

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 19 OCTOBER 1976

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 19 OCTOBER 1976

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HER MAJESTY'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from His Excellency the Governor:—

“Government House,
“Brisbane, October 18, 1976.

“Sir,

“I have the honour to inform you that the Message of Loyalty from the Legislative Assembly of Queensland dated September 14, 1976, has been laid before The Queen.

“Yours faithfully,

“COLIN HANNAH,
“Governor.

“The Honourable

“The Speaker of the Legislative
Assembly,

“Parliament House,
“Brisbane.”

PAPERS

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

Reports—

State Service Superannuation Board, for the year 1975-76.

Chairman of the Consumer Affairs Council, for the year 1975-76.

Department of Community and Welfare Services and Sport, for the year 1975-76.

Council of the Griffith University, for the year 1975.

Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies, for the year 1975-76.

Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement, for the year 1975-76.

Literature Board of Review, for the year 1975-76.

Films Board of Review, for the year 1975-76.

Registrar of Co-operative and Other Societies, for the year 1975-76.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1964.

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1971.

Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958-1974.

Regulations under the Building Societies Act 1886-1976.

Ordinances under the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1974.

Reports—

Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations, for the year 1975-76.

Queensland Fish Board, for the period 1 July 1975 to 30 April 1976.

Legal Assistance Committee of Queensland, for the year 1975-76.

Queensland Law Reform Commission, for the year 1975-76.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

CLAIMS BY LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION ABOUT RETRENCHMENTS OF MAIN ROADS STAFF

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government and Main Roads) (11.7 a.m.): My attention has been drawn to alarmist and false claims by the Opposition Leader, Mr. Burns, about retrenchments of Main Roads staff in the Winton area of central-western Queensland.

For the second year in succession, the Opposition Leader seeks to capitalise and prey on the unemployment feelings and fears of people—just before the Christmas period—by raising the spectre of further unemployment and referring to retrenchments which simply haven't taken place.

As Minister for Main Roads, I believe I have a duty to this House, and to the people of Queensland, to set the record straight. Firstly, there have been no retrenchments of Main Roads staff at Winton—let alone 40 sackings, as the Opposition Leader has spuriously claimed.

The only transfers or retrenchments in Main Roads jobs either in the Central West, or the North West, have been the normal adjustments between jobs, as one job finishes or nears completion, and as men are either transferred to jobs elsewhere or transferred from construction work to maintenance. For example, there have been some reductions in the transfer of staff from construction work on the Flinders Highway between Julia Creek and Cloncurry to maintenance, and to work on the Landsborough Highway in the Central West. In the central-western and north-western regions, however, the reductions in fact involve fewer than 20 men, in total.

Mr. Burns's comment about the Government's cutting down on roadworks in the North West, while finding money for jobs in the seaside resort areas, is of course a political jibe at me as a Minister representing a seaside electorate in this House.

The claim, however, is not only untrue, irresponsible and mischievous, but also quite ludicrous when we consider the policies of

Mr. Burns's party. His party has never shown any real regard for the position of people living in the country areas, or for rural industry, and in fact the whole thrust of Labor policy has been directed at winning votes principally in the major centres of population.

Mr. Aikens: A typical scurrilous action of the A.L.P.

Mr. HINZE: That is so. It has tried its darnedest to wreck local government, which plays such a vital role, especially in country areas, and its record in respect of rural industry is nothing less than abysmal.

Mr. Houston: How do you spell it? You don't know what it means.

Mr. HINZE: A-b-y-s-m-a-l. It has been shocking.

This Government has every reason to be proud of its performance in expanding and improving the State's network of some 120,000 miles (200,000 kilometres) of roads throughout the State. Several western towns, such as Goondiwindi, St. George, Charleville, Longreach and Winton, have been linked to each other, and to the coastal areas, by bitumen road during the term of this Government.

There have been other major developments, too, in the State's north-western and western roads system during that time. Next month, for example, the Premier will officially open the final bitumen link on the Flinders Highway between Mt. Isa and Cloncurry, making it a bitumen road all the way from Townsville to Mt. Isa, and beyond Mt. Isa to the Northern Territory and Western Australia.

This Government's road record, I believe, could be rated as one of the most outstanding achievements of its 19 years in office—despite major problems encountered on the way, such as inadequate recognition of road needs by successive Federal Governments.

That will teach the Leader of the Opposition not to come out with some second-rate story that he gets from some second-rate journalist, telling lies to Queensland yesterday about me. He just didn't do his homework. Next time he makes a statement, he should make sure he has his facts straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

PETITIONS

REORGANISATION OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY INDUSTRY

Mr. BURNS (Lyton—Leader of the Opposition) presented a petition from 681 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reject the legislation for the reorganisation of the electricity supply industry in Queensland, which is not in the interests of this State or its economic development, and immediately appoint an

independent group to investigate the electricity supply industry and to report its findings to Parliament.

Petition read and received.

[Similar petitions were presented by Mr. Dean (180 signatories), Mr. K. J. Hooper (180 signatories), Mr. Houston (122 signatories) and Mr. Marginson (1,276 signatories) and these petitions were read and received.]

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. REDUCED SALES OF BEEF TO THE UNITED STATES

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

(1) Is he aware of reports that, under the new export formula approved by the Australian Meat Board, Queensland stands to lose the sale of 6 000 tonnes of beef sales to the United States of America?

(2) What is the reason for this loss?

(3) What will be the effect of President Ford's announced cut-back on beef imports to the United States of America as far as Queensland beef producers are concerned?

(4) Did the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry insist on this scheme?

(5) What action has his department or the Queensland Government taken to ensure that Queensland producers are not disadvantaged by these decisions?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) It is understood that certain principles covering beef exports to the U.S.A. were agreed to at a meeting of the Australian Meat Board last week. If these principles are adopted, it is expected that export allocations for the United States market will be based partly on 1976 performance and partly on performance during certain periods of 1977. Until full details are available, I am unable to comment on the likely effectiveness of such proposals.

(3) President Ford has not announced a cut-back of Australian beef imports to the U.S. The U.S. administration has suspended the "voluntary restraint" agreement, which controlled imports and substituted a system of quotas for importing countries. Australian and U.S. officials are currently negotiating the level of the Australian quota.

(4) The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry did not insist on this scheme of quota control by the U.S. and has publicly criticised the United States action in this regard.

(5) I fully support the protests which the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable the Premier have made over the introduction of quotas.

2. ENLARGING OF CAIRNCROSS DOCK

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

With reference to recent concern expressed by shipbuilding workers regarding threats to their job security, are there any plans to widen and lengthen Cairncross Dock so that larger vessels that may enter the new Brisbane Port can enter the dock and, if not, will he give consideration to such a proposal in an effort to ensure that, because of lack of dock size or facilities, ships do not bypass Cairncross Dock?

Answer:—

My Department of Harbours and Marine has no plans to widen and lengthen Cairncross Dock for use by larger Australian flag vessels now operating on the Australian coast. The estimated cost, which is in excess of \$5,000,000, cannot be justified economically, particularly in the light of continuing operating losses over recent years due in no small way to irrational industrial stoppages, which have prompted clients to look elsewhere for ship-repair facilities. Successive Commonwealth Governments have been requested to provide financial assistance for enlarging the dock in the national interest, but these requests have been refused.

3. SPEECH THERAPY

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

(1) Is Queensland the only State which provides degree status for university training in speech therapy?

(2) Is his department the main avenue of employment for speech therapy graduates?

(3) Are Queensland speech therapy graduates much sought after in other States because of the high standard of training?

(4) Why does the Public Service Board advertise speech therapy positions in the Education Department in October-November and then make no appointments until February?

(5) Does he realise that this delay in the appointment of speech therapists results in graduates taking positions in other States and that Victoria, in particular, takes advantage of Queensland's delay in appointments by advertising for and appointing speech therapists to the Victorian Education Department well before Queensland appointments are made?

(6) What is the reason for this very serious and unnecessary delay in appointments, which means that we have a brain drain in speech therapists from Queensland to other States?

Answers:—

(1) Queensland is the only State in Australia providing a university-based degree course in speech therapy. Although not within a university, all other four training schools offer degree courses in speech therapy.

(2) The Department of Education is a major avenue of employment for speech therapy graduates throughout Queensland.

(3) There is no evidence to suggest that the training at the University of Queensland is superior to that of other States. It is true that some therapists do seek employment in other States and overseas, but the reasons for doing so are usually personal. The mobility of speech therapists is also attributed to an Australia-wide shortage.

(4) Speech therapy appointments are usually made in January, allowing the appointed therapists to undertake an orientation programme prior to the commencement of the school year. It is not possible to appoint a new graduate until final examination results are released in December.

(5) The Department of Education is aware of the advertisement by the Victorian Education Department in October, but does not know when appointments will be made in that State. In order to be appointed to a position, graduates must provide evidence of qualifications.

(6) The Department of Education endeavours to secure early applications by interviewing final-year students in September. Representatives of the Public Service Board and the department interviewed students and sought applications from those interested in working with the department. Positions will be advertised in the local Press in the near future. These cannot be filled until final-year results are notified by applicants in December.

4. APPOINTMENT OF SPEECH THERAPISTS, MARYBOROUGH REGION

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

Will he ensure that appointments are made as soon as possible from the 54 Queensland University students finishing their speech therapy degree course this year to the four vacancies in the Maryborough Education Department region at Maryborough, Kingaroy, Gympie and Bundaberg?

Answer:—

Vacancies will be filled within guidelines determined by the Government for the growth of Public Service numbers and within the limits of fund availability.

5. SEX EDUCATION OF CHILDREN

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

(1) Has he considered the content and implementation of proposals for a so-called personal development course in Queensland State high schools as outlined by the Sex Education Committee of the Women's Electoral Lobby, which places heavy emphasis on sex education?

(2) Does he agree that schools should not take over the responsibilities of parents in sex education of children?

(3) Will he give an assurance that he will not implement the dangerous rubbish as outlined by the Women's Electoral Lobby?

(4) Are the proposals, as outlined by the Women's Electoral Lobby, typical socialist and Communist policy to break down the influence of family life?

Answers:—

(1) Yes. The course proposed by the Women's Electoral Lobby embraces five broad areas of study—physical development, behaviour, social influences, personal relationships and health. The sex education component is treated as part of a total study of human relationships. I agree with the approach though not with their specific content and proposed method of implementation.

(2) Yes. The parents' right and responsibility to educate their child in matters of sex are undeniable. Because of the failure of some parents to accept this responsibility, however, it is important for some outside agency or agencies to assist in this regard.

(3) To date no decision has been made on what form a human relationships programme in Queensland will take. A considerable number of submissions from interested groups and persons have been received. Once general policy guide-lines have been determined the wide-ranging views existing in the community will be considered. I believe that many people including the Women's Electoral Lobby have a contribution to make. This does not imply agreement with all its proposals.

(4) No. The course advocated looks at how a family functions, the role of its members, stresses within the family and how they can be overcome. Such an approach is common to most programmes in this area, including those offered by church groups and the Family Life Movement.

6. UNHYGIENIC CONDITIONS AT FOOD BARN

Dr. Lockwood, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Is he concerned with the health aspects of wholesale and retail food trading?

(2) Has he received complaints concerning the cleanliness of barn-type retail grocery outlets?

(3) Will he arrange for inspectors to visit the premises of Mark-It Foods, owned by Jim Nolan and Allan Burge at Geebung, where the floors are of rough concrete and are dirty, with groceries lying on the floor and dirty grey sugar and rice lying in, on, between and under groceries offered for sale?

(4) Will he also arrange for an inspection of Jack the Slasher's premises at Geebung, which, although much cleaner than Mark-It Foods, also have spilled sugar and icing mixture on goods offered for sale?

(5) In the interests of health, will these and other shed retailers be forced to comply with the same regulations that apply to all other retailers regarding clean floors, lined walls, sealed roofs and groceries stacked on shelves to allow cleaning of floors?

Answers:—

(1) I advised the honourable member in reply to his question without notice on 14 October 1976 that it is the policy of the Government to maintain the very highest health standards throughout the whole State. Health legislation should be solely for the promotion and maintenance of health. Under the Food Hygiene Regulations of 1976, local authority health surveyors are responsible for the structural standards and cleanliness of all food premises.

(2) Complaints have been received about structural standards.

(3 and 4) A departmental inspection of both premises has been made.

(5) Local authorities will be requested to enforce the provisions of the Food Hygiene Regulations of 1976 in regard to these premises. The conditions found by our inspectors at the two particular premises mentioned will be drawn to the attention of the Brisbane City Council.

With reference to the honourable member's question without notice referred to above, appropriate action has been taken. I shall advise the honourable member of the results of my investigations.

7. INCREASED TAXI CHARGES

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

(1) With reference to a report in "The Courier-Mail" of 14 October that taxi charges are likely to rise soon, has the Queensland Taxi Council applied for increased charges in flagfall and waiting-time?

(2) Is the new charge sought to be more than \$5?

(3) When were taxi charges last increased and on what basis are the higher taxi charges sought?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) Details of the increase in fares were announced by me last Thursday and were published in the Government Gazette of Saturday, 16 October 1976.

8. MEDICAL BENEFITS, CAIRNS BASE HOSPITAL

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

(1) What is the situation and what are the procedures applying to patient admission with a private or intermediate fund cover at the Cairns Base Hospital through (a) casualty outpatient department and (b) private doctor referral?

(2) If no intermediate or private beds are available as required, are the medical funds collecting contributions under false pretences and, if so, is there any provision for the refund of moneys?

(3) If not, is this a direct contravention of usual trade practices and, if so, what redress does such a patient have, paying as he does into a medical fund for a private or intermediate bed, when such services are not received?

Answers:—

(1) (a) Patients admitted to the Cairns Base Hospital from the casualty outpatient department would normally be seeking public ward accommodation.

(b) Private doctor referrals are arranged in two ways:—

(i) Booked cases for non-emergent treatment are arranged between the doctor's surgery and the hospital by telephone.

(ii) Emergent cases are referred by their private doctor to the hospital with a written request for admission.

(2) I am informed by the manager of the Cairns Hospital Board that the situation does not arise very often where intermediate or private beds are unavailable.

However, on the rare occasion where this does eventuate, patients of private practitioners are temporarily accommodated in public wards pending availability of private or intermediate accommodation. Patients so accommodated are not disadvantaged in that they retain the right of being treated by their own private medical practitioners.

(3) The honourable member will appreciate that membership of medical funds is on a voluntary basis and it is not the prerogative of such funds to guarantee their members automatic availability of beds at hospitals over which the funds have no jurisdiction.

9. HEN QUOTAS

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

(1) Following proclamation of the Hen Quotas Act, how many producers have been prosecuted for possessing over-quota hens?

(2) Who were the producers charged, what were their quotas, what were the numbers of hens in excess of their quotas and what penalties were imposed in each case?

(3) How many egg producers in zone 3 have ceased production and what was the quota in each case?

(4) Why have these quotas not been redistributed to zone 3 producers, especially in view of the shortage of eggs in that zone?

(5) How many eggs were sold by the Egg Marketing Board, Brisbane, to zone 3 in each of the years 1973 to 1976?

Answers:—

(1) Fourteen egg producers have been prosecuted for possessing over-quota hens.

(2 and 3) I table the information requested by the honourable member—Schedules A and B—and ask that it be incorporated in "Hansard".

(4) Of the quotas which have been issued in District 3, six quotas have been relinquished, which together total 1,739 quota hens. I am informed that, to date, because of the relatively small numbers involved, the Hen Quota Committee has not reallocated these birds. Notwithstanding this, I understand that the Hen Quota Committee has already arranged to consider this question at its next meeting in November.

(5) The information requested by the honourable member is in Schedule C and I ask that it also be incorporated in "Hansard".

SCHEDULE A

Prosecutions of Persons in Breach of the *Hen Quotas Act 1973-1975*
Up to and Including 19 October, 1976

Name of Producer Prosecuted	Date of Offence	Quota	Number of Hens held in excess of quota	Penalty Including Fine, Costs of Court, Witness Fees, Professional Costs
Merradong Pty. Ltd. and D. A. Hall	Nil	1,571	\$ Nils (case dismissed)
Yandilla Hatcheries Pty. Ltd. and D. A. Hall	23-10-75	65,338	3,180	377.75
B. Thallon (Bowen)	20-11-75	5,723	979	34.25
R. D. Inwood	6-11-75	6,000	1,442	84.25
R. T. and P. M. Dunn (Mackay)	21-11-75	7,840	214	44.24
J. K. and J. E. Grant (Innisfail)	17-11-75	4,896	754	368.50
W. J. and L. Y. McLoughlin (Tinana) ..	5-11-75	3,539	2,397	254.24
F. B. Newell Nominees Pty. Ltd. and F. B. and N. L. Newell (Beerwah)	21-1-76	18,414	2,766	87.25
H. and E. Lenz (Beerburrum)	3-12-75	2,937	468	234.50
A. L. Davie, K. D. Davie and E. F. Hitzke (Trinity Ranch Products No. 2—High-fields)	26-2-76	13,244	546	162.24
A. L. Davie, K. D. Davie and E. F. Hitzke (Trinity Ranch Products No. 3—High-fields)	26-2-76	12,747	814	252.24
Joalma Egg Farm and J. Phillips (Edmonton)	17-11-75	10,400	1,751	1,062.22
I. W. and L. Wolski (Jondaryan)	29-6-76	7,488	1,354	92.25
Thornlands Egg Farm Pty. Ltd. and J. P. Unwin and A. V. Hill	5,342	2,804	342.27

(Source: The Hen Quota Committee)

SCHEDULE B

Quota Holders who have relinquished their quotas in Hen Quota District Number 3 Up to and including 19 October, 1976

Name of Original Quota Holder	Adjusted Quota Originally Allocated
J. Cannon, Atherton ..	548
R. Robson, Innisfail ..	100
L. A. Scott, Home Hill ..	357
G. H. and A. Slape, Tolga	132
T. H. and G. A. Stone, Charters Towers	552
H. Carse, Bowen	50

(Source: The Hen Quota Committee)

SCHEDULE C

Eggs consigned to Hen Quota District Number 3 from The Egg Marketing Board since July 1973

Year	Numbers of Eggs consigned (dozens)
1973-74	1,400,655
1974-75	767,850
1975-76	623,310
1976-77 (progressive figures to 8 October, 1976) ..	209,225

(Source: The Egg Marketing Board)

RADIO STATION 4ZZZ

Mr. Gygar asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

(1) What is the corporate structure of radio station 4ZZZ, which operates from the University of Queensland, what form of incorporated or unincorporated association does it take and who would be liable for its debts if it were to collapse financially?

