and reasonable that they should be able to pass their homes on to their children. The point I make is this: in arguing my case I said that I was dealing with estates with a value of \$300,000 and above. Possibly that amount is a bit small, so I will make it \$500,000 or even \$1,000,000. But we must have a limit. How big do we want estates

to become? Whom do we want controlling this State? I asked a question in the House this morning relative to the issue.

I think that it is unreasonable that huge amounts of money and land—I am talking about enormous estates—should be given to somebody who may not even be a relative. At the moment, no death duties are applicable to estates passing between spouses. I support the case argued by Sir Gordon Chalk, particularly as we in Queensland have an enormous pay-roll tax.

The editorial of "The Courier-Mail" of 23 August 1976 reads—

"In any budgetary tax cutting, the State Government should be careful to get its priorities right.

"Reductions in payroll tax should have precedence over total abolition of death duties.

"Payroll tax is a levy on employment. It hits hardest those industries which are labor-intensive-firms which need to employ many people, as well as machines.

"At a time when Queensland has one of the two worst unemployment situations of all the States, priority in tax relief should not be given to estates of the well-to-do, over jobs for the living."

I support that concept. I am here to assist the living, not the dead; the needy, not the greedy.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (4.12 p.m.): In joining in the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I should like to make a few comments commending the Governor on the programme outlined to him by his Ministers, which surely will capture the imagination of every person in this State. It is a programme of legislation and Government action. No doubt a very good Budget will be presented in the middle of the sitting, which will please many Queenslanders, who will be able to continue to enjoy the usual prosperity and great development that we have been used to since this Government came to power.

It is traditional to indicate the loyalty and dedication, not only of myself but of the electors of Merthyr, to Her Majesty the Queen and her representative in Queensland, the Governor (Sir Colin Hannah). I do this readily and with sincerity. The frequent denigration and harsh treatment of the Queen and her representative by members of the A.L.P. from State to State as well as at Commonwealth level are quite unacceptable to the average Australian. I am ashamed to sit in the same Chamber as some of these fellows who say these things. They do not know just how much out of step they are with the average Australian or they would not say them. Perhaps they are overcome by doctrinaire policies which override good judgment or feeling of responsibility for the electorate at large.

To be more specific—I should like to make some comments on a matter of great concern to a sizeable number of Queensland people. I refer to the current railway development in Brunswick Street, Fortitude Valley. It is near my electorate and that of the honourable member for Brisbane. It affects people not only at that point but also people from the many areas from which they travel to Fortitude Valley which, in recent times, has gone ahead and become one of Brisbane's greatest shopping centres and commercial and business communities. In due course, it will rival Kings Cross and the Centrepoint development in Sydney. These developments have been carefully tailored by a number of people to bring them to their present standard.

The Valley Business Council is a very progressive group and it is, of course, in the commercial interests of its members to develop the area as it has been developed. They have certainly played their part. The State Government, through the S.G.I.O., has played its part in the development of the Valley Centre Plaza. This is a quite outstanding development. There are 52 tenants in the broad expanse of shopping malls in that complex. It is very modern and it is a pleasure to shop there. More and more people are going to the Valley to spend their money and to enjoy the surroundings.

Unfortunately progress, in the form of electrification of the railways, has upset the calm environment that the people have come to know there. Electrification is, of course, essential if public transport in Brisbane is to be improved. I am sure that electrification of the railways has the support of every member in the House, even those dull fellows on the Opposition benches. However, when it was announced in April of this year that Brunswick Street would be cut for 45 weeks I am sure that many of us were alarmed. This arose out of the letting of a contract to John Holland Pty. Ltd. to develop the railway bridge to increase the head room and to allow the widening of the permanent way to take an extra track as part of the electrification programme. Many of us have waited almost a lifetime for electrification and this is a programme that has to be carried out gradually as finance becomes available.