(2) Who owns the equipment and machinery used at 4ZZZ?

(3) How much money has 4ZZZ received from the University of Queensland Union since its inception?

(Originally asked on 29 September 1976)

Answer:—

I refer to questions asked of me on Wednesday, 29 September, by the honourable member for Stafford, regarding radio station 4ZZZ which operates from the University of Queensland, and also the finances of the University of Queensland Union. In my replies of that date I advised that inquiries were being made to provide answers for the honourable member for Stafford. In response to question No. 53, I am now able to say—

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland (Sir Zelman Cowan) advises that he has received the following information from the station coordinator of 4ZZZ:

(1) The licence for Radio Station 4ZZZ was issued by the Commonwealth Government to Creative Broadcasters Pty. Ltd., without any reference to the senate or to the officers of the university. Creative Broadcasters Pty. Ltd. is a company incorporated under the provisions of the Companies Act. If it were to collapse financially, its assets would be distributed under the provisions of the Companies Act.

(2) The equipment and machinery used by station 4ZZZ is owned by Media Facilities Pty. Ltd., a company incorporated under the provisions of the Companies Act.

(3) \$71,840.

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND UNION SHOP

Mr. Gygar asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

(1) With regard to the finances of the University of Queensland Student Union, how much money has been spent to date by the union in equipping, stocking and operating the union calculator and stereo shop in Adelaide Street, including amounts for which accounts have been received but no payments made?

(2) What have been the gross receipts of this operation since it commenced?

(3) What was the source of funds used by the union to settle accounts arising out of the operation before any income was generated?

(Originally asked on 29 September 1976)

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The Vice-Chancellor has referred the questions relating to the operations of the union's stereo FM centre to the president of the union for advice and information. He has been advised that the union is not prepared to disclose the information requested in parts 1 and 2 on the ground that such disclosure would prejudice the union's trading position in the commercial sphere.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

TRANSFER OF PATIENT BY HELICOPTER,
IPSWICH TO BRISBANE

Mr. HALES: I ask the Minister for Health: Is he aware of newspaper reports concerning the transfer of a patient by helicopter from Ipswich to Brisbane? Is it true that there was no ambulance waiting for the patient when the helicopter arrived? What steps has the Minister taken to ensure that a similar situation will not occur in the future?

Dr. EDWARDS: I am aware of the report in the newspapers today—the matter was brought to my attention yesterday afternoon—and I think it is important, both for members of this Assembly and for the public in general, for me to give an outline of the situation, because immediately the matter was brought to the attention of the department an investigation was ordered into the reason why the ambulance was not there to meet the helicopter.

It is true that the lady concerned was burnt in Ipswich and was taken to the Ipswich Hospital, where it was found that she had severe burns to almost 100 per cent of her body. As a result, it was decided by the Medical Superintendent of the Ipswich Hospital that she should be transferred to the special burns unit at the Brisbane Hospital to give her the very best chance of survival as it is well recognised that people who have burns to more than 70 per cent of their body have very little chance of survival.

Arrangements were made with the R.A.A.F. base at Amberley for the patient to be flown to Brisbane as quickly as possible and arrangements were made for the patient's transfer by ambulance from the hospital to a helicopter area in Ipswich. Unfortunately, although the Ipswich Hospital did notify the burns unit that the lady was

arriving, because of a lack of communication—which is a rare occurrence in a hospital situation of this particular nature—the Brisbane ambulance was not notified that the patient was arriving. I am informed that a doctor and nursing sister accompanied the patient to Brisbane. I am also informed by the director of the burns unit at Royal Brisbane Hospital that the attention given by the doctor and nurse was of the highest standard and that the short time lost whilst waiting for an ambulance did not lower the patient's chance of survival. I make it quite clear that the ambulance services of Brisbane and Ipswich were in no way at fault and that what happened was in fact a minor communication delay.

Instructions have now been issued to all hospitals throughout the State that it is the responsibility of a hospital that is receiving an emergency patient, irrespective of the means by which the patient is arriving, to ensure that an ambulance is available. I do not think that what happened yesterday will happen again.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Mr. HALES: I ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: Has his attention been drawn to statements made by Mr. Costello, the president of the Queensland Teachers' Union, that if the teachers registration board finds the three sacked school-teachers fit to teach, they should be re-employed? Is he aware that Mr. Costello wants to set up the teachers registration board as an employer? In view of the recent confusion between statements made by Mr. Costello and by Mr. Guymer, chairman of the teachers registration board, will the Minister clarify the difference between the Board of Teacher Education, which handles qualifications, and the Public Service Board, which handles employment?

Mr. BIRD: As the honourable member suggests, there is a vast difference between the two bodies to which he referred. The Board of Teacher Education is responsible for the registration of teachers in this State and has nothing whatever to do with employment of teachers by the Public Service Board—in other words, in my department. If the Board of Teacher Education decides that the teachers concerned should be suspended, that simply means that they would lose the right to teach at any school in Queensland, including, of course, private schools throughout the State.

This has nothing whatever to do with the decision of the Public Service Board, and also my decision, that these teachers be dismissed from the State Education Department, thus losing the privileges attaching to work within the Public Service because they had, on their own admission by pleading guilty, been found guilty of an indictable offence.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION'S BUDGET SPEECH

Mr. ELLIOTT: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware that the Leader of the Opposition is reported to have sought the advice of the former Federal Treasurer to help him frame his Budget Speech? If so, what stock does the Treasurer place on such advice?

Mr. KNOX: I do not know precisely from whom the Leader of the Opposition sought advice. He came into the Chamber looking like a walking filing-cabinet, with great heaps of papers and tags all over him. He had more tags on him than Bart Lourigan has at the moment. If he did get advice from a former Treasurer I can scarcely imagine who it was. Perhaps it was Dr. Cairns.

Mr. Jensen: Bill McMahon advised him.

Mr. KNOX: If Bill McMahon had advised the Leader of the Opposition, he would not have delivered the silly speech he made in the Chamber. If the advice came from Dr. Cairns—and it sounded as though it may have come from that source—he is the man who, when asked as Treasurer of Australia, what he was going to do for money, simply said, "We will print more." The attitude of the socialists is to reduce the standard of living and lower our standards generally by making money valueless. That is the fiscal attitude of the socialists to this country.

OPENING OF ANAKIE ROAD LINK

Mr. LESTER: I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: In view of his standing and the high esteem in which he is held in Queensland, will he agree to a request from me to go to the Central Queensland gem-fields and, as a tribute to the wonderful people of the gem-fields, open the new bitumen road linking the town of Anakie to the Capricorn Highway?

Mr. HINZE: With such an introduction, how could I refuse? Naturally I would be pleased to accompany the honourable member to the opening of that road. It was through his representations that the road was planned and funds were accordingly made available. Of course, the people of the area will remember that—probably late next year.

PROPOSED NURSING HOME AT HERVEY BAY

Mr. POWELL: I ask the Minister for Health: What stage has planning for the 40-bed nursing home at Hervey Bay reached, and when can it be reasonably expected that tenders for the work will be called?

Dr. EDWARDS: I am aware of the honourable member's constant interest in this problem. Since he became the member for the Hervey Bay area, he has made constant representations to me concerning the Hervey

Bay Hospital. As a result of his representations, the Premier has visited the area and I, too, have been there to look at the problem. Following his representations and the visit of the Premier and me to the area, we have decided to build a 40-bed nursing-home unit and carry out other extensions to the hospital. Plans are well advanced, and the Maryborough Hospitals Board has recently advised me that it is very hopeful that these plans will soon be presented to it for final acceptance, and, if that happens, I shall certainly be prepared to approve the calling of tenders in the very near future.

HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES, ISIS ELECTORATE

Mr. POWELL: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: With reference to the news items in "The Courier-Mail" of Wednesday, 13 October, will the Minister reconsider the decision that, of the 160 new homes being built by the Housing Commission, only 110 will be based on the new design? As a number of new homes are to be built by the Housing Commission in McCarthy's Road, Bundaberg, would the Minister see that some of these houses are of the new progressive design?

Mr. LEE: Like the Minister for Health, I, too, am fully aware of the keen and constant representations that the honourable member for Isis makes on behalf of his electorate, and it is pleasing to me that he has noted that we are upgrading the standard of Housing Commission homes. It is also pleasing that he has enough interest in his electorate to ask that at least some of the new homes in his electorate be constructed to that new standard.

The honourable member said that, of the 160 new homes to be built, only 110 are to be built to the new design, but he must of course remember that it is not possible to construct all the 160 homes to the new design, firstly, because we have a duty to house people and, secondly, because we have a duty to keep the building industry rolling, and if we halt the building programme in order to incorporate the new design in all houses, we would cause a delay in the building programme. Nevertheless I can assure the honourable member that I will give due consideration to having some houses in his electorate built to the new design.

LEADER OF OPPOSITION'S ATTENDANCE IN CHAMBER

Mr. LANE: I ask the Premier: What is the minimum period of attendance that the Leader of the Opposition must have in the Chamber of this Parliament when it is in session—

(1) to fulfil legal and constitutional requirements; and

(2) to fulfil his moral and political obligations to the people of Queensland and play his part in providing a viable Opposition to the Government?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The minimum period is, of course, one day a session. I do notice that the Leader of the Opposition is again absent from the Chamber. Of course, he is often away from the Chamber.

Mr. Houston: You weren't even here for the Budget debate!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am in the next room meeting deputations each day the House is sitting. I am here all the time.

Mr. Houston: The Leader of the Opposition also meets deputations. He's in the building.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition is not here very often; he is away on very many occasions. I say to him that he has a moral obligation to be here—

Mr. Houston: Eighteen Cabinet Ministers against one.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: —particularly when he has such a small team as he has. Taking the calibre of the men into account, he ought to be here to help them. He also has a moral obligation to his electorate, and I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that he is not here very often.

PREMIER'S PLAN TO PRESERVE STEAM LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. JONES: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer him to a report in today's "Courier-Mail" that State Cabinet opposed his plan to preserve the last steam locomotives in Queensland. I ask the Premier: Is this a case of double defeat when last week he was rocked by his deputy over Abba and this week he is being steam-rolled by Cabinet over the Lockyer motive? Is this final proof that the National Party has run out of steam and strives for revival out of electrification?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: One thing that the honourable member has overlooked is that the Labor Party has run out of members. There are only a few of them left. The fact is, of course, that the decision was unanimous; everyone agreed whole-heartedly with this suggestion. I am afraid the honourable member is wrong once again.

POLICE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION INTO COMPLAINTS BY MICHAEL BALLISTER AND JANICE LAMBERT

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister for Police: When will the results of the Police Department's investigation arising from complaints made by Michael Ballister and Janice Lambert be released to the public?

Mr. NEWBERRY: In the near future.

DAYS ALLOTTED TO SUPPLY

SESSIONAL ORDER

Hon. T. G. NEWBERY (Mirani—Leader of the House): I move—

"(1) That for this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, not more than thirteen days shall be allotted for the consideration of the Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates, the Vote on Account and the Resolutions of Supply.

(2) That for this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House may, on the days allotted for Supply, continue to sit until 10 o'clock p.m. Each of the periods between 11 o'clock a.m. and 4 o'clock p.m. and between 4 o'clock p.m. and 10 o'clock p.m. shall be accounted an allotted day under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307. Two allotted days shall be allowed for the discussion of the Estimates of a department. At the termination of the period so allowed the Chairman shall put every question necessary to decide the Vote under consideration and shall then proceed to put the question for the balance of the Estimates for that Department; all such questions to be decided without amendment or debate: Provided that, if the discussion of the Estimates of the department be concluded before the expiry of the two days so allowed, the period remaining shall be allocated to the discussion of the Estimates next brought before the Committee.

(3) That all other provisions of Standing Order No. 307 shall, mutatis mutandis, continue to apply."

Motion agreed to.

MINERS' HOMESTEAD LEASES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 14 October (see p. 977) on Mr. Knox's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1976-77, a sum not exceeding \$127,953 to defray Salaries—His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (12.14 p.m.): In rising to speak in this Budget debate, I congratulate the new Treasurer on the Budget that he is able to bring down in spite of the austerity measures that the present Federal Government has been forced to implement as a result of inheriting a

deficit of \$2,994 million from the Whitlam Government's mismanagement of the economy.

Mr. JONES: I rise to a point of order. In view of the question put to the Premier this morning about the absence of the Leader of the Opposition from the Chamber I draw your attention to the fact that on the ministerial benches at the moment there is only one Minister and one back-bencher.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. There is a Minister in charge of the Chamber and that is all that is necessary.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I congratulate the Treasurer on his ability to introduce such initiatives as the abolition of succession duty and gift duty in Queensland. I have a few comments to make on those matters in the light of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition during the last election campaign ran up and down the State—

An Opposition Member: He travelled.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He did, but he would not travel very fast.

The Leader of the Opposition travelled the length of the State pointing out that we would have to impose a special State tax; that there was no way we would be able to abolish death duties and raise the exemption level of pay-roll tax—much talked about during the Clayfield by-election and at other times. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that once again Queensland is taking the initiative. It is the first State in Australia with such forward thinking.

I hope that the Federal Government will follow suit and abolish its death duties. Death duties are completely iniquitous. They rob widows and orphans. As a member of the Government, I take great pleasure in relating to my electors that, as a coalition Government, we will be able to achieve these aims and that from 1 January they will be realities. Like many of my National and Liberal Party colleagues I have talked at meetings about the abolition of death duties. This is probably the most forward step I have seen implemented in Parliament in the time I have had anything to do with politics.

Pay-roll tax is anti-initiative, anti-business and anti-employment. We should strive to increase the level of exemption which will rise finally to \$100,000. We should continue past that level to encourage business to invest in Queensland and create further employment. I shall deal now with a few of the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition in answer to the Treasurer's Budget speech. It is interesting to note the advice he appears to have taken from supposedly astute people such as the former Federal Treasurer (Bill Hayden). I would not ask Bill Hayden how to run a piggy bank, let alone our State. He presided over the worst

inflation that this nation has ever seen; he presided over the worst mismanagement our nation has known.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The honourable member for Archerfield may say what he likes. His bleatings are typical of a party that has been decimated to 11 members. His is the party which, in a by-election, should have been able to pick up an extra 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the vote, but got only a miserable 4 per cent increase. There are no two ways about it: it will lose a few more in the next election instead of picking up seats as it believes it will.

After listening to the Budget speech by the Leader of the Opposition, it would appear to me that he places tremendous stock in the advice handed out by Bill Hayden, which is, "Spend your way out of trouble." The recipe that the Leader of the Opposition gave to us in this Chamber is one for increased inflation; one that has been seen by the nation and judged by the nation at previous elections to be nothing more than a disaster. I would not go along with it one bit of the way. As a Government, we must get behind the Federal Government. We must go along with the austerity measures wherever we consider them to be reasonable. We must ensure that we fight inflation above all else. If we don't, we in this country are finished.

I turn now to a few other matters. I believe the Federal Government is doing a good job. I was interested to note the scheme to make incentive payments to employers engaging school-leavers who have been out of work for six months. That is a step in the right direction but I feel that it does not go far enough. Take the instance of a person who is conscientious and does not believe in taking the dole and who may have been unemployed for four months although consciously trying every day to obtain employment. Because he is too proud to take employment relief, he may not be able to benefit from the job opportunities created by this scheme. The Federal Government should decrease the time after which incentive payments are made for the employment of people who have been out of work. I suggest that it be reduced to three months.

One of the most important things we can do today is to ensure that our young people are employed. Allowing young people to be out of work for any length of time breeds the type of mentality. "Well, why work? We are getting paid. We can form a commune-type arrangement and a whole group of us can live in a house and draw social service." Once that type of mentality or attitude towards the work ethic is bred, we will be on the downhill slide and it will be very difficult to rehabilitate some of those people to get them back into the work-force. Consequently, I ask the Federal Government

to look closely at the proposal with a view to decreasing the period of unemployment from six months to three months.

I wish now to make some comments about succession duty, because I believe that the principle involved is very important. Contrary to the sort of advice that is proffered at various times by the bunyip aristocracy from Archerfield, abolition of death duties is not an attempt to support the wealthy and the squatocracy. That is the attitude and statement of Opposition members on the subject. I would like to kill once and for all the notion that that is the case.

This tax concerns people; companies do not die. Over the last three years, the value of the average home has increased to such an extent that the people who are being hit to leg are, in most cases, small businessmen, owners of small properties and homeowners in the suburbs whose properties have escalated in value because of inflation. When the value of a man's home is lumped with that of his few meagre possessions such as a car and so on, his estate comes into the category that attracts succession duty.

We have seen some tragedies. I support the views of the honourable member for Ipswich West and the honourable member for Albert, who both said the other day that some people have had to sell the family home to meet this duty. The case was cited of a mother and daughter living in a family home. The mother died and the daughter did not have the necessary capital to pay the duty and so she had to sell up and get out. I believe the proposal is a forward and humanitarian step which should have been taken ages ago. I thoroughly support it.

I should like now to deal with the reduction in road transport permit fees—again a step in the right direction. I point out to Opposition members that this was a pledge and part of our platform during the last State election campaign. We promised to abolish permit fees over the three-year period. In the previous State Budget we abolished the first third; in this Budget we are abolishing the second third; and next year the final third will be abolished. I repeat that this is a step in the right direction. The Government's adherence to its platform and promises at election-time prove its good faith.

Regardless of our political colour, we surely all support decentralisation. The move to abolish permit fees will help to keep down the cost of road transport, which, of course, results in an increase in all other costs. The honourable member for Mt. Isa said that in Mt. Isa sales tax is levied on the total cost, including the cost of transport permit fees. This move will have a twofold effect in keeping down transport costs and the cost of the final article.

I welcome the Treasurer's move on land tax, which is an anachronism. Unfortunately, it hits at anyone who has had enough initiative to build up something such as a business or a property. I welcome the further

raising of the exemption level for land tax. I believe that it will be of benefit to some of my constituents.

The proposed slight reduction in workers' compensation premiums is another forward step. Unfortunately, owing to the tremendous number of claims, the premiums were increased. I note with interest that, owing to the slightly reduced level of departmental costs, we have been able to reduce workers' compensation premiums slightly and reintroduce the merit bonus system. The merit bonus system should be commended. It works on the basis that if people are careful in an industry, that industry will reap the benefit of their care. In turn it ensures that management will go to great lengths in implementing further safety practices which will keep the establishment's safety record reasonably good. The scheme will help management to gain merit bonuses and will help to make the company more profitable. I see it as a very good move.

I should like now to discuss rail freights and the general railway position. I believe that members of the Opposition, and at times other honourable members, have spoken a lot of rot about circumstances which they think should be allowed to continue. As far as I am concerned, we must look very closely at the over-all operations of the railways, but I would firstly like to say to the Treasurer that people in my electorate are deeply grateful that the cattle and grain industries have been exempted from the proposed increases in freight rates. The cattle industry, which in the past has been one of our great export-earning industries, has been brought virtually to its knees, and I believe it is only just that we ensure that no further increases are imposed on this industry while it is in its present parlous state, which has been brought about through no fault of its own but because its overseas markets have been jeopardised through political pressure.

Mr. Houston: Why don't you go to Russia?

Mr. ELLIOTT: It's a pity the honourable member does not go back over there. He seems to be very keen about that area.

Mr. Houston: I am keen to get markets for your beef, which is more than you fellows are. You are all talk.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Unfortunately, until recently sales to that area have been made at ridiculous price levels which are totally unacceptable to the producers. When the Whitlam Government first sold beef to Russia, the Meat Board finished up having to foot the bill. There was no profit in it for anyone; in fact we ended up suffering a loss. So honourable members opposite should not talk about their efforts in this direction, because they were absolutely hopeless.

Opposition Members interjected.

The **CHAIRMAN:** Order!

Mr. ELLIOTT: I would like now to deal further with the exemption of the grain industry from the increases in freight rates. This will be of tremendous benefit to the grain growers in my electorate. During a debate on matters of public interest some time ago, I pointed out that the price of A.S.W. wheat had dropped from \$135 a tonne to \$103 a tonne. It has since dropped a further \$14 a tonne and is now selling for about \$89 a tonne, so no-one should get carried away with the idea that the grain industry is buoyant, that its profitability will continue to increase and that the growers will spend money and thus keep more people employed.

I put forward the argument that for those reasons we must look at the over-all position, that we must not look purely and simply at one industry or one section of the community but at the viability of an entire area. If we allow the grain industry to go into decline, those industries which are dependent upon it will also decline. I refer to industries such as agricultural machinery manufacture, which are so prolific on the Darling Downs, in particular, in Central Queensland and in the area down towards Goondiwindi. At the moment these companies are selling a tremendous amount of machinery to farmers. As honourable members know, there is no sector of the community which is more inclined to spend money than farmers when they have it. They are prepared to spend, and when they do they purchase worth-while machinery to modernise their plant and thus make themselves more efficient, which in turn leads to greater productivity and aids the fight against inflation through lower prices.

We have seen that, far more than has any other group in our society, the farming community has provided a hedge against inflation in terms of putting cheaper commodities on the dinner tables of the world, so no-one should go away with the funny idea that in putting forward these arguments we are just protecting some select group in the community. This exemption for the grain industry will be reflected through the stores in the grain-producing areas because the farmers will be able to purchase more machinery and the people employed by the machinery manufacturers will be able to purchase more goods from other companies, and this in turn will result in even more employment opportunities. So there is a chain reaction right down the line. We cannot look at the grain industry in isolation; we must look at the situation in toto.

While speaking about the railways, I should like to offer some advice to the Minister for Transport—I hope he will take it in good part—about the sleepers used on the railway lines in Queensland. I am not referring, Mr. Hewitt, to members of the A.L.P. when they are travelling; I am referring to the sleepers that go under the lines.

In my opinion, the sleepers being used in Queensland are possibly second-grade when compared with those used in some other

Australian States. It is false economy to use sleepers of slightly inferior quality simply because they cost less initially. I suggest that, in terms of true economy, it would be better in the long term to use good hardwood sleepers—ironbark sleepers—which in many areas would last up to 30 years. Because of the high cost of the labour used in fitting the poor-quality sleepers, the State loses eventually.

Although I have already brought this matter to the Minister's attention, I again ask him to look at what action can be taken to overcome it. I also urge Government members to share my concern and consider the problem carefully, because I believe that many thousands of dollars possibly are being wasted in the long term.

Any other avenues that may be open to overcome the problem of the deficit in the Railway Department should also be explored. It cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, and honourable members should all endeavour to ensure that all the operations of the department are investigated carefully. I make no bones about saying that many employees of the Railway Department are excellent workers. They are prepared to do a good day's work for a good day's pay and they are interested in what they are doing. Unfortunately, there are some who tend to rest on their laurels and allow others to do all the work. I reiterate, Mr. Hewitt, that all of us must look very closely at the present circumstances in the railways.

I point out to the Committee that the decision not to increase rail freight rates on grain will also be of benefit to the Brisbane area. Any decision to apply the increase to grain would have resulted in additional use of road transport to cart grain. It would have meant that roads which are already in a very bad condition would have been damaged further; it would have caused traffic chaos between Brisbane and Toowoomba, and particularly in seats such as those held by the honourable member for Bulimba and the Leader of the Opposition. Huge trucks carting grain through to Pinkenba would have caused immense social and physical problems, and I ask honourable members to bear that in mind when they hear talk about the freight concessions to farmers. The Government's decision not to increase rail freight on grain should not be looked at in isolation.

Let me turn now to health. The increase of 21 per cent in expenditure, which is above the rate of inflation, will assist considerably, so one can expect to see the building of new hospitals and the provision of further improvements. The Minister for Health has already considered the problem at the Oakey Hospital and is trying to do something to overcome it, but I ask him to assist further by having the senile annexe rebuilt and by providing a new small hospital complex for outpatient and general use.

While speaking about health, I should like to point out how hypocritical the Leader of the Opposition has been in the stand that

he has taken. What he said in Toowoomba during the Lockyer by-election campaign was a joke. What he said about Medibank and his attempt to blame the Government of Queensland for what has transpired were quite unbelievable.

The truth is that Bill Hayden's first estimate of cost of this monster was \$898,000,000. The operational cost for the first year approached \$1,400 million, which showed that his calculations were a long way out. The Leader of the Opposition runs round saying, "We were going to impose a 1.25 per cent levy. You blokes have put on a levy of 2.5 per cent." He very conveniently omits that Mr. Hayden's Green Paper mentioned two other levies. The 1.25 per cent levy was to be on each person's taxable income.

Mr. Moore: It was to be 1.35 per cent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: There was to be another levy on workers' compensation payments and yet another levy on motor vehicle third-party insurance. There was to a further levy that would fluctuate according to the over-all taxation pool. That was given in differing amounts; every week Mr. Hayden gave a different sum. One has only to read Federal "Hansard" to see what Mr. McVeigh, the member for Darling Downs, and various other members said about it in the Federal Parliament. They could never pin Mr. Hayden to a precise figure; he always waffled one way or the other, as we have seen him do so often. The truth therefore is that the Labor Government proposed three levies, not just the one to which the Leader of the Opposition conveniently refers. Labor members are hypocritical enough to go round the countryside conveniently forgetting about the additional levies. Let there be no doubt where they stood in relation to them.

I should now like to mention a few problems in the field of education, particularly one relating to book allowances. Unfortunately there are in all areas some who are not as ethical—I think that is the correct word—as they should be. They are receiving from the Education Department cheques that should be paid to either book stores or parents and citizens' associations that sell second-hand books. But what are they doing with those cheques? They are cashing them at hotels and drinking the money. I find such conduct totally unacceptable. We should have a very close look at this matter and ensure that cheques for book allowances are cashed only by parents and citizens' associations that are selling second-hand textbooks or reputable companies that sell textbooks. If this is not done, there will be a perpetuation of the problem of some people cashing the cheques and spending the money in any way they choose.

Mr. Houston: They could already have bought the books and the cheques were reimbursement.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Unfortunately the honourable member for Bulimba has never been further from the truth. There is very good

evidence available of what is going on and it will be put before the Minister. I seek the co-operation of the honourable member for Bulimba in stamping out this type of activity. If he is honest he will admit that it goes on in his electorate just as it does in others. We must see that it is stopped. Book allowances were designed to help the children of Queensland; they were not meant to be used to buy grog. I state that most emphatically.

Whilst on the subject of education, I should like to refer to small schools, such as those that many members have in their areas, and the provision of specialist teachers, such as music teachers. Unfortunately, in the allocation of specialist teachers the highest priority is given to larger schools. Generally speaking, the bigger schools, because of their large staff, are able to find among their teaching staff someone who is qualified to teach music and similar subjects. On the other hand, the one-teacher or two-teacher schools are not always staffed by teachers who are qualified to do so. So, for goodness' sake, let us have a close look at this situation and establish a group of roving teachers who could visit schools to teach music and similar subjects.

I am pleased to see that the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities is in the Chamber and taking note of my comments. He is very interested in his portfolio and is doing a good job. I am sure that he is noting my remarks and will look at this problem. Small schools are at a disadvantage and could well do with the services of roving teachers who are qualified to teach those subjects.

Finally, the concept enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition is one that would result in failure. When his adviser, Bill Hayden, put forward similar proposals in the Federal arena they proved disastrous. For goodness' sake, don't take any notice of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (12.47 p.m.): We have just heard a remarkable speech from the present member for Cunningham, whose actions stand in stark contrast to those of his predecessor, Sir Alan Fletcher. I am sure Sir Alan would have been embarrassed if he had been here today and heard the honourable member's speech.

I have not heard any other member of this Chamber wanting to give so much away. The honourable member for Cunningham would abolish all taxes except those imposed on city people. He would have the people living in Brisbane pay the lot. He would have us believe that death duties should be abolished—and so they should; no-one would argue against that—and that all other charges should be reduced. As his speech went on we heard him saying that practically every charge should be reduced. Where does he think the money will come from to pay his salary alone? I know that we could do with fewer members.

A Government Member: Particularly in the Labor Party.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will still be here after the honourable member has gone. If he can chalk up 19 years in this Assembly he will have something to talk about.

If Queensland had an honest redistribution of boundaries under a proper Electoral Act, members such as the honourable member for Cunningham would be fighting among themselves instead of representing the pocket-handkerchief-size electorates that some Government members represent.

Mr. Elliott: I could walk around your electorate in five minutes.

Mr. HOUSTON: That may be so; but I represent human beings, not areas, not trees. The National Party leads the coalition Government only because it has rigged the electoral boundaries.

I want to bring to the attention of the public the claims of the honourable member for Cunningham that there are far too many police, that too much is spent on education and that people are being given too many subsidies. If we were to follow his suggestion and reduce everyone's income tax by \$1, somebody would miss out. I can well remember that whenever members urged the previous Treasurer to spend more money in certain directions, the first thing he would ask was, "Where do I take it from to spend it on this or that?" I would suggest to the honourable member for Cunningham and those who hold the same view that they look at those areas that will miss out if there is no taxation at all.

Mr. Elliott: Who said "no taxation at all"?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is what the honourable member implied.

Mr. Elliott: I did not.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member also spoke about the Cabinet Ministers. I have never heard of so many "looking" Ministers. Time and time again the honourable member said, "I have got the Minister to have a look at it." Apparently all the Ministers have "had a look at it", but not one of them has done anything. Not once did the honourable member say, "I got the Minister to look at it and he took action on it." They are all "looking" Ministers.

Mr. Prest: A mirror.

Mr. HOUSTON: They are mirrors. Last but not least, the member for Cunningham ragged me because I suggested that the beef industry should sell its product to Russia and any other country that wished to trade with it. He said that that was wrong, that we must not do that and that it was only the old Labor Government that set up a relationship with Russia.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I rise to a point of order. I said no such thing. I find that remark offensive to me and ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will accept that explanation.

Mr. HOUSTON: I accept it.

The honourable member said, "I said no such thing." I do not know what he is referring to, but he certainly criticised me and said that I should go back to Russia, or something like that, because I said that the beef industry was trading with Russia and was looking for further trade with Russia. That is what I said but when he took his point of order he virtually denied that the beef industry is looking for trade with Russia. Let us be clear where he stands.

On 14 October "The Courier-Mail" carried the headline, "Australia after big Soviet meat order". If the last order had been so disastrous for the beef industry why would it want another order? One of the problems of the beef industry is that it has not enough orders. That is because the Government is not seeking orders. For donkey's years the Labor Party members in this Chamber advocated the establishment of trade offices in other countries of the world. We advocated their establishment in the Middle East, Japan and elsewhere. We said, "We must get out and sell our products, particularly primary products." In 1969 I had the privilege of leading the Labor Party and that policy was advocated strongly year after year. Every year the Government has said that it would do that, but it has done nothing. It cannot sell unless it tries to sell.

Mr. Jones: Weren't they going to appoint Mr. Hodges?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is so. There was a fight in Cabinet about who was to go to Japan or elsewhere.

I urge the meat industry to get out and sell its products and support a party that will do the same, that is, the Labor Party.

I am sure that all honourable members listened attentively to the introduction of the 1976-77 State Budget. It was of interest not only because of its effect upon the State but also because it ended the era of the Chalk-Bjelke-Petersen coalition and introduced a new concept into the State Government. This morning it was quite remarkable to hear the Premier, in answer to a Dorothy Dix question, attack the Leader of the Opposition for not being in the Chamber. The Premier did not even pay the Parliament or his new Treasurer the courtesy of being in the Chamber during the presentation of this Budget. He is not here now. I do not know where he is. It is remarkable that, of all the Ministers, only the Treasurer is here. The former Treasurer and his predecessor were here virtually

throughout the whole of Budget debates, but the present Treasurer is here only on rare occasions. I do not know how the Minister for Works and Housing spends his time but occasionally he comes in here for a minute or two to say hello.

While I am talking about Ministers and members attending Parliament, let me emphasise the lax attitude of Ministers to questions without notice. They were introduced to give members an opportunity to ask Ministers questions without notice; that is exactly what was intended. But quite often only 10 of the 18 Ministers are in the House during question-time. If the Premier wishes to challenge the attendance record of the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber let him line up his Ministers and make them attend because they have a responsibility to be in Parliament between 11 a.m. and 12 midday so that members can ask questions on behalf of their constituents. Let the Premier attend to this matter.

It is obvious that the Government consists of a National-Party-controlled majority and a rebel group backed by the Liberal Party Convention. As yet this group is leaderless, because the Treasurer, who is the leader of the Liberal Party, has thrown in his lot with the Premier rather than support those who, at the Liberal Party Convention, wanted open three-party contests. He may have changed his mind a little since the Lockyer by-election. However, basically he is in the Premier's camp and not in the camp of his own party's convention.

Without in any way agreeing with all of the policies or statements of Sir Gordon Chalk, I think it would be fair to say that he did bring a semblance of stability to the State Government. He was not overshadowed by the Premier, as is the present Liberal leadership. Previous Budgets had a balance about them that is completely lacking in the present one. They had a direction and they were given a name to symbolise the direction. Last year Sir Gordon Chalk called it the "Press Ahead" Budget. The present effort was left nameless. Maybe that is also symbolic. A prerequisite to naming a Budget is giving a balance to the subject matter. It is obvious that there is not much balance in this Budget, and its nameless state is symbolic of that.

The main concessions in this Budget were born not in the hard economics of our times, but in the demands for by-elections. The abolition of death duties was a concept of the Premier's for the Clayfield and Port Curtis by-elections. I suggest that but for those two by-elections we would not have heard anything about abolishing death duties until some time in the future. On the other hand, perhaps it would have come to light in the Lockyer by-election. The pay-roll tax amendments and the workers' compensation adjustments were the Liberal Party's reply for the Lockyer by-election. It seems that the

Liberal Party was more successful with that than the National Party was with death duty abolition.

It is no wonder the Treasurer was so nervous and jumpy during the presentation of this Budget. He is the first Treasurer I have seen break away from his prepared Financial Statement to answer interjections. I suppose one should not be too hard on the Treasurer, for he is passing through a rather torrid time. Even at his own party's convention he was booed. Apparently the delegates there were not in starry-eyed raptures over his Budget proposals. They obviously put them out of their minds when they vented their feelings over the Liberal Party's role in the present coalition. They knew that Bill Knox is a follower of the Premier, as are many other Liberal Party members in the State Parliament. They also know that the slightest spark between union and management, between country dweller and city dweller, between North Queensland and South Queensland is being developed by the State Government's propaganda machine and fanned by the Premier and his disciples into a roaring inferno.

One of the great tragedies in our State is the attempt by the State Government to pit people against people. How often do we find that, if someone disagrees with the Government or with something the Government has done, the Premier or one of his supporters gets up in this Chamber and criticises those people, calls them Communists and gives them all this type of tag. He has no knowledge at all of the political beliefs of those people. The odds are that 99.9 per cent of them are completely opposed to Communism. But that does not prevent the Premier from getting up and naming people as being either influenced by Communists or supporters of Communists, or from saying as he did the other day, "If you want it, I will give Parliament the background of these people." If he has so much information, he should give it outside the Parliament and name the people involved. That would allow those people to go through the courts of our land and have the Premier prove how factual his information is.