We all want this work carried out, but I think we must also consider the interests of businessmen in the area and those who shop there. We must also consider the principles of town planning as they include a reasonable environment for the people. It is certainly unreasonable to have this important part of Brisbane disrupted so dramatically for such a long time.

Following representations from various people in the area, State Cabinet about a week ago approved the additional expenditure of taxpayers' money to speed up this project. The work initially was to cost about \$600,000. The Government now

plans to spend an additional \$116,000 to shorten the construction time. The time for the work will thus be reduced from nine months to five months—approximately 22 weeks. That is very good and I am sure the Government deserves full credit for what can only be described as an outstanding gesture. Another \$116,000 of taxpayers' money is being committed to alleviate noise and disruption in that part of Brisbane. I commend the Government on taking that action. As one representing an adjacent area from which many people go to shop in the Valley, I must acknowledge what the Government has done to improve the situation.

But I am afraid there has to be a better answer and it is about that better answer that I should like to speak this afternoon. I make this speech and these suggestions in a climate in which people are threatening legal action over the bridge. Some members of the Valley Business Council are advocating the taking out of an injunction against the Government to prevent work proceeding in the way in which it is presently planned.

In fact, the Valley Business Council has engaged engineers of its own to devise an alternative way of carrying out the work. These engineers have recommended that the excavations be carried out from beneath the existing bridge, which I understand is a masonry bridge. It might well be that this is something that could be done. However, I think it is quite impractical and unrealistic to suggest that this could be an answer at this time; the work has already started. The jackhammers were working there this morning and there are cranes on the site. Contracts have been let and signed. Prices have been agreed to, and I do not think it would be realistic to expect the Government or anyone else to go back, cancel those contracts and start again. The thing is too far advanced, and, as a realist, I think it is time the Valley Business Council faced reality too and understood that it is just not on for the contracts to be redrawn after the work has been commenced and for construction to begin again in another way, whether that other way is feasible or not.

But a proposal has been put forward by a young professional man in the area who has had an interest in town planning for some years. I speak of Mr. Philip Little of Little & Associates of the Valley. He owns a business in the area and has his professional offices there. He is probably in one of those buildings most affected. His proposal entails converting Brunswick Street into a pedestrian mall; that is, Brunswick Street would be blocked off at Alfred Street and at Wickham Street so that no vehicular traffic would be allowed into the area in between. It would then be possible to reduce the size of the area required by the construction company and so concentrate the work in a smaller area and hide it better behind hoardings, so causing less interference to the people in the area and being less noticeable and less of a nuisance.

I think I should tell honourable members that this morning the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, together with the honourable member for Brisbane, the honourable member for Wavell and myself, visited the Valley and had a conversation with a number of small businessmen, representatives of the Valley Business Council and Mr. Little. We inspected the site so that we would have first-hand knowledge of what the various recommendations are. The Valley Business Council talk in terms of legal action. I think that they should stop talking in terms of legal action and look at Mr. Little's proposal. I think it is a reasonable one, and one they should be prepared to accept, but for some reason at this time they prefer to take a hard line and talk about confrontation with the Government; the Government which has recently authorised the expenditure of an additional \$116,000 to look after their interests, the Government which listened, I think quite reasonably, to their proposal. And now they are making threats and talking of legal action and confrontation. I think it is the wrong thing for them to do.

I think we are then entitled to look at the motives of some of the people who are opposed to this proposed pedestrian mall or, as its architects call it, the pedestrianisation of Brunswick Street between Alfred Street and Wickham Street.

The proposal is a hoarding be put around the works that need to be carried out across the road leaving only the footpath clear on the Valley Centre Plaza side so that pedestrian traffic can pass by the excavation work only on that side of the roadway. Naturally, the hoarding would span only an area consistent with the width of the permanent way. It would not be erected in front of any business premises, shops or other buildings in that street, blocking access to them.

The proposal currently written into the specifications subject to the contract already under way envisages a larger area of disruption. It envisages cutting away the awnings of some of the shops and directing buses along the footpath on one side of the road—in other words, total disruption.