Or does the statement of the Premier really indicate that through various departments he has a dossier on every person who objects to or criticises his Government's policy or his policy? It makes one wonder. I was astounded when I heard the Premier say, "I will name these people." He was referring to a body of people who had decided to meet and probably criticise some Government activities. Many of those people were unknown, I am sure, to one another and would have been unknown to the great majority of the population. It makes one wonder how many people the Premier has a dossier on. How far is this State advanced towards being a police State?

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

Mr. HOUSTON: Queenslanders who have had the opportunity of travelling overseas or to other parts of Australia—in fact even to Tweed Heads—must be concerned at the vast difference in basic freedoms. From the way that the National-Liberal Government in Queensland is endeavouring to protect us against ourselves, one would imagine that we would be the most contented people on earth. There is no doubt that we have the greatest climate in Australia. Also there is no doubt that Queenslanders are very friendly. But that, I am afraid, is the end of the major prizes.

We have the greatest gerrymander of electoral boundaries. Incidentally, until the Liberal Party does something about them, it will never be the senior party in any coalition either in government or in opposition. Waiting until the next election could prove too long. If, by some mischance, the Labor Party is not returned to Government, the next set of boundaries will be even worse for the Liberal Party than the present ones.

In this State we have the most rapid breakdown of public respect for the Police Force and a breakdown in police morale, not because of any actions by the great majority of our policemen or women police but because of the Government's failure to answer quickly charges that are brought against members of the force. Immediate public investigation of major charges against groups of police is the surest way to restore public confidence and to build up morale within the force itself. We have now seen introduced an oppressive rule for Government employment. Even the possession of a pipe for the smoking of marijuana brings instant dismissal for a tradesman working in a workshop. Many people are wondering what will be next and who will be next for instant dismissal from the Government payroll.

We have the most restrictive censorship laws in the Commonwealth for both film and literature. However, the Government will bend over backwards to assist a foreign investor by extending to him plenty of concessions and assistance. Talking of films and entertainment, I suppose it was quite refreshing to see the Premier and the Deputy Premier in accord in wanting the Abba group brought here. Possibly one of the reasons they were not coming originally—I do not know whether they are coming now or not—is that they had heard about this police State and its attitude towards anybody raised in a socialist country. The fact is that the Abba group was brought up in Sweden, which is a socialist country. These young people spent the whole of their childhood under a socialist Government. And this is the type of statement we hear from the Premier and the Deputy Premier. They want them here because they are wholesome young people. I have no doubt that they are but the point is that the Government should not talk with a forked tongue as it has been doing for so long. It is well known

that the Premier and the Deputy Premier have condemned other aspects of our way of living. What annoys me is not that people are asked to come here but the way that these things go on.

Time after time in this Parliament we have heard Government members coupling Communism and socialism and then trying to decry a person as someone not to be associated with. I think the Premier and the Deputy Premier would do well to realise that there are good people in all nations and countries which choose their own way of life. That applies particularly to Australia. The greatest ever majority of people in Australia are loyal to Australia and are loyal to its people.

Talking of values brings me back to the Budget. It is a Budget of gloom and uncertainty. Following on top of the Federal Budget, there is indecision and now Medi-bank confusion. The Budget has failed to tackle unemployment and failed in its sponsorship of Fraser's federalism. Fraser's federalism, which was so readily endorsed by the Premier, has proved very costly to Queensland and Queenslanders. It has drastically reduced the finances available to this State, therefore affecting the State's progress. Even the first item in the Consolidated Revenue Fund—receipts—showed our deteriorating position.

Mr. Byrne: Who wrote that?

Mr. HOUSTON: I did, as a matter of fact. The honourable member should not be surprised. If he had been in the Chamber to hear me speak on many occasions he would know that, but not being a regular attender of this Assembly, of course he would not know. Under Commonwealth payments, General Revenue Assistance last year was \$536,791,799. I am reading this part of my speech because I am using figures and I want to have those figures accurately recorded. That amount was 29.5 per cent up on the 1974-75 figure and represented 17.4693 per cent of the total money allocated under this heading for all States. This year the basis for the formula has been changed under the Fraser-Petersen-Knox agreement, so it is anticipated that we will receive \$646,500,000 or 17.3968 per cent of the Australian total, or in cash \$2,700,000 less than our entitlement on a percentage basis using the previous formula.

This amount would go a long way, for instance, towards starting the planning and survey work for a gateway crossing of the Brisbane River. Incidentally, the reason for the reduced percentage is that the new formula excludes a wage factor which was incorporated in the old form, and that was to Queensland's advantage because we are a high-wage State. Our main reliance is now to be on the population factor, and as we have the lowest population increase in all the States we will be the loser. I have to completely disagree, of course, with the Treasurer's statement when he said that in

terms of growth in population, employment, output and income Queensland emerged as the fastest-developing State in Australia. I do not know where the Treasurer gets his figures to support that statement, because the official figures given in his own financial document show the relevant Australian increases as follows:—

State	Popula- tion 31 Dec- ember 1975	Popula- tion 31 Dec- ember 1976	Per- centage Increase
New South Wales ..	4,810,900	4,880,700	1.45
Victoria ..	3,688,200	3,731,800	1.182
Queensland ..	2,015,100	2,034,700	0.973
South Australia ..	1,241,700	1,256,600	1.2
Western Australia ..	1,138,300	1,167,300	2.548
Tasmania ..	409,000	414,300	1.29

Those figures were supplied by the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. Frawley: Why give population figures?

Mr. HOUSTON: The figures for Queensland show that our percentage increase is the lowest anticipated increase of all the States. The honourable member for Murrumbidgee is interested in why I am giving population figures. For his benefit, let me point out that the formula that was developed prior to this year for the calculation of the Financial Assistance Grants to the various States was based on many factors including a population factor, a wage factor and a betterment factor.

Mr. Frawley: You will find they will all flock to Queensland shortly.

Mr. HOUSTON: No. This was an Australia-wide formula and under the new formula the betterment and wage factors have been excluded and any difference in the percentages to be paid to the various States have to be based entirely on the increase in population.

It has been suggested by the honourable member for Murrumbidgee that people will flock to Queensland. I do not know where he gets that idea from. Perhaps he thinks they will do so because of the abolition of death duties. However, other States will quickly follow suit. Although the State Government will be saving people thousands of dollars, the Commonwealth Liberal-National Country Party Government will continue to rake off additional money through its death duties.

I hope that people will come to Queensland, because the Queensland figures will then increase and the State will get a greater percentage of the total pool. However, I am afraid that while the Government maintains its attitude of calling people Communists and carrying on as it does in many other fields, no-one will want to come to Queensland.

Mr. Frawley: We don't call you a Communist.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, you do.

Mr. Frawley: No; we wouldn't.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member may not have done so personally, but many of his colleagues have tried to put that tag on me. It is nice to know that the honourable member has not done it.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: We were probably talking about some of your friends.

Mr. HOUSTON: Honourable members opposite were talking about me. Anyway, to accuse one of my friends is to accuse me, and I believe that my friends are loyal to me.

Mr. Knox: Are you going to look after Bart Lourigan?

Mr. HOUSTON: As a matter of fact, Mr. Lourigan will be looked after; there is no fear of that, one way or another.

As I said, I do not know where the Treasurer gets his population figures from. As that part of the Financial Statement is completely wrong, what reliance can honourable members place on the remainder of the statement relating to employment, output and income?

Under the present police-State attitude, who would want to come here, settle and rear a family? Why would young married people want to have a large family, or, indeed, any family, under the present circumstances, with in many instances husband and wife both having to work to make ends meet, a lack of housing, uncertainty about employment, and unemployment being a constant threat?

The lack of Federal support is shown in many other areas as well as those mentioned by the Treasurer. The Commonwealth Grants Commission payment last year was \$36,300,000 and this year it is expected to drop to \$27,000,000—down \$9,300,000, or by over 25 per cent—and one could well ask for how much longer, under the Petersen-Fraser federalism, the Grants Commission will operate in its present form.

Another loss to the State has been in money made available to help overcome unemployment both within Government departments and within local authorities. An amount of \$7,700,000 is missing this year. This lack of Commonwealth financial assistance is based on far far more than a desire to cut back Federal spending, because even after the total amount for the State has been decided, Queensland is the loser against other States.

There are other yardsticks, too, to test this new federalism—for example, the Commonwealth General Revenue Assistance per head of population. Queensland is expected to receive an increase from \$285.12 per head to \$330.38 this year—an increase of 16.05

per cent. However, the percentage increases in the other States are expected to be—

	Per cent
New South Wales	19.6
Victoria	19.37
South Australia	18.5
Western Australia	19.34
Tasmania	19.58

A close look at table 8 supplied by the Treasurer in the Budget papers shows a similar picture. Queensland's percentage of the total available dropped by 0.73 per cent—from 18.72 to 17.99—while those of all other States, with the exception of South Australia, which dropped by .04 per cent from 11.75 to 11.71, increased.

If one looks at the Trust and Special Funds, one sees that the pattern is the same. Although the new federalism is giving an increase of \$10,400,000—from \$13,800,000 to \$24,200,000—for local authorities, it has taken away from local authorities as much, if not more, under other headings. For instance, the Backlog Sewerage Loans Account, which was basically Federal money supplemented by a small amount of State money, last year amounted to nearly \$15,000,000, while this year it is just over \$3,200,000—a reduction of well over \$11,000,000. Add to this the \$3,000,000 less for the Aborigines' Welfare Fund and one quickly sees the true picture of Queensland's place in the shining eyes of the Liberal-National Country Party in its concept of federalism.

Last but not least is the Commonwealth Government's treatment of Queensland in the matter of loan funds. One would believe that each State should get a loan allocation based on the General Financial Revenue Assistance amended to take into account decentralisation as far as State works and housing are concerned, and the responsibilities of local and semi-governmental authorities in the matter of loans to States, local authorities and semi-governmental authorities.

Coupling the two loan allocations together is ridiculous because each has a separate and distinct function. Their activities are in no way related except to general progress and the state of the nation. In General Revenue Assistance, New South Wales is to receive 30.6 per cent; in State Works and Housing Loans, 32 per cent; and in loans to States for semi-governmental bodies and local authorities, 34.8 per cent of the totals in each case. Victoria is to receive 22.78 per cent, 25.5 per cent and 30.4 per cent respectively. The figures for Queensland are 17.99 per cent, 12.6 per cent and 19.1 per cent respectively. Those figures show that Queensland is again losing out to New South Wales and Victoria, which have shorter distances in roads and which are much older and wealthier States.

The drastic reduction in money for housing is one of the greatest tragedies, and if this is Fraser's new federalism surely this State wants no more of it. The present

Federal Government has inflicted on Queensland a drastic reduction in the number of homes that can be built for the people at a time when so many are making plans to obtain good accommodation. Perhaps the Federal Government is not alone to blame for this situation. It could well be that the State Government has not been pushing very hard over the years for allocations in this field, because the results over the last few years are quite significant. In 1972-73 the number of houses built was 1,779; in 1973-74, the number was 1,443; in 1974-75 it was 1,359; and in 1975-76 it was 1,069. On the Treasurer's own figures, it is estimated that it will be possible to complete only 800 in the coming financial year. That will surely represent the lowest number of houses built in this category since the war years.

Let me now refer to State income derived from our own sources. The abolition of death duties will have only a marginal effect on the State's income as its effect will be only for half a year and estates are assessed and duty paid some time after death. In this case, only \$1,300,000 less than the comparable 1975-76 figure is expected. The proposed reduction in pay-roll tax becomes more a matter of who will pay because the estimated income is still increased by 13.8 per cent to \$192,000,000 from the amount of \$168,986,214 received last year.

The reduction in road transport fees was an election promise and it has been carried out. However, it seems contradictory that at a time when the railways are going financially from bad to worse its main competitors are given further financial advantage. What a blunder was the Government's decision many years ago to allow private-enterprise road transport systems to develop in direct opposition to the State's railways! In the early stages the State could have developed its own co-ordinated rail and road services.

An interesting position has arisen in the matter of licence and permit fees. The shortfall resulting from the concessions to road transport operators is to be more than made up by the increase in liquor licence fees to give an over-all increase in income of 29 per cent—from \$24,170,000 to \$31,170,000. Again it is those who like alcoholic drinks who are to be called upon to pay and so compensate the Government for the results of some of its decisions, and again I make the comment that Government leaders, who are ever ready to condemn the drinking of alcoholic drinks, are always ready, when they want extra revenue, to increase taxation in this field.

Over two years, liquor licence fees for hotels are to increase by 33½ per cent from 6 per cent to 8 per cent; this year the increase is from 7 to 8 per cent. The difference between hotel licence fees and tavern licence fees was generally thought to be due to the fact that hotels

were required to provide food and accommodation and that the hotelier was therefore entitled to enjoy a lower licensing fee. As the tavern licence fees are to be decreased from 9 per cent to 8 per cent, thereby making them equal to hotel licence fees, surely it is wrong to compel the hotelier to provide additional amenities such as accommodation and food.

I have no doubt that in some instances the provision of accommodation and meals would be an advantage to a hotel. Nevertheless it should not be compulsory. A tavern is less costly to operate than a hotel, particularly as it is required to provide accommodation and meals.

This equalisation of licence fees should demolish all arguments against granting to bowls and golf clubs the right to sell take-away liquor to their members. Some time ago many members in this Chamber either wrote to the Minister or presented petitions on this matter, and I wonder why the Government is delaying the announcement of a decision one way or the other. Perhaps it hopes that, by allowing the matter to stand as it is, everyone will forget about it. In that case those clubs that want to break the law will go back to doing so and those that abide by the law will be denied the basic right of allowing their members to purchase take-away liquor. I call upon the Government to make a decision quickly in the interests of all concerned.

A case could be made out for allowing the major retail stores to sell liquor, as they do in New South Wales. Trading conditions in that State are certainly much more pleasant and civilised than in Queensland. The bottle counters offer a wider selection of beer, wine and spirits than any Queensland hotel that I have seen.

One brewery is complaining that hotels owned by it will be required to sell another brewery's beer. Surely in an era of free enterprise and free competition there is nothing very much wrong with that. If hotels were to sell all brands of beer, there would be no need for the public to go outside to other liquor outlets. The Government would do well to require hotels, taverns and other establishments that have bottle departments to update their facilities and to offer a very wide choice of liquor. The public has the right to a choice and there is no reason why they could not be the sole outlets for those commodities.

Those members of the public who drink are forced to pay a high price for their liquor. On top of that, if they drink and drive they run the risk of losing their driving licence and, in some cases, their job. So surely the Government has an obligation to give those persons who like to drink the widest possible choice of brands and establishments.

The increase in the exemption level for the purposes of land tax will not even cover the increases in valuations. Even with these

concessions, land tax income is expected to increase this year from \$8,800,000 to \$12,000,000. Increases in other Government charges come on top of last year's substantial increases, in many instances in the same area. It is significant that the Treasurer passed quickly over these increases. I have no doubt at all that they will be quite substantial.

The increase of 15 per cent in rail freights comes on top of the drastic 40 per cent increase last year and has the effect of increasing freights by 61 per cent as at 30 October 1976. I could well ask what has gone wrong with our railway system and its management. With running profits in 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969-70, why should there be such massive losses now, particularly as the Treasurer and the former Treasurer boasted of the growth in profits made from the haulage of minerals. In 1969-70, the railways showed an operating profit of \$1,950,000, but since then the losses have been as follows—

Year	Amount \$
1970-71	6,400,000
1971-72	8,900,000
1972-73	13,900,000
1973-74	38,600,000
1974-75	64,400,000
1975-76	70,700,000

In other words, over the last six years the losses have totalled \$203,000,000. By a strange coincidence, as the State has geared its railways more and more to coal and other mineral haulage, our over-all railway losses have increased. In only six years our railways have gone from a profit of nearly \$2,000,000 to a loss of over \$70,000,000, and an estimated loss of \$57,500,000 this year. These figures, of course, do not take account of interest and redemption payments that have to be met. Surely something is drastically wrong. Have the railways lost patronage in every field except mineral haulage? Do those who receive rebates and special assistance from the railway system (when it is in trouble itself) patronise the railways when times are good? Is the service offered to passengers equal to that offered in other States?

I know of some instances where our service is well below that offered in other States. An example I have cited on other occasion is still valid. It relates to the twin sleeping accommodation on long-distance runs. It is not reasonable to expect people of mature age in twin sleeping compartments, in many instances with strangers, to climb up to sleep in top bunks. Other States can afford single compartments and can fill them. This is one section of our passenger carriage that has been lost to road transport simply because the Railway Department will not catch up with modern thinking and public demand. The State cannot continue to accept such terrific losses, nor do I believe that the State can afford to give the railways

to private enterprise. In fact, I do not suppose that private enterprise would want a service that runs at such a terrific loss. The railways are necessary and I would be the first to play as active a part as I could in getting them back into profitable operation.

I have no fight with helping the producers when problems arise through prices for wheat and beef, but in most instances freight concessions are covered by rebates or concessions met direct from Treasury funds. It is necessary to give such concessions, but it is also necessary that people who use the railways when given concessions recognise their obligation to use the railways at other times. On many occasions I have heard people say that they use the railways when things are tough but when prices are right and sales are high they find many excuses for switching to road transport. That is not fair to the State. I suggested the other night, and it is worth recording in this debate today, that we should have contracts. If a grazier or anyone else gets concessions, he should be bound for some time in the future to use the railways so that the good times may balance the bad.

Mr. Warner: What is to happen to our roads?

Mr. HOUSTON: As I said, there is a place for road transport. We believe that any new road transport operations should be run by the Government itself under a transport authority.

I see no reason why we should allow a new enterprise to start road haulage unless it can be shown that it is an essential part of an existing normal business undertaking. With the Government going into road transport, money would be kept in the same organisation and the income from one section could be used to balance the losses of the other.

Because of our long-distance railway travel, the sparseness of population and the volume of trade, the Commonwealth Government must play a more direct financial part in the operation of our railways. I do not think it would be wrong at all for this Government to approach the Commonwealth Government and request it to subsidise our operating losses. After all, the maintenance of a high degree of efficiency in our railway system is a very important part of this nation's defence capability. At the moment the Federal House is arguing the toss about how much should be spent on providing tanks, boats, aircraft and other equipment and weapons to defend our nation. It is not much good having those things if one part of our nation is isolated from another. One of the things the Commonwealth Government has to do is to help finance the railway system to allow us to operate it effectively and well, thus maintaining it as an important part of our defence strategy, in case defence is ever needed—and we hope it never will be.

An inquiry should be held to find out what is wrong and to make sure that the railways operate efficiently. We must discover why we are not getting the amount of custom that I believe we should be. As I suggested the other night—and I repeat it in this debate—the Government would do well to set up an all-party committee to investigate the department. The committee should be given a broad charter, not with any idea of looking for scapegoats or finding that someone has slipped up along the line, but to put the department back on a profitable basis.

Such an inquiry would cost little in monetary terms. The members would already be receiving their salaries. Even if money had to be spent on some outside assistance, the possible savings would be well worth the cost. I am sure it would be much less than the \$203,000,000 that the railways have already lost in the last six years, with a further \$57,000,000 staring us in the face this year. I ask the committee how much longer we can ignore the situation. I referred to the loss of \$57,000,000. Perhaps it can be just fobbed off, but I ask the Committee to take into account that the budgeted railway loss this year requires the income expected to be realised from the following items of State income. It will take up all the totalisator betting tax, estimated to be \$14,700,000; all the bookmakers' turnover tax, estimated at \$4,700,000; all the soccer pools income, estimated at \$1,000,000; all the liquor licence tax, estimated to be \$19,800,000; all the fines and forfeitures, estimated to be \$8,300,000; all traffic licences and permits, estimated to be \$5,600,000; and all the income of the State Government Insurance Office in lieu of income tax, estimated at \$3,500,000.

I know that the Premier shudders when there is talk of an inquiry. His natural reaction is to say, "No." Let me remind the Committee that in the Australian Senate and in the American Senate many inquiries are held into aspects of government which involve much less money than this item. They are carried out by members of those Houses. Although members of Parliament are busy, I believe they are interested in losses such as this and would be prepared to use their talents if an inquiry were instituted. The main emphasis of the inquiry could well be on how to attract custom to rail. An empty seat, a vacant berth or an empty wagon is a dead loss. It costs little more to operate a full train than one that is half empty.

Let us now look at our expected expenditure. The Treasurer said in his Financial Statement, amongst other things—

"I give the assurance to the Committee that wherever and whenever possible during the year every dollar of saving that can be made in the State budget provisions will be immediately redirected to capital works to supplement the approved State

capital programs. This is the crucial area for the whole economy in the short term, for employment in Government and private areas, for the maintenance of skilled groups and so on and this is the area I will be keeping under constant review during the year."

Those are very noble sentiments. I hope that the Treasurer will do that. One of the great tragedies in our State is being unemployed, not only for the person who is out of work but also for those near and dear to him who are dependent on his income for their subsistence.

Anything that creates work will certainly be supported by me and my party. However, I can suggest to the Treasurer that one immediate way of getting quite a few thousand dollars extra is to reduce the number of Ministers in State Cabinet. I believe that performance has shown that 18 Ministers are far too many. We all know that the number 18 was selected not because of the work-load on the then Cabinet Ministers but at the political whim of the coalition. Naturally some departments require more knowledge and have a greater work-load than others. But practically every Government department is headed by highly paid and skilled public servants. In fact, some commissioners are paid much more than Cabinet Ministers. Surely in these areas the responsibility of a Cabinet Minister is not as high as in others.

Another factor to take into account is the activity and actions of the Premier himself. Often the Premier will superimpose his own desires on his Ministers or the head of a department and his point of view is acted on. The vetoing of a Minister's action is not unknown in this Cabinet. Certainly the Minister for Police is not a full-time Minister. The dedication and knowledge of the previous Minister was no defence against his removal when the Premier thought it desirable.

Other portfolios which I believe do not have a full work-load are Tourism and Marine Services; Water Resources; and Survey and Valuation. Four other portfolios carry considerable loads but they are well below a Minister's capacity. I refer to: Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries; Welfare and Community Services and Sport; Works and Housing; and Transport. I have nothing personal against any of those Ministers. It is a matter of weighing State and public expenditure against the work-load and responsibilities of a Minister.

I believe that the State can be run very effectively with 14 Cabinet Ministers, particularly in the present economic situation. The reduction of the Ministry by four ministries would save millions of dollars in their Chief Office Vote, which includes Press secretaries, private secretaries, chauffeurs, and many other personal staff. It would result also in a saving in office accommodation, motor-cars, overseas trips and other incidental expenditure.

The Treasurer has already said that he intends to peg the Public Service. The Ministers' staffs displaced by the abolition of these posts could very soon (through deaths, resignations and retirements) be found suitable positions to avoid interference with their personal incomes or welfare.

An interesting statement made by the Treasurer was to the effect that departments will not be able to increase staff numbers beyond the established levels approved at the end of June 1976. Departments are required to effect economies where it can be done without serious detriment to the quality of service provided.

I am sure that when he made these statements the Treasurer did not have the Premier in mind, but the Budget shows that the Premier intends to increase his 1975-76 staff by four. The positions are senior administration officer, administration officer, assistant administration officer and stenographer. Of course, he can claim that he is reducing his clerks from 18 to 15, but he is increasing the lower-paid clerical assistants from two to five. The numbers to do the work may be the same, but they will be on lower pay. His incidental and miscellaneous expenses are to increase by 33 per cent from \$341,776 to an estimated \$452,957. This is hardly the lead one would expect from the Treasurer's declaration.

I think it was Sir Gordon Chalk who established the precedent of setting aside in the Budget an amount to cover what he called increases in Public Service and related awards. In 1971-72, he earmarked \$12,600,000. In 1971-72 it was \$11,900,000; in 1973-74, \$23,000,000; in 1974-75, \$80,000,000; in 1975-76 \$110,800,000, and in this Budget \$85,300,000 has been set aside. These amounts have now become the basis for unforeseen expenditure not necessarily related to wages and salaries alone. In the provision for salaries in various departments substantial allowance is made for increases over the coming year, and this has been the principle for many years. For example, the total of salaries for 112 people in the Co-ordinator-General's Department last year was \$958,858, while this year the amount is up 30 per cent to \$1,253,476. Another example is the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, where last year nine persons received \$112,913 in salaries and this year \$149,894 has been allowed, an increase of 32.7 per cent—not a small increase, I am sure honourable members will agree. In the State Stores we see a similar but not spectacular allowable increase. Last year 128 persons received salaries totalling \$859,488, which has increased this year to \$1,009,644, or an increase of 17.5 per cent. Certainly it is well above the anticipated wage and salary increase, particularly under our type of wage and salary indexation increases.

With the amount of \$80,800,000 floating around in the Budget figures to cover extra expenses I suppose one should not take the

Budget figures on the expenditure side too seriously. Of \$1,400 million appropriated from Consolidated Revenue last year only \$1,269 million was spent in the directions indicated in the Budget, and that was allowing for changes of expenditure within the departments themselves. This represented 90.6 per cent of the total appropriated. However, another \$79,740,000 was spent out of Consolidated Revenue and not covered by the appropriation. Of course, it will be covered by this Parliament very shortly. This amount represented 5.9 per cent of the total spending. The point I want to make is that this \$79,740,000 came from the money that was set aside by the Treasurer for increases in salaries, etc., and would otherwise have been left as a surplus.

The Treasurer did promise an increase in police strength. Of course, this same promise has been made year after year but we do not seem to be getting very far. Even last year Sir Gordon Chalk promised an extra 245 police to bring the force up to the strength budgeted for. Apparently after retirements and other losses, he finished up with only an extra 17, so the present Treasurer is now looking for an extra 228 personnel to bring the figure up to that envisaged by Sir Gordon Chalk. I might suggest to the Treasurer and to the Minister for Police that if they want to get these extra people they will have to recruit many more to cover retirements and resignations, which are still running at a very high rate. The Minister for Police had better get the police inquiry started and finished with to restore some confidence to the public mind. To get acceptable recruits, the force must have a good name and those within it must have high morale. I believe that only a full inquiry can bring about those results. A full inquiry would not only find whether any persons deserve criticism, but, much more importantly, it would clear the air and restore in the public mind a feeling of good will towards the Police Force.

The Treasurer made a fleeting reference to the Trust and Special Funds, and it is no wonder when one realises that it is in this area where big cut-backs have been made. I mentioned earlier the cut-backs in income, which, of course, mean drastic cuts in works and services. Cut-backs in Government spending mean not only cutting back the money given to pensioners and other payments to individuals and organisations but also Government works, many of which are carried out by private enterprise. One of the fallacies of the present Liberal-National Party Government thinking about Government spending is that much of it goes to the private sector. If we decide not to build something that was previously built by private enterprise, the Government's saving of expenditure cuts down on the private enterprise operation. Another false notion is that the Labor Party does not believe in successful private enterprise. Of course we do! We believe that successful private enterprise is necessary; but we also believe that it is

necessary to adopt certain socialistic attitudes, provide subsidies, and so on. If private enterprise is successful, employees can get a fair deal in wages and conditions.

One of the things that concern me most in this nation is that the people who receive hand-outs and assistance from socialistic projects and under socialistic policies are so ready to cry out against them. I do not know why they adopt that attitude. Perhaps they think it is of some electoral value to say that receiving a subsidy is not socialism at work. Of course it is. Anything received from the public purse is not private enterprise. If a completely free private enterprise system operated, there would be corner shops wherever people wanted to build them and there would be hotels wherever people wanted to build them. There would not be an outcry about cut-price petrol, and so on. If honourable members opposite want completely free enterprise, let them have it. We do not have it at the moment.

Government members want Government control in every field in which competition may hurt someone. They cannot have it both ways. When a drought occurs and farmers are in trouble, where does the money that is given to them come from? It is public money, and public money is social money. As I said, it is money from the public purse.

Mr. Warner interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is given to the farmer. When he is given a rebate on the transport of his stock, that is money in his hand; otherwise he would be charged a rate different from that of his competitors. There has been talk about the rail freight rebate on the transport of grain. Many honourable members have asked, "Why haven't fruit and vegetable growers received it?" While the Government is giving it to one section of primary industry, it is not giving it to another section. That money is coming from the public purse, and any money that is given, either directly or indirectly, from the public purse to private enterprise or to an individual is socialism at work, irrespective of what Government members wish to call it.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I know that honourable members opposite do not like to think that they are being helped by the public sector. I know they do not like the word "socialism". When they are helped by the public sector, the money comes from income tax. It comes from the money I pay in tax when I have a glass of beer, for example. I have no objection to that; but I ask honourable members opposite not to throw it back in my face and say, "We don't want your socialistic money."

(Time expired.)

Mr. KAUS (Mansfield) (3.3 p.m.): I offer my sincere congratulations to the Treasurer on framing a Budget which was responsible

in that it recognised the need for expenditure cuts during an exceptionally difficult period yet was progressive in encouraging people on the land and in business.

Among many things it proposed, the Budget increased pay-roll tax exemptions, reduced workers' compensation premiums, increased education and health spending and land tax exemptions, and abolished death and gift duties. One could speak all day on those subjects, but I am particularly pleased that the Treasurer has increased the pay-roll tax exemption. The capacity of small firms to meet their pay-roll tax commitments was limited and they were struggling to overcome the effects of the inflation that has occurred in the last three years or so.

The explosion of wage rates more than doubled pay-roll tax payments of many business undertakings. I remind the Committee that pay-roll tax collections increased from \$6,900,000 in 1972-73 to \$168,900,000 in 1975-76. That figure would have been greater this year had the exemption level not been doubled and had other concessions not been granted in the State Budget. Pay-roll tax is based on the total wage and salary bill of a firm and obviously it discourages the creation of new jobs. I congratulate the Treasurer on the level of exemption that has now been granted.

The Financial Statement foreshadowed expenditure from all funds of a record \$3,331 million, including \$1,597 million from Consolidated Revenue, yet anticipated a continuance of a proud record of balanced Budgets—a wonderful achievement in inflationary times.

I want to speak today on the vital contribution of Queensland's raw resources to the resumption of a great industrial march forward, which was so disastrously checked by policies pursued by the previous Federal Labor Government. No-one will challenge that the inflexible, ham-fisted administration of Mr. R. F. X. Connor seriously affected the interests of States such as Queensland, which are so heavily dependent on the utilisation of natural resources for their economic development. Federal Labor's policy of active discouragement of private investment, and its mistaken belief in the alleged virtues of Government control and ownership, inevitably worked to the disadvantage of this State.

The attraction of overseas capital investment is completely unacceptable to the Labor Party which, in pursuing this aspect of its archaic and unrealistic ideology, overlooked the undeniable benefits of know-how and markets which would have accrued from such an investment policy.

I should mention in passing that the State Leader of the Opposition was Federal President of the A.L.P. for much of the Labor Government's term of office and must accept his share of responsibility for a policy which so seriously retarded Queensland's and Australia's industrial development. If he still

holds the view that that policy was right and that investment by private enterprise should again be stifled in the resource field under any future Labor Government, I challenge him to stand and declare himself. All the people in mining ventures—current and potential—and in industry which benefits from exploration and development would, I am certain, be most interested to hear the honourable member's views. I again challenge him to stand up and declare himself.

For a decade to 1971-72, Queensland benefited from a high rate of investment, particularly in the development of large-scale undertakings using natural resources. The cumulative impact of the growth so generated induced further development. As a result, Queensland became the most buoyant State in Australia.

In company with that in the rest of the nation, investment in Queensland then receded and the great R. E. X. Connor—still clinging to State-ownership at all costs—even sought to raise \$8,000 million of Arab money in the name of discredited socialism. Labor in power was a tragic experiment that Australians will not want to see repeated for very many years to come.

Dr. Crawford: They nearly bankrupted the nation.

Mr. KAUS: That is so. The nation was heading that way and we were lucky to get out of it when we did.

Dr. Crawford: Very few people realise that.

Mr. KAUS: Fortunately, encouragement to private enterprise to enable it to increase its productivity and to provide further employment and investment opportunities has returned with the re-election of a sane Government and Australia can now resume its wonderful pattern of growth. But this will not happen instantly; it will take quite a few years.

Let me contrast the approach of the two Governments. The Prime Minister has already said that the Federal Government sees national development in terms as large as the country itself. It is concerned in great measure with the optimum use of the continent's basic natural resources—minerals, timber, land and water—for the greatest good of all Australians.

The Government's aim is to ensure that the country's natural resources are developed to the greatest advantage, on the one hand, through a partnership between the State and Commonwealth Governments, and, on the other, by private enterprise.

What a difference this is from the attitude adopted by the Labor Government! Under Labor the States had no say whatever and private investment was marked for elimination. What is more, this great task is being undertaken within the confines of the Commonwealth Constitution and this calls for close liaison with the States. Labor never regarded the requirements of the Constitution as being important.

The story goes on and on. I can point to new towns, new ports and new industries that were born and grew under free enterprise; I can also point to other projects, such as at least three in the coal-mining areas of Queensland, that were stillborn as the result of the efforts of ostrich-like socialists. What a tragedy it was, in terms of development, employment, export income and pure humanity, that this blot ever occurred on this history of responsible government. But as I said before, fortunately it is all over.

I look forward confidently to a continuing high level of exploration in the years ahead and to the expanding and orderly development of our natural resources. Slow-downs in world trade will come and go, but Australia will remain in the Big League on the international scene if the dead hand of socialism remains buried.

Mr. Houston: What about beef?

Mr. KAUS: We know that the beef industry is presently facing a problem, but it will be overcome in the long term.

I turn now to education and particularly to pre-schooling. The Budget continues to recognise the importance of catering for our youth and shows this recognition by lifting education spending to \$396,700,000, or an increase of 20.5 per cent. Again education is to consume the major slice of the Budget cake, and rightly so. Educated children are our best investment in the future as citizens, as ambassadors and, through the work-force, as contributors to Queensland's economic advancement and to its inevitable leadership over all other States.

The Queensland Government is determined that this will always remain a prime policy objective and it is putting its commitment to work from the earliest possible age. For example, grants in the Budget to the Creche and Kindergarten Association for its 290 kindergartens total almost \$3,200,000 compared with less than \$2,500,000 last year.

In the "next stage" area, that is, pre-schooling, the Government is proceeding at a tremendous pace with one of the most ambitious and praiseworthy programmes on record. In fact, Queensland has taken the initiative and it is the most advanced of all States in the provision of pre-school facilities. The Government feels that providing pre-school children with the advantages—social as well as educational—that these centres offer is a necessary education development. I am certain that many mothers, perhaps for slightly different reasons, are happy when their four-year-olds are taken off their hands while they are at the centres and they have a morning or afternoon breather.

A total of 229 pre-schools, comprising 345 units, are now completed under a scheme that was initiated by the Government only a little more than three years ago. I said that there are 229 pre-school centres in Queensland comprising 345 units. A single

unit caters for up to 50 children. Some centres consist of a single unit while others have up to three. I am very fortunate in having quite a few units in my electorate. A further 51 centres are under construction or have gone to tender. They will be completed by December 1977. It is little wonder that the Budget for pre-school centres exceeds \$5,000,000, but we do have a problem in getting finance from the Federal Government.

It is remarkable that the 700 units which the Education Department expects to have established by the end of 1980 will cater for about 85 per cent of all eligible children. At present some 20,000 children are being catered for throughout Queensland, representing 50 per cent of eligible pupils. The ultimate aim is to establish at least 800 pre-school units. This will include provision for pre-school children attending small rural schools of insufficient size to permit construction of a regular pre-school. In this context I should like to quote from an article attributed to the Minister for Education on 24 July last, in which he is reported as saying—

“The Department plans a further extension of Class 4 pre-schools. These are facilities provided where the potential enrolment is too small to justify a pre-school of the regular type and too large to be incorporated in the Pre-School Correspondence scheme. In such cases a pre-school class is integrated with lower primary school and the Department provides a teacher specially trained in early childhood education, plus an extra teacher-aide as well as special pre-school equipment and furniture.”