I should say it is an ideal place for a pedestrian mall to be laid out. Surely it would be better for the crowd spilling out from the Valley Centre Plaza and from the new and modern entrance to the Brunswick Street Railway Station, to spill out into a pedestrian mall than into a street congested with traffic, with buses running along the footpath and all the other disruption and noise. If we are realistic, we will accept the proposal of Mr. Little, who I understand has the backing of a considerable number of small businessmen in the area.

At a meeting to be held tomorrow afternoon, at which all the Valley business people hope to be represented, a decision will be made as to what the recommendation will be on that proposal. It may very well come

down to the question of who has the numbers. The two groups who are trying to get the numbers are, on the one hand, the small group of businessmen who have their shops and businesses along Brunswick Street near the Valley Centre Plaza—those who support the proposal for a pedestrian mall—and, on the other hand, the representatives of the people who have larger business interests in the major shops (Myers, David Jones and Waltons) at the other end of the Valley. That is where the crux of the problem lies.

At the moment, there is a conflict between those two groups—the small businessmen of Brunswick Street and the large department stores (perhaps one could say the monopolies) such as Myers, Waltons and David Jones. The question is: who has the lobby muscle? Till now, the large stores have had the muscle when making representations to Government, and they have managed to persuade the Government—quite justly and rightly—to undertake additional expenditure to have an extra shift of work carried out to cut down the time needed to complete this particular undertaking.

I could not help noticing this morning, when the Minister for Transport gave an explanation to the House of some of the problems, that he commented on the marked division between the Valley traders who desire the complete closure of Brunswick Street and those who want two lanes left open to vehicular traffic. It is a conflict between George Purdy, the manager of Myers, and those who support him from the large stores—the economic muscle of the Valley, I suppose one could call them—and the small businessmen.

My reason for speaking in this debate today was that I wished to say a few words for the small businessman, the man who is not as well connected with Government and not as well able to brief lawyers and qualified people to fight his case.

Many small businessmen are overawed by the whole proposal. Of course, they are overawed by the giant Myer store, which stands on the Valley corner like a citadel looking down on their small specialty shops and other businesses. As I said, they are in conflict, and I am on the side of the small businessmen, and I believe that most metropolitan members of the House who have an interest in this matter and with whom I have discussed it are certainly on the side of the small businessmen.

I hope that the Government will accept Mr. Little's proposal to convert that section of Brunswick Street into a pedestrian mall and ignore the interests of the large stores.

Apparently it is believed by Mr. Purdy and his colleagues—certainly they are entitled to their opinion—that the creation of a pedestrian mall would mean a shift in the shopping population. Apparently they believe it would mean a shift of the customers from where they now gravitate around

Myers, the Target store and the corner where Waltons is to the area around the Focal Point Arcade and the Valley Centre Plaza and thus take business away from the big stores. I think that is the motive of Myers, David Jones and the other big entrepreneurs, who have the numbers on the Valley Business Council. Apparently they have made the judgment that, if Brunswick Street is blocked off, the customers will gravitate around the proposed mall with the result that some of the money that would normally go through the front doors of Myers, the Target store and Waltons would go into the pockets of some of the small people at the other end of the Valley shopping centre. I say quite openly that I agree with a little of the money going into the pockets of the small shopkeepers. I think more employment is created and more families sustained by the number of small people operating in that area. I hope that the Minister for Transport, the Treasurer, and indeed the Premier, in receiving representations from these people will see quite clearly the difference of commercial interest at stake here.

To help honourable members to understand what I am talking about and to familiarise themselves with the geography of the area, I seek permission to table two maps of it. They are extracts from the submissions of Mr. Little. One outlines the original proposal for the hoarding and the traffic in that area and shows quite clearly what disruption it would cause. The other one indicates quite clearly the proposal incorporating the pedestrian mall. It is very easy to see the difference when one looks at these two maps.

The pedestrian mall could be beautified temporarily with tropical plants growing in planters and when the work is completed they could be taken away and the road reopened. What Mr. Little is proposing, and what I am proposing, is that the mall should exist only temporarily.

Mr. Lowes: What about the Surfers Paradise mall? How did that go?

Mr. LANE: Those of us who have been down to Surfers Paradise recently have had a look at Cavill Avenue. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise would know how successful the Surfers Paradise mall has been.

Sir Bruce Small: Very good indeed.

Mr. LANE: I thank the honourable member. It has been a complete success.

Pedestrian malls have been successful in other places. In Adelaide the council has closed off some streets to provide a very attractive shopping mall. So has Perth. All of us know Martin Place in Sydney. Some of us have had the opportunity to see how successful a mall can be in some of the towns in Britain and on the Continent. We have seen how a mall can be decorated with planters and seats and become a real

centre of family activity. The suburbs surrounding the Valley are densely populated. Many of the people live in flats and enjoy an opportunity to get out for a stroll. The Valley should be a place to go to rather than to pass through. I hope that the gentlemen who hold the numbers on the Valley Business Council will see the light and generously support the proposal put forward by Mr. Little, the planning group from the University of Queensland and the small businessmen of the Valley who realise that a pedestrian mall is the answer to the current impasse. I am sure that the Government will be prepared to look sympathetically at such a proposal if it receives support tomorrow afternoon at the meeting to be held in Fortitude Valley.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (4.36 p.m.): At the outset I associate myself and the electors of Sandgate with the expressions of loyalty addressed by my leader, deputy leader and other honourable members to Her Majesty the Queen. Next year, no doubt, we will have an opportunity to express our loyalty to her personally.

I was very pleased to note in His Excellency's Opening Speech the references to Sir Gordon Chalk. I was also pleased to hear the complimentary remarks made by honourable members about Sir Gordon concerning not only his electoral representation, but also his conduct as a Minister in this House. I thank him personally for the assistance I received from him over many years. Whenever I called on him in the years since my election in 1960 concerning matters in my electorate or the House generally, he received me very courteously and gave earnest consideration to the matters raised. I join with other honourable members in wishing him a very happy and healthy retirement. I hope that he may be spared for many years to enjoy it.

I welcome the newly elected members—the honourable member for Port Curtis (my colleague and friend Mr. Prest), who takes over from Mr. Hanson, and the honourable Member for Clayfield (Mr. Brown). From what I know of Mr. Prest's honesty and integrity, he will be a good member. I know Mr. Brown personally. Some years ago he lived in my electorate. I feel sure that both newly elected members will acquit themselves well during their time in this Assembly.

The time is opportune to express my appreciation to the former Minister for Police (Mr. Hodges) for the consideration he gave to representations made by me on behalf of my electors and on behalf of the people of Queensland generally. All honourable members will agree that the Police portfolio is very difficult to administer. I thank him for the earnest consideration he displayed during his term of office. I look forward to a similar happy relationship with the newly appointed Minister for Police (Mr. Newbery). I am sure that he will display keen ability in tackling this very difficult portfolio. I congratulate the newly appointed

Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr. Lickiss), on his elevation in Cabinet. I am sure that he will apply himself equally diligently to his new portfolio. I also congratulate the Minister for Survey and Valuation on his elevation to Cabinet rank. There is an old saying that many are called but few are chosen. Mr. Greenwood is a very young politician and a very fortunate one. It does not fall to the lot of many members in this House to receive the accolade at such an early stage in their political career.

I now refer to this passage in the Governor's Speech—

"The Government, in its active pursuit of greater efficiency and economy in the electricity supply industry, will introduce legislation this Session to reorganise the industry throughout the State."