The Minister said 19 such pilot schemes are already in operation, and that their success had encouraged the department to plan on extending the scheme to 40 schools. That should be excellent for the people in the Outback whose children attend the smaller schools. It will be particularly helpful to the mothers who want their youngsters to attend pre-schools, and it will provide a social and educational advantage for the children. It will give people in remote areas the same advantages as those available in the city areas.

As in all things, while progress of construction is excellent now, its continued rate will, of course, depend on the availability of funds. At this point I should mention that our Minister for Education has urged Senator Guilfoyle, the Federal Minister for Social Security, to take immediate steps to clarify the Commonwealth position on pre-school education and child-care centres. I, like the Minister for Education, would like to see the senator—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That is Senator Coulston?

Mr. KAUS: No; I am referring to Senator Guilfoyle.

I should like to see her come to Queensland to look at our pre-schools and see them in operation. In particular, I would like her to talk to the committees that run the pre-schools and the mums and dads of children attending them. I am sure that if she saw this wonderful scheme in operation and noted how it has advanced, we would get to the negotiating table to talk about further finance for the scheme so that we could build the necessary 800 units in the next three to four years.

Mr. Houston: Where did you get your original money from? Which Government?

Mr. KAUS: I know that the money comes from the Federal Government. I am just trying to get a bit more.

Mr. Houston: It was the Labor Government that gave it to you.

Mr. KAUS: Not for pre-schools. The Federal Labor Government wanted to promote child-care centres. However, Queensland finds that pre-school centres are far better than child-care centres, and that is where the money should be going.

The fact that there is no clear policy statement on pre-schools is a source of major anxiety to the committees of community kindergartens. Since 1974 those committees have been faced almost every six months with new policies and new funding arrangements. With each change, new demands have to be made. That is another reason why I am making a plea not only for money for our own State schools, but also for private kindergartens. They do not know where they are going. As I stated before, the Government has increased the grant to the association by \$1,000,000, which should keep its kindergartens stable for 12 months.

The Government's record in this most important field is there for everyone to see, to endorse and to applaud. While I am speaking about education, I mention that last Friday night the Minister for Works and Housing and I were at the opening of a new high school in the Mansfield electorate. The Minister had the pleasure of opening that high school.

Mr. Houston: Did you give the kids a holiday?

Mr. KAUS: No, we didn't, as a matter of fact—not to my knowledge. It was a memorable occasion. About 500 people attended the opening. It was a very good night.

At this stage I pay a tribute to the teachers and the parents and citizens' association, which has done so much in providing amenities for the school. I have had nothing but co-operation from the principal, Mr. Jim Stoodley, and I cannot speak too highly of him. He has been such a wonderful help not only to the parents but also to the teachers and students. Unfortunately, next year he is being transferred to another school and has to be replaced.

I will repeat in effect what I said on Friday night. The transfer is unfortunate indeed, but if I get the same co-operation from Mr. Stoodley's replacement, then I will indeed be happy.

I would like to turn now to the teachers, who have also assisted me greatly by being ever ready to exchange thoughts on different matters from time to time. The school is also blessed with what I see as one of the most progressive and active parents and citizens' associations that I have been fortunate enough to be involved with over the years. Apart from the fact that members of the parents and citizens' association have hammered me hard to represent them in matters relating to the development of this school, they just don't sit back in their committee meetings. They really get going and they push and push and push. Anyone visiting that school out there will see what a marvellous job they have done and what a marvellous job the department has done with the new buildings.

Theirs is a classic example of the self-help principle. In fact, they are a self-help organisation of the best style. A look at the present football field will prove my point. This, of course, is a standing memorial to the efforts of members of the p. and c. association. They went straight ahead to prove to the Minister that they did not want all the help from the department; that they were prepared to help themselves. They put in a new football field themselves. They had to clear the area and they made a marvellous job of it.

Most good schools have an active, interested and perhaps what is most important, an involved parents and citizens' association. These facts are reflected in many ways—not simply as seen by the eye, but as seen in the attitude of everyone involved with the operation of a high school such as this.

It is also reflected in the general appearance and attitudes of the students and it is at this point that I would like to say that today many are quick to level criticism at students of high schools. I think it is time that we looked at the situation as it really is, instead of being quick to criticise. When I have been to this school, I have been proud to notice the number of clean-cut, keen students, moving quietly about the business of learning. I think this reflects both their own attitudes towards their studies, the encouragement of parents and the co-operation of the staff.

Another interesting point I should like to make about that school is that the attendance when I opened the first night adult education course was 400 adults. I believe that would be one of the largest gatherings for an opening night at an adult education school.

Mr. Marginson: They knew you were going.

Mr. KAUS: It shows how popular I am.

It also speaks volumes for the way in which people in the surrounding areas support the school as a venue for further education.

I wanted my speech on Friday night to be recorded on behalf of the p. & c. of that school in this Budget debate.

I should now like to make a few remarks on notable political events that have occurred in the past 18 months. The first is the High Court of Australia and High Court appointments. Another would relate to the former Senator Murphy. Now that he is Mr. Justice Murphy, it would not be proper for me to refer to him in a personal way. His political history is known to most honourable members. However, I feel I should make some reference to the High Court. The High Court sits in judgment on grave and vital constitutional matters. I refer particularly to its decision in relation to the double dissolution. The decisions given by the High Court have far-reaching consequences not only for the federal system of government but also for the very Constitution of Australia and the people of Australia.

We know that ever since its foundation there has been a need for the High Court of Australia to ensure that the Constitution is honoured at all times by all members and by all Governments. We live in a country where Governments have to obey the law and the law is the Constitution. If we have confidence in the ability of the High Court to discharge its great responsibility, we must have confidence in the judges who are members of it. For my part I have always had that confidence. Despite the fact that many of the High Court judges have been appointed from the political arena, the very eminence and stature of the men concerned have ensured that the High Court is totally non-political. Some of the great jurists who have sat on the High Court were previously members of Parliament; I instance Sir Samuel Griffith, Sir John Latham, Sir Isaac Isaacs and Sir Garfield Barwick, to name only four.

Mr. Frawley: What about Lionel Murphy?

Mr. KAUS: His, too, was a political appointment.

The fact that they became eminent jurists is not really related to their parliamentary experience, as all were established and respected members of the legal profession before their term of public office. So there is no quarrel with the principle of appointing members of Parliament to the High Court or, for that matter, to any judicial office. What we should be considering is the method by which these appointments are made.

Unfortunately, the Constitution does not provide an effective guarantee against politicising the High Court. It does not lay down any qualifications for appointment or put

any limitation on the number of judges. The numbers of the High Court are left entirely to Parliament itself, and in the present circumstances that does not provide a safeguard. Legislation to increase the number of judges from the present seven would have to be passed by both Houses of Parliament, that is, the House of Representatives and the Senate, but those circumstances might not always exist and it would then become quite simple for any Government in Canberra to stack the High Court for political and constitutional advantage.

These are matters which the forthcoming Constitutional Convention should consider, and I ask those members who are attending it to consider and discuss those points. We know that each State is a part of the federal system and a party to the Constitution, and as such is entitled to be concerned at the prospect of the High Court being stacked by the Federal Government. It is because the Constitution is being reviewed that we canvass these matters.

Clearly the role of the High Court as the final arbiter on crucial constitutional questions will increase. Undoubtedly, the High Court will ultimately judge great questions in respect of federalism and the centralisation of power and authority in Canberra, and this is what the States must concern themselves with at this conference. My confidence in the judges of the High Court is such that I do not for one moment believe that the court will be other than fair, impartial and non-political. The appointment of one judge who was a controversial political figure will not adversely affect the independence of the bench. However, I believe that the time has come for the States to act positively to ensure that the High Court remains as it was originally intended to be— independent and impartial.

The High Court is fundamental to the Constitution and it is crucial to the federal system of government. The States cannot stand idly by and allow the Canberra Government to erode the Constitution, as the former Labor Government tried to do—it tried to smash federalism—nor can they give a power-hungry centralist Government at a future time any opportunity to destroy the independence of the High Court. For my own part, I never trusted the socialist Government when it came to the Constitution or the federal system of government. We have to be the watchdogs to make sure that the federal system operates, and operates well. To be candid, in view of the actions of the former Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, I doubt that he or the Labor Party would stop at anything. He talked about conventions and traditions; yet in the last two years his Government had done more than any of its predecessors put together to erode the Constitution, the institution of Parliament and the federal system of government. He claimed to be a man of principle; yet he personally masterminded the Gair affair to gain majority control of the Senate.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Miller, the socialists want power at any price. Only the Senate and the High Court stood in the way of the massive and devious Canberra grab at that time.

Mr. Marginson: Who wrote this for you?

Mr. KAUS: I am just letting the honourable member and the people know what went on, because they forget too easily. The people of Australia could understand clearly and, of course, they made their decision at the ballot-box. Control of the Senate is through the ballot-box, whenever the opportunity arises. We can make sure that the High Court remains independent through a united effort by State and Federal parliamentarians to thwart any attempt to radically alter the composition of the court's bench itself. It would be timely for the present Government in Canberra to give a public and unqualified undertaking that it would ensure that no future Government could radically alter the composition of the High Court for political reasons. This could be done by changing the system by which appointments to the High Court are made. It might even be desirable to provide that future appointments to the High Court be made on the recommendation of a panel that is broadly representative of the Commonwealth and the six Australian States. The system under which appointments are virtually made by Federal Cabinet may not be the only way, in view of the growing constitutional and legal stature and importance of the High Court.

In the meantime, Queensland parliamentarians, in conjunction with those from pro-federation States, should look closely at the system of High Court appointments. Ultimately, if a change to the system is desirable to provide sure and certain safeguards, we will need to support the Federal parliamentary party. It is a proposition that ought to commend itself completely to all our Federal members and senators. As the Supreme Court of the nation, the High Court must remain free from political interference, and its independent stature must be placed beyond any question in the future, as it has been in the past. By doing so, we will be upholding the Constitution and ensuring that the rights of the State are protected for all time.

I leave it at that, Mr. Miller. Again I indicate my support of the wonderful Budget brought down by the Treasurer.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (3.38 p.m.): This Budget debate is a non-event. Mr. Miller. We have followed the same old pattern year after year. Before the Budget is introduced, we have the carefully contrived leak from the Treasury Department indicating whether it is going to be a good Budget or a bad Budget and speculation in the Press. Of course, when the Treasurer introduces the Budget in this Chamber, all the Government parrots say, "Hear, hear!"

and there is a chorus of "Hear, hears!" in the right places. As I say, it is a complete non-event.

The only real highlight of the Budget debate is when the Leader of the Opposition replies to the Treasurer's speech. I think you would agree, Mr. Miller, that when the Leader of the Opposition replied to the Budget on this occasion, he delivered a very brilliant and incisive speech and cut the Treasurer to ribbons. He really exposed the Budget for what it is—a complete "rob the poor and protect the rich" Budget.

Then we had the stereotyped League-of-Rights-oriented speeches by National Party members.

Mr. Tenni: Name them.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Barron River is one of them. They make their speeches right on cue—the same old speeches, asking the Government to protect the wealthy cattle and sheep barons and also, of course, the multinational mining companies. In addition, Mr. Miller, we hear the usual Cook's tour by National Party members.

Mr. Tenni interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I have only a couple of cartridges left. I am not going to waste them on a tom-tit. This Cook's tour is epitomised by the honourable member for Belyando. He is the "everywhere" man. You know the song "I've been everywhere", Mr. Miller. That is about the honourable member for Belyando. He has been to Daringa, Clermont, Emerald, Dingo—

Mr. Frawley interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will have his opportunity later.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: He has been to Collinsville; he has been everywhere. There is nothing original about it. I know the honourable member for Belmont would agree with me that the only thing original about the National Party is original sin.

Liberal members of course, make the same old plaintive pleas on behalf of big business and commercial interests in the State. Of course, they do their usual kicking of the Communist can and engage in their favourite sport of union-bashing. They never make any mention of the poor old worker and his problems. So far as they are concerned, he does not exist.

The word "profit" is a sacred cow in Liberal-National Party circles. I should, of course, say National-Liberal Party circles because the National Party is, and will remain for some considerable time, the major party.

Incidentally, I wish the Minister for Community and Welfare Services, who is at present the Treasurer's representative in the Chamber, would at least stay awake.

As I have already said, "profit" is a sacred word in the National and Liberal Parties and "wages" is a dirty word. What National and Liberal Party members want is high profits and low wages. I place on record once and for all that trade unions are doing a marvelous job in this State and country. Without them workers would be working long hours for small wages and under poor conditions. Without unions the workers would have nothing at all. All the benefits that workers enjoy today, such as superannuation, long service leave and a reasonable living wage, were obtained by trade unions. If members on the other side of the Chamber had their way, they would behave like some farmers who support the National Party; they would work people for about \$3 a week, and keep them hungry.

The Budget has once again left the Fraud Squad and the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs without an adequate number of investigators to carry out their duties. I say quite sincerely that I believe a growing number of Queenslanders are becoming concerned about the activities of the lead-pencil gangsters, the white-collar criminals in grey flannel suits whom the Government appears happy to let rob and plunder the people at will.

Mr. Frawley: Someone wrote that for you.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: What I am saying is quite true. I heard the honourable member for Ithaca come out in his speech and attack some of the white-collar criminals in the used-car racket. I agree with him, and I am sure that he, as one of the most erudite members of the Liberal Party, will agree with me.

Mr. Houston: He should be a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: If there were any justice at all, he would be a Minister. He has the ability, integrity and bearing to make a competent and successful Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Houston: He has the right hair, too.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Yes, his hair is the right colour, too. He looks very dignified.

It is interesting to compare the amount of time and effort that the Government is prepared to expend to apprehend law-abiding citizens who drive their vehicles at 90 km/h in an 80 km/h zone with that spent in apprehending deceivers in the corporate world. Let there be no doubt about it; I do not condone breaking the law. I do not even condone the kicking of dogs. The point I make is that the Government is not prepared to take on white-collar criminals. Ministers have over a period of many months gone out of their way to keep from the public details of the unsavoury types whom the Opposition has been attempting to expose.

One of the worst offenders in this business of covering up is the present Deputy Premier, who went out of his way last week to

attack me personally because I attempted to elicit information. I asked a question concerning some skulduggery going on in a finance company named Finance and Commerce. What a cynical answer I was given by the Deputy Premier, who answered on behalf of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General! Had I been answered by the Minister for Justice, no doubt I would have been given a sensible answer. The Deputy Premier told me—

“The information sought is not required to be lodged in the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and is, therefore, not available. If the honourable member has information which would necessitate the investigation of this co-operative society, he should convey the information to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.”

I am prepared to accept that challenge and I propose to detail now the reasons why this company should be investigated by either the Fraud Squad or the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs.

Mr. Byrne: Where did you get that information?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I am pleased to acknowledge that interjection from the honourable member for Belmont. I am only sorry that the honourable member for South Brisbane is not in the Chamber; because the honourable member for Belmont is spreading this information throughout the Liberal Party. The honourable member for South Brisbane is just as great an embarrassment to the Liberal Party as the honourable members for Barron River and Carnarvon are to the National Party.

Mr. BYRNE: I rise to a point of order. I find the comment that I made certain remarks about a colleague to be quite insulting, and I ask that the member withdraw it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! I ask the honourable member for Archerfield to withdraw the statement.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I withdraw it.

I was about to say that Desmond Paul O'Shea, the then managing director of the Great Australian Permanent Building Society and a current director of the Finance and Commerce Co-operative Society, arranged for a computer listing of balances of members of the United Savings Permanent Building Society and the Great Australian Permanent Building Society to be supplied to Mr. Peter Fleming and also to two female canvassers from Sydney, thereby enabling them to contact the members who had substantial balances in these building societies and to request them to transfer their funds to the Finance and Commerce Co-operative Society.

Mr. Peter Fleming is a very honourable gentleman. He is the Philippines Consul in Queensland. I am sure that he would confirm to the police or to officers of the Corporate Affairs Office that this did occur.

The Deputy Premier is not in the Chamber. Nevertheless I have thrown down the gauntlet. Let him pick it up and try to prove that my comments are untrue.

It must surely be an offence as well as a breach of trust and a breach of security to distribute a computer list of balances of members of a building society. This was done by the managing director of the now defunct Great Australian Permanent Building Society.

It did not surprise me to learn that the Deputy Premier is not even strong enough to stand up to his coalition Government colleagues and that that is why many of his Liberal followers want him replaced by a stronger and more forthright Minister, such as the Minister for Transport, who, I might add, at least has the guts to come out in support of three-cornered contests.

The Deputy Premier, as former Minister for Justice, constantly fobbed me off, and, as I said before, last week he got the chance to do so again in answer to a question.

I make it quite clear that I believe a conspiracy exists in this State—one that is condoned by members of this Government—to protect white-collar criminals. The Opposition is getting very close to finding out the facts. I have also very good reason for believing that some smug smiles in high places will very shortly be wiped away. Make no mistake about that.

Dr. Lockwood interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Toowoomba North mumbles. I can't hear him. He is rather an innocuous member, and I don't want to insult him; but I would ask him to speak up.

Mr. Houston: That's his bedside manner.

Dr. Lockwood: I said: Haven't you noticed that the colour of the shirts has changed?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member is known as the best bedpan commando in Toowoomba.

The question I pose is: why does this Government protect these crooks who rob our citizens of millions of dollars when it nails some poor old grocery store clerk who slips a few dollars out of the till because he cannot pay a hire-purchase instalment?