This has caused a lot of comment from consumers in the Brisbane area. Those in responsible positions in the Brisbane City Council, as well as the general citizenry, are really alarmed, because reorganisation will result in increased tariffs for the city of Brisbane. In the Brisbane City Council the Liberal aldermen joined with the Labor administration in strong opposition to the take-over by the State Government of electricity distribution in Brisbane. It is a very profitable undertaking at present—one that has been very carefully administered over the years by the Brisbane City Council. It would be very unfair if a take-over was effected without adequate compensation to the ratepayers of Brisbane. In common with many of my aldermanic colleagues, I say that the people of Brisbane should express their strong feelings through their members of Parliament, particularly those on the Government side, who have a say in the joint-party meetings.

The Lord Mayor of Brisbane (Alderman Frank Sleeman) made a very cogent suggestion when he said that any action should be delayed till after the next State election. The matter should be made a State election issue so that the people can express their opinion. I repeat that the Liberal Opposition in the council joined the Labor aldermen in their strong stand against a take-over. An article appearing in "The Sunday Mail" on 15 May 1976 stated—

"On 1976 figures Brisbane people would be paying at least \$20 million a year more to subsidise the rest of the State.

"This was based on a statement in January 1974 by the then Local Government Minister (Mr. McKechnie).

"Mr. McKechnie told Cabinet that reorganisation of electricity would increase Brisbane domestic tariffs by 13 per cent.

"The cost to the Southern Electric Authority would rise only by about 2 per cent."

There is a weight of evidence against a take-over, if the Government will only carefully study the various submissions that have

been made by Brisbane City Council aldermen as well as others in positions of authority.

Adding force to my submission this afternoon on the proposed take-over, the State Liberal Party President (Mr. John Moore) made a similar statement. I will quote it, because it states the matter correctly. It suits my purpose very well. I quote from "The Courier-Mail" of 21 June 1976. Mr. Moore said this—

"A public inquiry into the State Government's plans to rationalise electricity charges was called for yesterday by the State Liberal Party President (Mr. John Moore).

"He said that senior sources had told him the likely price increase to consumers would be 15 per cent.

"If rationalisation of electricity results in benefits to a few at the cost of disadvantage to the majority, the proposal will be undesirable," he said.

"I believe there should be a public committee of inquiry into the proposal."

"Mr. Moore, the Federal member for Ryan, said the controversy within the electricity industry and among distributors made it clear that without public debate rationalisation could disadvantage most consumers."

That again is very strong evidence against any take-over. As I said earlier, it would be very dishonest if the Government pursues or carries to its conclusion the rationalisation of electricity, because it will be to the detriment of the Brisbane electricity consumer.

In his Opening Speech, the Governor said also—

"During this financial year, the Licensing Commission will open two new district offices. This will allow more frequent inspections of licensed premises and should result in improved facilities for the public."

We know what the improved facilities for the public will be. There is a move afoot for an expansion of the liquor traffic in the community by allowing bowling clubs and golf clubs to sell bottled liquor. Personally, I am not against any bowling club or golf club—I attend their functions—but I am against an expansion of the liquor traffic in the community, considering the devastation that takes place daily as a result of the consumption of liquor. Over the years, the Government has been guilty of expanding the liquor traffic far beyond anybody's imagination years ago. This Government introduced Sunday drinking. Anybody can drive around the suburbs of a Sunday and see the men, who should be home having their midday meal, filling the hotels. The Government should be absolutely ashamed.

Teenage and under-age drinking is so prevalent in the community that the police and the Licensing Commission cannot cope with it. The Governor refers to an increase

in inspectorial staff so that the matter can be policed properly. I do not think that the staff can be increased enough to police the present problem adequately.

Mr. Frawley: Don't you think all of the fetotallers in this House should unite?

Mr. DEAN: I accept that interjection. It would not take us long to unite because the forces are very small.

This brings to mind a reference by Judge Broad yesterday to some licensed cabarets in Brisbane being nothing more than booze joints. That is what the average golf club and bowling club will become once they are allowed the free-for-all bottled trade that they seek. It will mean another lot of booze joints in the community.

The Governor said also—

"The Law Reform Commission is presently working on such items as the Rules of the Supreme Court, anomalies in criminal law . . ."

My goodness, aren't there some anomalies in our criminal law! We spend hours passing legislation in this place, sometimes till early in the morning. I do not know whether or not the loop-holes are in the legislation deliberately. Sometimes I think that we should carefully examine the drafting of legislation and have a further check made before it is brought down in Parliament. I hope that that will take place in the future, because the anomalies are glaring.

I read in "The Courier-Mail" yesterday of a legal case concerning a drink-driving charge. These are some brief excerpts from the report—

"'I'll kill him', man tells courtroom

"A truck driver was fined \$800 yesterday for dangerous driving, and a man screamed in the Criminal Court: 'That's not enough for my daughter's life. I'm going to kill the swine.'

"The Crown earlier dropped a charge of manslaughter against the truck driver, Raymond John Gartner, 27, of Princhester Street, West End."

It is amazing and scandalous that there is a weakness in the law that allows such people to escape. It is time that the Government parties did something to remove the anomalies in our criminal law.

Further on, the article reads—

"Gartner pleaded guilty to a charge of having driven dangerously about August 22 last year.

"He had pleaded not guilty to a charge of manslaughter on the same date at Kingston."

After Mr. Justice Williams had fined Gartner, a man called out from the public gallery. Of course, he left the gallery before the police could take any action against him. He was the father of the dead girl and one can understand that it may well have been an emotional outburst on

his part. This case certainly demonstrates a very glaring anomaly in the Criminal Code.

The newspaper report continues—

"Mr. G. S. Forno (for the Crown) told the Court that Gartner passed a couple in a car who had estimated his speed at 60 to 70 miles an hour on a road with a 50 mile-an-hour speed limit.

Gartner's car went out of sight around a bend before the collision and no-one saw the accident occur, Mr. Forno said."

That is the loop-hole; that is the weakness and the legal technicality that got this fellow off a very serious charge. In my opinion, the case should have ended with a life sentence. If this fellow was not sentenced to life imprisonment, he should certainly have had his licence cancelled for life. I point out further that the licence of this road killer was preserved. Irrespective of how one looks at such people, in my view they are road murderers.

Gartner, of course, told the police that he had been doing only 45 to 50 miles an hour. The Press report continues—

"Mr. D. J. Draydon (for Gartner) told the court there was evidence Gartner had done 60 to 70 miles an hour to pass the couple in the car, but there was no evidence he had maintained that speed.

"Mr. Justice Williams told Gartner he was lucky not to have been sentenced to two or three years' gaol, but he could be sentenced only on the objective elements of the case."

An element of the case was that nobody actually saw the accident. He happened to be round the bend in the road when he crashed into the other car. Again reading from the Press report—

"Mr. Justice Williams emphasised that he was not sentencing Gartner for anything which happened after his car had disappeared around the bend."

What a lot of rot! All the evidence pointed to his being guilty of driving at an excessive speed and killing the girl. He was also the only one on the highway. The judge said—

"The probabilities of what happened were clear, but probabilities were not enough for the Criminal Court to deal with."

I think it is about time we altered the criminal law to give judges wider powers to do something about this situation. The report goes on—

"Gartner had driven extremely dangerously, at speed, with an erratic course in a defective vehicle.

"Mr. Justice Williams told Gartner his traffic record indicated he had started to show a complete disregard for other road users.

"Mr. Draydon told the court that Gartner had a limited recollection of the accident . . ."

I suppose he was too intoxicated.

“ . . . but he was aware of the probabilities referred to and his conscience would not need the proof required by law.”

It is a scandalous state of affairs when we do not give the judiciary enough powers to deal with people of this kind. As I said earlier, in my opinion they are nothing short of road murderers. Mr. Justice Williams finally fined Gartner \$800 in default nine months' gaol and disqualified him from driving for two years. That is absolutely scandalous. So far as I am concerned, his licence should at least have been cancelled for life. Anyone guilty of an offence as serious as taking the life of another should himself be committed to gaol for life. It is no good blaming drink all the time. If people drink, they should be made responsible for their actions.