Mr. Elliott: Do you support that sort of thing?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Cunningham should have his ears cleaned out. I said earlier that I do not condone any type of law-breaking—even by members of Parliament who have trucking businesses and take back streets to dodge the weighbridges.

The net is growing tighter. It is not surprising to find names from the Ivy League swindlers set popping up all over the place. It is getting to the stage where the Treasurer, and other Ministers, too, will be unable to protect them by default.

Mr. Lindsay: How about giving me a serve?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I don't have to serve the honourable member for Everton; the electors will do that at the next election, whenever that may be, and Gerry Jones will once again resume his rightful place in this Chamber. The present member for Everton will then be history.

On many occasions honourable members have had drawn to their attention the dealings and fiddlings of that arch-crook Desmond Paul O'Shea and of his brother Raymond O'Shea. More of their activities have now come to light since there are some solid citizens in this State who do not condone swindles—even though this Government does. These two O'Shea brothers have incredible gall.

Mr. Frawley: I think so.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is about the only time the member for Murrumba has agreed with me. It is time he showed some concern.

The O'Shea brothers have been using Commonwealth subsidies to finance and maintain flats on the Gold Coast as well as a home and a farm. They have five flats and a house located at Labrador. In conjunction with Neville Keith Meredith, they conduct Nursing Centres of Australia, which is one of the shyster companies this Government turns a blind eye to. Nursing Centres of Australia gets a Commonwealth subsidy as well as taking every possible cent from the people in its care. The O'Sheas renovated their flats—their personal flats, mind you—and in so doing arranged to have supplied by Nursing Centres of Australia the carpets, wallpaper, paint, fibreglass curtains, bed-lamps, TV points and cable. The curtains were made by a seamstress at the Mt. Gravatt Nursing Centre. To date they have obtained about four weeks' labour of men hired by Nursing Centres of Australia. Needless to say the flats are cleaned by the domestic staff at the Labrador Nursing Centre and the flat rentals are organised and collected by Matron Barnard of the Nursing Centres of Australia at Labrador.

Mr. Jensen: It's a shame!

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Of course it is a shame. The honourable member has hit the nail on the head. Something should be done about this.

I trust that the Commonwealth Government will be smarter in acting against this scurrilous pair than the Bjelke-Petersen Government has been.

Mr. Frawley: Give them a copy of your speech. Will that do?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I have no need to do that. The Press will certainly publish it.

Incidentally, as well as financing renovations, maintenance and labour for the flats and Gold Coast home through Common-

wealth subsidies to Nursing Centres of Australia, Raymond O'Shea is also the proprietor of a milk run which supplies milk to Nursing Centres of Australia at Mt. Gravatt, Annerley, Hunting Tower and Jindalee. The Milk Board and the Health Department will probably be interested to know of a memorandum issued to the nursing centres in which they are instructed to supply food scraps to be taken in a milk truck to a farm at Belmont. This 4½-acre farmlet with house, is located at Boston Road, Belmont. It is owned by Peter Markovich who just happens to be Raymond O'Shea's son-in-law. Isn't that a coincidence! The farm was financed by Finance and Commerce, another company in the O'Shea-Meredith chain. Finance and Commerce is also the finance society about which the Treasurer was so careful to conceal details last week.

I might add that conditions of the finance contract stipulate that Markovich must be living on the farm. However, he is not living on the farm. At present he lives at Mt. Gravatt Nursing Centre but uses the Boston Road address. As a further item of interest, the farm labour and the fences around the farm were supplied by Nursing Centres of Australia. A Hoover washing machine installed there was charged to Hunting Tower Nursing Centre at Annerley. That is fraud on a grand scale.

O'Shea, Meredith, and their cohorts in crime—Desmond Paul O'Shea and Clarence Edward Coulson—were also associated with the five firms I drew to the attention of the former Deputy Premier in November last year.

Mr. Jensen: Do these people go to church at all?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I do not know whether they go to church. If they do, they certainly would not be good Christians to perpetuate or practise some of these shocking frauds on the people of Queensland.

Last year I asked a question about the following companies: Madlo, Mara, Lyra, Narran and Nina—a few of the dozens of companies that these crooks use to pirate the public. These firms are all built into a commerce firm set-up for bookwork swindles. The holdings of these firms were transferred to the Great Australian Permanent Building Society. Honourable members know what happened to that company. Because of my exposures in this Assembly last year the Great Australian Permanent Building Society went to the wall, as it deserved to do.

Mr. Lane: Exposure would be right.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It was exposure. As a matter of fact I wonder that the honourable member for Merthyr has not been charged for wilful exposure.

This was a direct and obvious plot to evade pay-roll tax for the year ended 30 June last. By splitting company structures

the pay-roll of a single company—as the Treasurer would know—can be divided among several companies with each one claiming the benefit of the general exemption under the Pay-Roll Tax Act. When I asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer last year about this he refused to reveal the names and addresses of the directors of this company. He agreed that some of this skulduggery was going on and he promised that certain legislation would be introduced to tighten up the loop-holes. To date nothing has been done. It is quite obvious that the present Treasurer (Bill Knox) is no Sir Gordon Chalk. I think that the people of Queensland would agree with that. He would not even be the poor man's Sir Gordon Chalk.

The Government has refused to acknowledge that this particular shifty deal took place or name the companies and directors involved. Although it promised action to prevent wilful evasion of the law, nothing has been done.

Mr. Frawley: It is shocking.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is shocking.

A search of the companies office in the first week of this month revealed that, although I drew this matter to the Government's attention one year ago, not even a change of address, as required by the Act, has been advised.

The questions I would like to pose to the Treasurer, who, of course, is not here—he can pick it up from "Hansard" or probably his officers will report it to him—are these: will appropriate action be taken by the Minister, or does he intend turning his other blind eye to the gold medallist of the criminal world? Exactly when did the Great Australian Permanent Building Society or the new directors purchase interest in these firms? That will make very interesting reading if it is revealed here. If the firms were purchased, how much was paid, and to whom? If not purchased, why would firms transfer their holdings, especially when setting up companies is so costly these days?

Nursing Centres of Australia has used the same system of evading pay-roll tax for years. The State Government's own records will furnish it with undeniable proof of a conspiracy to deceive. The change of directors involving the five firms took place on 14 June last year. Action should be taken to reveal to the public a massive conspiracy involving the Great Australian Permanent Building Society and its brothers in crime, City Savings and United Savings Building Societies, plus the Finance and Commerce Co-operative organisation (which involves the same crooks) and Nursing Centres of Australia.

The Government's own records, which it refuses to reveal, provide information which would allow it to take action under at least two sections of the Crimes Act, including conspiracy, but it chooses to take no action.

Why? It amazes me that it chooses to take no action. There must be a sinister reason for it. The records it refuses to bring before the Parliament show that, even in defiance of the Building Societies Act, people after vacating office as directors of the three building societies and the finance society in fact administered all four societies. That is a breach of the Building Societies Act.

Another disturbing feature of this white-collar criminal area is that these people are getting good advice. They are managing to keep their heads above water only with assistance and help from high places and from a handful of shyster lawyers, misusing their talents, prostituting their honoured profession and living high on the proceeds of white-collar crime. The Premier and Al Capone have been kept out of goal for years and years with the help of shyster members of the legal profession. The information and allegations brought to the attention of the Parliament over a period of many months should be sufficient to encourage an open, concerned Government with no skeletons in its closet to hold an open and independent inquiry to flush out these crooks once and for all. Instead, it runs around plugging holes while crooks and their accomplices remain rich and free.

For instance, an inquiry would have its attention drawn to a very disturbing report circulating freely in building society circles.

Mr. Aikens: Keith Wright didn't do a bad job writing that speech for you, did he?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Townsville South is in his dotage. I do not want to be unkind to him.

The report is that many, many cheques—hundreds, in fact—drawn on the Bank of New South Wales and the Commercial Bank of Australia and purporting to bear the signature of a director and the managing director of the Great Australian Permanent Building Society were forgeries. It is commonly reported that the misuse of a particular signature on cheques and other documents is now in the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and the banks concerned. However, any action to sheet home those forgeries would be very embarrassing to the Corporate Affairs Office and the banks that paid out on forged signatures, and it has been decided at this stage to let sleeping dogs lie. The bank and the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs have chosen the easy course and done nothing about it. I am sure that if there is an investigation, it will reveal a major conspiracy to defraud by some of the directors of the building societies in this State. As I say, it has been condoned by some officers of the Corporate Affairs Office and also some of the officials in the Bank of New South Wales and the Commercial Bank. A Government concerned at the activities of white-collar crooks and anxious to clean up its corporate world would have investigated reports of this nature without delay. I have raised this on many occasions.

Last Tuesday, in my absence, the honourable member for Maryborough made a vicious and unprovoked attack on me, which upset me greatly. He said that my exposures in this Chamber had caused building societies to go to the wall. Let me put the record straight. Had the Government of the day heeded what I was saying in August and September last year, the crisis that did occur in the building societies would not have happened. They completely ignored my statements. They allowed some of the shy-sters and white-collar crooks to remain in the building society industry. As a matter of fact, one gentleman has been charged. I cannot mention his name, as the matter is sub judice. But everything I have said has been spot on. Let me say this: not one aspect of any speech I have made or question I have asked on the subject has ever been refuted. I say to the honourable member for Maryborough that when he was an accountant he, too, was recognised as being very adept at the use of the lead pencil.

Reports have circulated too freely to escape the attention of the authorities. A responsible Government would have initiated moves to set them to rest or bring the offenders to justice.

Mr. Aikens: The Trades and Labor Council Building Society was the biggest crook of the lot.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Townsville South has a tendency in his dotage to talk through his anal column and I propose to ignore him.

Mr. Frawley: He is next speaker so you will have a chance to listen to him.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Fair enough; I hope he is.

Mr. Frawley: Don't you go away.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I won't go away.

Honourable members recall that during my Address-in-Reply speech I outlined the selling tactics of Peter Kurts Pty. Ltd. in the sale of home units on the Gold Coast. This is not the only place where Peter Kurts operates. He operates his business from four fronts. They are Edward Street Properties, Queen Street Realty, Lockyer Valley Estates—

Mr. Frawley: You're not saying Peter Kurts is a crook, are you?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I ask the honourable member to let me finish what I want to say. I'm sure then that he will agree with me.

The last front is Peter's Realty of Ipswich, Goodna, Fernvale and Toowoomba. These companies operate in land and houses in the fast-growing areas of Brisbane, including the near metropolitan suburbs of Gailes, Goodna and Carole Park. Through you, Mr. Miller, I warn prospective buyers that this company operates the very heavy sell. A person literally does not get out of the salesman's car until he has signed for a block of land.

At this juncture I should like to outline how the State has lost in excess of \$1,000,000 as the result of a stamp duty dodge by Peter Kurts and his companies during the past five years. This is the *modus operandi*. The company picks on a young couple who are struggling to pay off their mortgage. The young couple are told that on a forced sale they might lose everything. They are financially blackmailed into selling their home to Peter Kurts for a sum well below the market value. The settlement is an extraordinarily lengthy 90 days, after which time they agree to transfer the property to Peter Kurts or his nominee.

Mr. Frawley: That gives him a chance to resell it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is true. That is what I am coming to. The honourable member is one of the most perceptive members in this Chamber.

Peter Kurts then works like fury, sells the house within 90 days and then demands that the original owners transfer the house to the Peter Kurts nominee, who is the new purchaser. The transfer on the title documents makes no reference to Peter Kurts's involvement in the sale. Therefore no stamp duty is paid on the second sale. I would like the Treasurer to investigate this matter.

Mr. Lowes: That's not true, you know.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is true. Let the Treasurer investigate it and then stand up and issue a denial.

By allowing this practice to go on under its nose, the Government is costing the Treasury a small fortune.

Mr. Knox: Is there something illegal about this?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The Minister would not know. I understand he thought that "illegal" was a sick bird.

Mr. Knox: You are saying that there is something illegal about this?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Of course it is illegal. Surely the Minister has enough between his ears to comprehend what I am trying to do for other people.

Mr. Knox: It is difficult to follow what you are saying.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is not. It is just that the Minister does not have much between the ears. As leader of the Liberal Party, he is on shaky ground.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I suggest also that Peter Kurts is evading taxation, in many cases under section 26AAA of the Federal Income Tax Assessment Act, on property bought and sold within 12 months. It would be quite

interesting to see the result if the State Treasury and the Commonwealth Taxation Department initiated inquiries. They would be surprised at what they would come up with.

How can the Prime Minister of this country call for financial confidence in the business community when this sort of practice is allowed to go unchecked. At the present time the Door to Door (Sales) Act, which to the credit of the Deputy Premier was introduced by him when he was Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, provides for a seven-day cooling-off period after sales made by overbearing door-to-door salesmen. Yet one of the most important financial transactions of a lifetime, namely, the purchase of a home or land, is not similarly covered. This is a disgrace and something should be done about it as quickly as possible. I therefore call on the Government to institute some meaningful reforms to protect the home buyers and land buyers of Queensland.

According to the Budget, the Government will provide 800 fewer Housing Commission homes this year. This is a disgrace. In my opinion the Government is completely abrogating its responsibility to the thousands of needy applicants who are seeking State rental accommodation. At the moment it is impossible for the average wage-earner to purchase his own home. Numerous Government members have stood up and parroted, "It is the dream of the Liberal and National Parties that the ordinary man in the street will own his own home." In saying that, they are mouthing pious platitudes. It is quite obvious that it is impossible for the average wage-earner to purchase his own home. If we take average wages, we see that many of the main bread-winners in this State are bringing home somewhere in the vicinity of \$100 to \$120 a week. Taking into consideration that such a person might have a wife and two or three children, I ask how in the name of heaven he could afford to own his own home? It is an impossibility! At the moment, if he seeks private accommodation, the price charged for land by some of the land sharks in this State is exorbitant, and then on top of that he has the high cost of construction.

It really amazes me that land in this State is so expensive. There certainly should be no premium on land in this State; there is land everywhere. The land sharks are charging up to \$10,000 and \$15,000 for an ordinary 24 perch block of land. The average young couple purchasing a block of land would have to build a home costing at least \$30,000 to complement the price of land. That means they are committed to paying \$40,000 for a home, and that is virtually an impossibility for the average young couple on low wages. But what concerns me is that, with building costs and other fixed costs rising and with real incomes not increasing at the same rate, fewer and fewer people

will be able to afford to save the deposit on a house and, even if they can, how would they be able to afford the repayments?

It has often been said in this Assembly that some young couples today are earning good money. A low-wage earner bringing home, as I say, in the vicinity of \$100 to \$120 a week whose wife is working and bringing home \$80 to \$100 a week can, of course, live quite comfortably. But what happens when a family comes along? They are then committed to spending \$200 to \$220 a week on an income of \$120. That is a financial impossibility, and that is when the trouble starts.

The standard of living in this State has declined very rapidly, particularly since the advent of the Tory Government in Canberra. We see high rentals being charged by landlords, particularly slum landlords. This is where there should be an investigation. This Government lifted rent control completely in this State. A young fellow came into my office a couple of weeks ago and told me he was unemployed. He had a wife and two children and was receiving \$75 a week in unemployment relief and he was paying \$50 a week for a run-down hovel in Archerfield Road, Richlands. How in the name of heaven could he afford to keep his wife and two children on \$25 a week? The callous indifference of this Tory Government towards people seeking homes is well known. They are not interested in providing State rental accommodation, and the only way the Government can solve the housing shortage for the average low-income earner is to make available State rental homes at a reasonable rental. That is the answer to the housing problem in Queensland.

The recent moves by the State Government and Minister for Works and Housing, who is not in the Chamber at the moment, to sell Housing Commission homes at inflated prices and to increase rentals on Housing Commission homes is a regressive one that will affect low-income earners in particular. The statement of the Minister for Works and Housing that Queensland Housing Commission rentals will be gradually increased over the next five years and that prices will be increased to market value has effectively destroyed the concept of welfare housing.

I was not present last week when the honourable member for Salisbury spoke in this debate, but I believe she mentioned some of the exorbitant prices set by this Government for tenants seeking to purchase Housing Commission homes. I have had a lot of complaints about this, and I know my colleague the honourable member for Wolston has also been the recipient of complaints from irate tenants. Last week a fellow told me that last year he made application to purchase his Housing Commission home. The price he was quoted was \$16,000, but being an average wage-earner he could not scrape up the deposit at once. It took him a while, and last month, having finally

scraped up the deposit, he went back to the commission, only to find that the commission then wanted \$19,500 for the house. That was an increase in the price of a State rental home of \$3,500 in 12 months, and I think it is a scandal.

Mr. Marginson: There are numerous cases like that.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I know that there are numerous such cases, but the honourable member would know as well as I do that it is not much use bringing these cases to the attention of this Government because it shows callous indifference to the average wage-earner in this State. It is not interested. I might add for the record that the Opposition vehemently opposes the proposed moves by this conservative Government in furtherance of its attitude to welfare housing in this State. The A.L.P. philosophy is diametrically opposed to the recent proposed moves, as we firmly believe that more emphasis has to be placed on welfare housing if we are to solve the housing shortage in this State. We also firmly believe that people on lower incomes should not be discriminated against in living in a rented house or owning their own home.

What we could do here is to divert some of the money from the S.G.I.O. Instead of the S.G.I.O., as I have said on numerous occasions, building multi-storey buildings for multinational companies, financing the construction of hotels and taverns and also buying a farm up on the Darling Downs, it should divert its money to constructing State welfare accommodation for needy Queenslanders.

Page 5 of the Budget is a real laugh— as a matter of fact, Mr. Miller, it's a real giggle—where it refers to the abolition of death duties. I know that some Liberal members will not come in on this, but surely it will provoke some National Party members. In my opinion, the Treasurer has embarked on a "tax the living" campaign in preference to taxing the dead. His reason is this—

"Death taxes are the most disliked taxes of all, throwing their burden as they do on individuals at a time when they are faced with emotional pressure and social readjustments . . ."

This would have to be the greatest load of codswallop I have ever listened to, since the Treasurer well knows that, because of the time it takes for the winding up of estates and calculation of death duties, emotions would long since have subsided.