Mr. Moore: They should be hung up by their thumbs.

Mr. DEAN: I know what they should be hung by! I do not think they should be allowed their freedom merely because of a legal technicality. Some years ago a member whose name I cannot recall said here that courts were not courts of morals but of legal technicalities. That is very true. But we are just as responsible because we are the ones who make the laws. It is about time we did something about reviewing them. I hope that His Excellency's reference to the Law Reform Commission in his Opening Speech means that something will be done very soon about the great weakness in the law that I have just pointed out.

Another reference made by His Excellency was to the reorganisation of the Police Force into districts. His Excellency said—

“The reorganisation of Police Regions and Districts is continuing and planning is well under way for alterations in the metropolitan area. A new Police Headquarters building is under construction.”

Whilst on the subject of police, I say that I think it is about time that more police were put on duty in the city at night. I frequent the city a lot at night attending many functions, and in particular on Friday nights and on the week-end it is a frightening experience sometimes to walk down Queen Street, particularly past Lennon's Hotel. Last Friday night, for example, people were hindered in entering Lennon's Hotel by persons who were sitting right along the front of the entrance to the hotel. They were making derogatory and stupid remarks to people going up and down the street and were interfering with the liberty of others. I think we should have more police on duty, especially on foot patrol, in the city at night.

I have been told by women that they refuse to come into town on their own at night because they are afraid of being jostled and pushed around and having stupid and embarrassing remarks made to them. I certainly hope the re-organisation of the

Police Force to which His Excellency referred will include an increase in the number of police so that they can be put on foot patrol in the city at night, especially in the inner-city blocks where the main offenders are located.

Quite often pedestrians are frightened by the behaviour of some motorists and especially some motor-cyclists who have no thought of stopping at a pedestrian crossing. The Minister can go and watch this conduct himself. He will see that pedestrian crossings in the inner-city area are ignored at night by some motorists and some motor-cyclists. A pedestrian on a crossing at night takes his life in his hands. Some motorists and motor-cyclists have no intention of stopping. I have seen them weave round pedestrians. That is why I always try to cross on my own. If I am with someone I ask my companion to let me walk across on my own so that motorists can see me. Sometimes the person with me conceals me to some extent and these hoons try to frighten him by screaming up to him and then slamming on their brakes.

Mr. Newbery: What nights do you say?

Mr. DEAN: Friday nights in particular, especially in Queen Street.

Mr. Newbery: Pedestrian crossings, too?

Mr. DEAN: Yes. As far as pedestrian crossings are concerned, Adelaide Street, Queen Street and Elizabeth Street are real death-traps, especially on Friday night or at the week-end.

Mr. Newbery: Whereabouts?

Mr. DEAN: In the city block between Albert Street and George Street. The motorists just will not give way to pedestrians. Of course, their speed is greatly excessive. I think it would be much better if the police patrolled and intercepted those people who travel at such high speed in the main street.

Reference was made in the Opening Speech to the Railway Department and the fact that the Metropolitan Transit Project Board would concentrate on the electrification of the suburban railway system. I think everyone eagerly looks forward to the day when this takes place. In my electorate we have a fairly good train service but a lot of congestion occurs when there is an influx of people from the Redcliffe Peninsula wishing to travel by train to Brisbane. Along with my colleagues the honourable member for Murrumba and Mr. Speaker, who also comes from Redcliffe—we happened to serve on the committee for the extension of the railway line from Brisbane to Redcliffe—I sincerely hope that the right thing will be done in regard to a railway line to Redcliffe. Great pressure is being exerted on the Government to rebuild the line to the Gold Coast. I think it would be very dishonest indeed of the Government if it now turned around and rebuilt the line to the Gold Coast, which was torn up years ago, instead of extending the railway line to Redcliffe.

I can speak personally about this because I have lived close to the Redcliffe Peninsula for many, many years. The population growth in that area is tremendous, but regardless of that—the members from the area can speak about local conditions themselves—I am concerned about the congestion caused in my electorate by people coming across the Hornibrook Highway in order to use the Sandgate line to Brisbane. So I sincerely hope that the honourable member for Murrumba will exert pressure on the Government—he has more influence than I have because he is a member of the Government—and support Mr. Speaker in his efforts because I know how he feels about this extension. It is long overdue—

Mr. Frawley: We must have a line to Redcliffe before a line to the Gold Coast.

Mr. DEAN: Absolutely; that is what I am saying. I know there is a lot of pressure being exerted on the Government and a lot of propaganda being disseminated about the need for a line to the Gold Coast and now a survey is being conducted about the potential use of such a line.

No-one respects the Gold Coast more than I do; I have a lot of time for it. At the same time, I do not think that the Gold Coast deserves a railway line before the Redcliffe Peninsula. Some years ago there was a railway line to the Gold Coast, and members of the Opposition and some Government members objected strongly to its being uprooted. If it had been left there, it could have been extended and improved. Morally, I do not think the people of the Gold Coast are entitled to a railway line before the railway system is extended from Brisbane to Redcliffe.

The Governor also said—

“Interchange facilities at many suburban stations will also be provided in the form of car parks and bus and car set down areas.”

Already one great improvement has taken place in my electorate, where parking facilities have been provided in the Shorncliffe area. At the Sandgate Railway Station, which is the main station from which people travel to the city, car-parking facilities are very bad at the moment, and I hope that the Minister for Transport will soon provide facilities there similar to those in the Shorncliffe area.

In his Opening Speech, the Governor said—

“The Main Roads Department is planning a balanced road and bridge construction and maintenance programme throughout the State this financial year, expected to cost some \$129 million.”

It is to be hoped that the Government will give early consideration to replacing the Hornibrook Highway. It has been very remiss in not replacing it before now. Admittedly, some years ago a franchise was still in operation; but I do not see why another bridge could not have been built in readiness

for the day when the existing bridge had to be closed. Anyone who drives over the Hornibrook Highway now will find that there is a great deal of wear on the shock absorbers of his vehicle when he gets to the Clontarf end.

How long will it take to replace the Hornibrook Highway? On a recent visit overseas, that thought came into my mind while I viewed a huge steel bridge at Nanking. It was about three times larger than the Story Bridge and of similar construction, not a simple design like the Hornibrook Highway. It took nine years for the Chinese to build that bridge, and I think they could build the Hornibrook Highway in about one month.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Tell them about the Yangtze River Bridge.

Mr. DEAN: That is the one to which I am referring.

In dealing with His Excellency's Opening Speech, one could cover many subjects. However, as the Budget debate will take place in a few weeks, I do not wish to deal now with items that may be covered in that debate. I shall conclude by referring to the expansion of health services. His Excellency said—

“The maintenance and expansion of health care will be continued at a high standard while major capital works on public hospitals worth over \$90 million are proceeding in 12 major centres throughout Queensland . . .”

I hope that Sandgate will be one of those centres. For many years I have asked that hospital facilities be provided in my electorate. As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the present population of the area exceeds 30,000, and the people of Sandgate have believed for many years that they are entitled to hospital facilities similar to those on the Redcliffe Peninsula.

The Redcliffe Hospital has played a very important part by providing services not only for the residents of Redcliffe but also for people living in areas to the north of Redcliffe. The same remarks would apply to the Sandgate electorate. We have a medical clinic, but it is housed in an outmoded building. The service provided by the hospital staff is of the highest quality; but they work under great difficulties in that antiquated building. I ask the Minister for Health either to provide hospital facilities in Sandgate or improve the present medical clinic there.

I content myself at this stage with those references I have made to His Excellency's Opening Speech. I sincerely hope that my suggestions will be taken note of by the Government so that it will not be long before we see the necessary improvements take place.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Ahern, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.6 p.m.