Mr. Elliott: You obviously don't know much about it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Cunningham does not know much about it.

Mr. Elliott: We have been through it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: All the Government is trying to do, as I said before, is create a bunyip aristocracy. I believe that this is a lame excuse to cover up political chicanery, as the reason for this decision is quite clearly to allow the beneficiaries of the rich graziers to actually benefit from the abolition of death duties and create hereditary landed gentry.

Mr. Elliott: Don't you realise that bank accounts are frozen?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: All I am concerned about is that very few working people leave much money these days. The honourable member for Cunningham is interested only in protecting the vested interests of the wealthy grain growers and graziers in his electorate. In fact, Mr. Miller, I challenge the Treasurer to tell the Committee what proportion of the population of Queensland will benefit from the decision. We will never find out; the honourable gentleman will never tell us.

As an example of sheer arrogance and nonsense, I refer to the Treasurer's statement that he expected some improvement in the State's economy as a by-product of the cancellation of death duties and that he had every confidence that it would bring to Queensland substantially increased private capital and real estate development in the months ahead. His reference to its attracting persons with capital resources to the State as well as encouraging his fellow Queenslanders to invest is hogwash, and well he knows it.

If the Treasurer really believes that other States will not take counter action, he must have rocks in his head, because Western Australia is already following suit. Now that the Queensland Government has introduced this reactionary measure, some of the progressive States—New South Wales, Tasmania and South Australia—will be forced to follow suit.

Finally, the Treasurer devoted almost a full page of the Financial Statement to excusing the Government's failure to extract from multinational mining companies an equitable share of the wealth being exported out of the country as raw material to provide employment in other countries. He also failed to tell the public that the real beneficiaries of cheap electricity from the Gladstone Power Station are again multinational manufacturers of export products, while domestic users are facing increases in charges forecast as being higher than 10 per cent. This only proves what most people already know—that this is a multinationals Government looking after the interests of multinational companies.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (4.13 p.m.): We are becoming used to the long diatribes by the honourable member for Archerfield, but I do wish—and I say this in all sincerity—that the honourable member for Rockhampton, who deserves some

credit for writing these speeches, would either write plainly or use a typewriter. The honourable member for Archerfield always has considerable trouble in reading the speech prepared for him by the honourable member for Rockhampton and, consequently, we hear a stuttering, blubbing delivery that reminds us of those machines that are used for breaking concrete—jackhammers.

I'm going to make, I think, a very good speech—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You always do.

Mr. AIKENS: Very rarely do I make a bad one. But I am going to touch on something today on which I think every member of the Committee should forget about his party-political affiliations, forget about bashing into the other fellow and forget about the little things that interest many politicians to the exclusion of anything else. We should get right down to the job of letting the people of Australia know where the country is heading. We are in a very serious and precarious position, believe you me, Mr. Kaus. Everybody knows it, although they may not have bothered to try to find out the reason for it.

I am going to take as my text today a speech made by the No. 1 liar in political circles in Australia, namely, Senator Keeffe. There is only one bigger liar and that is his wife, Alderman Keeffe of the Townsville City Council. As Senator Keeffe is an A.L.P. man, what he said the other day received all the publicity in the world. That always happens; the A.L.P. seems to have the media by the short hairs. Senator Keeffe said that this country is heading for Fascism because of the disturbing state of the nation, because some hippies at Cedar Bay got what they deserved (as a matter of fact, they did not get as much as they deserved) and because some university students in Brisbane got a crack over the head when they should have received two cracks. Because of this so-called police-State attitude, we are, according to Senator Keeffe, heading for Fascism.

When Senator Keeffe said those things he lied, and he knew that he lied. That sort of thing does not bring about Fascism. Fascism is brought about by the reaction of the people to ultramilitant trade union activity. It is not necessary to go back too far in history to see how Mussolini came to power. Mussolini was the Italian replica of the honourable member for Archerfield. He was a ranting, prancing socialist who was prepared to put socialism into effect if he ever got the opportunity. He came down from Switzerland, where he had been partly in hiding, to Italy and brought his brand of socialism with him. When he arrived in northern Italy he found the Italian workers in Turin and other places in the same position as Australian workers today. The Italian workers had virtually taken over industry and were riding roughshod over the

rights of the people. If I remember rightly, the socialists had complete control of the Fiat factory in Turin.

Mussolini watched what was going on and, what is more important, he had the intelligence to listen to the way in which the people were reacting. Gradually but surely he changed his ground and from that change Fascism was born. Nobody can deny that it arose from the reaction of the people to trade union irresponsibility and violence on the job.

Such a situation is arising in Australia today. Industrial conditions in this country are exactly the same as those in Italy when Mussolini came to power. If we do not watch the situation closely, there will be Fascism in Australia, and only one group of people will be responsible for it. Fascism is a monstrous, terrible thing and I hope we never see it, but we will if something is not done about the present state of affairs. And it has to be done by the politicians of this country who really do not believe in Fascism.

There are in Australia today many trade unionists who are pledged to arbitration and who are beginning to see the light. Quite a number are affiliated, either personally or through trade unions, with the A.L.P. and the policy of that party is still, so far as I can see from the rule book, arbitration and conciliation. What have we to do? There are scores of trade unions activated by officials who are men of the same ilk as the honourable member for Archerfield. They are soothing the workers on. They preach arbitration and conciliation from one side of the mouth and absolute contempt for the arbitration system and arbitration tribunals from the other.

I do not have sufficient time to deal with them all. At the present time Queensland is in the throes of industrial anarchy brought about by four or five trade unions. I am sure that if we were to delve deeply we would find that the number would more likely be 40 or 50.

The printers' union, for example, has the State of Queensland absolutely hog-tied and completely silent. I understand the position is similar in other States. A small handful of printers working at the back of a newspaper office are saying to the employers, "We want this. We don't believe in arbitration and conciliation unless it suits us. We have been to the Arbitration Commission and we cannot get what we want, so we are going to put you over a barrel until we do get what we want."

The idea of these unions is the same as that of the member for Archerfield. It is also, of course, the idea of Al Capone. He would say, "Come and sit down around a table and let us negotiate." When that happened he would poke a gun in his opponent's belly and say, "Give me what I want, or else!" That is the attitude of the member for Archerfield and all those who think like him and work with him.

The militant trade unions are saying to the people of Australia—the ones who are suffering—“Give us what we want, or else!” And we are getting the “else”.

The Municipal Officers' Association has gone completely haywire. The Townsville branch went to the Arbitration Commission asking for the incremental allowances that are paid to some other groups of workers. The commission said, “No, you will not get them. You are not entitled to them.” The M.O.A. then decided to adopt a system of rolling strikes.

I am sorry the honourable member for Cairns has left the Chamber, because in today's “Cairns Post” there is a report that Cairns—probably the loveliest and best little tourist centre in Australia—is now a city of festering garbage. People have put their garbage out on the streets for collection, but the garbos cannot collect it because the M.O.A. officers in the employ of the Cairns City Council will not process the rosters and other papers concerning the collection of garbage. So, thanks to the actions of members of the M.O.A., Cairns stinks to high heaven at the moment.

North Queensland now faces the problem of recurring power strikes called by a handful of men at the Collinsville Power Station whose working conditions are very much better than any that I enjoyed when I wore a black shirt. Some of these men live in very fine homes supplied by the State Government, for which they pay only \$3 a week rent. In addition to everything else they enjoy, they want a \$10 a day isolation allowance.

I asked one of these men, “How do you come to be isolated?” He replied, “Oh, they have even cut off the rail-motor between Collinsville and Bowen.” I said, “As I understand it, the rail-motor was discontinued because you people wouldn't patronise it.” He said, “Why should we? We have our own cars and we can drive into Bowen in a little over an hour.” I asked him, “Well why do you want the rail-motor?” He answered, “It should be running just the same.”

These men are going on strike because they want \$10 a day as an isolation allowance over and above all the other payments and conditions that they are enjoying. They won't go to the Arbitration Commission; they want to sit around the table and negotiate. They want to pull the old Al Capone trick.

The Northern Electric Authority, which is working with people's money, simply says, “If you want your \$10 a day isolation allowance, go to the Arbitration Commission.” These people, who, at election-time, proclaim from the public platform that they believe in arbitration, won't go to the Arbitration Commission. The result is that industry in North Queensland is paralysed and workers, fellow trade-unionists, are forced to get up in the morning and drink a cup of cold water—if they thought of filling a thermos

flask the night before, they can have a cup of hot tea—and eat some cold bread or a piece of cold meat. Because there is no electric power they are unable to make toast, boil an egg or cook anything. That is the style of life that is inflicted by these men at Collinsville on their fellow workers.

We are in exactly the same position—and I am not thinking back so many years—as we were in Queensland in 1948 when Queensland trade-unionists had a confrontation with the then Labor Government led by Ned Hanlon. That confrontation blew up into a railway strike and for nine long weeks not a wheel turned in Queensland. Finally the matter had to be settled.

The big confrontation came in 1949 when the meatworkers, the wharfies, the coal miners and all the other militant trade-unionists said, “We are doing pretty well; let us get a bit more for ourselves.” They got a little more for their own groups of workers but they failed to realise what they were later told by some of the Whitlam Ministers, namely, that an increase in wages for one means the loss of a job for another. It got to the stage where perhaps the finest A.L.P. Prime Minister that this country has ever had, that is, Ben Chifley, had to put the soldiers into the coal mines and on to the wharves to do the job that the workers should have been doing. In the election shortly after that, the Chifley Labor Government was swept out of office and Labor stayed out for many, many years.

Everyone says that the other fellow is wrong, but the people must face up to the fact that in their own homes, in the country, in the State or in any industry only as much can be paid out as the person, the State, the country or the industry can afford. In the final analysis the ordinary people, the battlers, the men, the women and the children have to pay for all these things that are granted. While I have always advocated that workers should receive the highest possible pay and the best possible working conditions, in the final analysis they can get only as much as the country can afford.

If we do not watch out, we will have another solid confrontation with the militant trade union leaders. The poor old rank-and-file trade-unionist does not get a chance. He is like the boy who fell out of the balloon; he is no longer in it. We will have another frightful confrontation which will impose hardship on those who are not in a position to withstand hardship. I refer to the ordinary average battler and the women and children.

For many years in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, we had the stolid Barramundi Jack Egerton, who was the leader of the trade union movement and the A.L.P. in Queensland. He followed the line that the militant trade-unionists are following today. He followed the line of the printers, the M.O.A., the power station employees and all other people who believe that

they should go to the employers and say, "Give us what we want or else." When he became very powerful and thought he could get away with it, he decided to take a knighthood. He went to Joh Petersen and said, "Will you give me a knighthood?" For some reason I have never been able to ascertain—Joh is so honest that he could not see the implications—he said, "No, I cannot give you a knighthood." Egerton said, "That doesn't matter; I will get one from Fraser."

He got one from Fraser quite easily and, from Fraser's point of view, it was a good political tactic to give him one. Egerton really thought he was so strong and powerful in the trade union movement that he would be forgiven and allowed to get away with it. If he had not been dealt with by the trade union movement, there would have been the absolutely ridiculous position of Jack Egerton, Knight Bachelor, or a Knight of St. Michael and St. George, or whatever he happens to be, leading the trade union movement and the A.L.P. in Queensland, still talking revolution and bloodshed, if necessary, and strutting around at big strike meetings in the City Square dressed in ermine, with big buckles on his shoes and so on. Members of the trade union movement said, "No, we will not let you get away with it." They then turned poor old Jack Egerton out to grass. When he was turned out he said, "Now that I am turned out of the trade union movement, now that I am not compelled to lie like Senator Keeffe and many other people, now that I can tell people the truth about the industrial position in Queensland and Australia, I am going to do so."

I suppose all honourable members have heard him on TV, as I have heard him, say among other things that the trouble with the trade union movement today is that many trade-unionists do not give a decent return for the money they get. I particularly remember seeing and hearing him say that in the building industry, for instance, some workers do not give 50 per cent return for the money they get and some do not even give 30 per cent.

It is no good putting our heads under the seat and saying, "Well they might be saying it, but I am not going to hear it anyway. I am going to hear only what I want to hear." The fact is that, wherever one goes in Queensland and whatever section of the people one talks to, the one theme recurs: bring in the troops and put this country back on an even keel economically and industrially. I would not like to see the troops brought in. I would like to see common sense prevail. I was born and reared in the trade union movement. I have a particularly proud record as a trade-unionist and I am going to keep it until the day I die. I will never sacrifice my trade union principles; I will never sacrifice my Labor principles; but I will do my best to see that the workers of Queensland and the workers of Australia, if I have any influence

on them, are not led astray by loud-mouthed agitators like the honourable member for Archerfield.

There is something that can be done here. We have in Queensland a National-Liberal Party coalition Government. What is needed more than anything else is for the Ministers to turn out all their own publicity officers, because most of them are doing a frightful job in not exposing to the people what the A.L.P. is heading for and what the trade union leaders are heading for. This National-Liberal Party Government should set up a propaganda secretariat apart and distinct from all the other publicity officers employed by the Ministers. The Ministers, of course, can have their own personal publicity officers if they wish; but the National-Liberal Party Government should set up its own propaganda secretariat, and that secretariat should tell the people at all times and in the strongest possible way where the A.L.P. is heading, where the militant trade-unionists are leading the people of Queensland and what must be done to rectify this grievous and dangerous position.

I would hope that, if they do appoint publicity officers, they will not appoint some of those who are being employed now; what they need is a rough and tough man. I have been walking along the pathway of life for many years, and I have learned this lesson above all others: when you are fighting a fellow who is using Marquis of Queensberry Rules, you have a chance if you, too, use Marquis of Queensberry Rules; but if he is using dog-and-goanna rules and you are using Marquis of Queensberry Rules, he'll belt you over the fence every time you stand toe to toe with him. That is what is happening in Queensland today. We have the Labor Party with the Senator Keeffes, the boys from Trades Hall—the Bevises, the Lourigans, the Tom Burnses and all the rest of them——

Mr. Frawley: Senator Georges.

Mr. AIKENS: Yes. We have all those people telling the people of Queensland all the taradiddles, all the platitudinous piffle of which they are capable, and unfortunately some of the people are beginning to believe it because no-one is telling the opposite story; I am telling it up in Townville, but Townville is only a comparatively small place.

When the Whitlam Government was in power, the A.B.C. had an open go to give all the slanted propaganda which their foul minds could conceive and their filthy tongues could utter on behalf of the A.L.P. They still have it and they are still doing it. The A.L.P. is the petted and pampered darling of the A.B.C. I do not mind A.B.C. employees. I do not mind those chaps on "This Day Tonight" doing what they do, if they think that is the way they should earn their living. They are doing what they are because no-one is telling them it is the wrong way to go about it. Now and again

they make a slighting, sneering or supercilious reference to some criticism of them. Bear in mind that television is the greatest medium today. What happens when the people turn on their television sets at night and, after the news, listen to "This Day Tonight"? They get this slanted, propagandist view from "TDT", who are allowed to get away with it.

I was rather surprised last night. Sitting in my lounge in Townsville I turned on the television and listened to "TDT". Dealing with the Lockyer by-election, it had Mr. Leggoe and Mr. Evans on the programme. When they came on I said, "This will be another example of men collapsing before these monsters of 'TDT'." Instead, Evans and Leggoe put up what I thought was a fairly decent show. They did say something for themselves. They did let the people know that they were not there just to lick the boots of the people who run the "TDT" show. At the end of the programme I thought, "If you keep going like that, the people of Queensland at any rate will get some idea of what really is going on in the coalition Government."

The main themes of "TDT" recently have been Cedar Bay and the Lockyer by-election. If we had a Government publicity and propaganda unit, it could have gone straight into all of the media—television, radio and Press—and told the people the plain, simple, hard truth about Cedar Bay. There would have been none of this nonsense about the unfortunate people at Cedar Bay getting a raw deal, about their homes being destroyed and about their bodies being bruised.

What happened at Cedar Bay—and everybody knows it—is that certain of the young bloods from Cairns used to go to Cedar Bay in motor-boats. I suppose they were their own boats. They would take up the grog and, with the marijuana and girls there, they had a wonderful time. Some of the women in Cairns and other places started to complain about their men friends being at Cedar Bay doing all of the things that they should have stayed home and done. So the police staged their raid. As far as I know, quite a few things seemed to go haywire with the raid. It is not the way I would have conducted a raid if I had been the officer in charge of police.

But so many other extraneous things crept in. There is some doubt as to whether the photographs taken by "TDT"—I understand by a man with a criminal record as long as my arm—were taken immediately after the raid or four or five days after the raid and whether the police and the others who went to Cedar Bay on that particular day did the damage or whether the damage was done later on by somebody who wanted to build up a case against the police.

Mr. Lane: Conspiracy to defeat the course of justice it is.

Mr. AIKENS: Conspiracy is nothing new. It seems to be the ordinary pattern of life for some people today and I would not put it past any television station to arrange it, naturally looking for publicity and an audience. That is the sort of thing that goes on.

The programme has been harping on the Lockyer by-election. I had been in the political game years before some of these fellows were born. The only thing wrong with the Lockyer and Clayfield by-elections is that the Liberal Party and the National Party ever bothered to spend any money at all in them, to send anybody into those areas to make speeches or to put any advertisements in the Press. The returns in both by-elections would have been exactly the same if those parties had not spent a penny in either electorate.

When is the Government going to learn that people vote not for a party but against a particular party on a general, over-all assessment. Some months before an election, they make up their minds in general terms. As a matter of fact they make up their minds three months before an election not only for whom they will vote but, what is more important, for whom they will not vote. All the propoganda and piffle in the world does not alter their opinion. Yet the political parties spend money. I do not know how much was spent in the Lockyer and Clayfield by-elections by the Liberal Party and the National Party, but they could have saved all that money and put it to much better use. They would still have got the same result at the poll. Of course, when the poll was over, the commentators and the people who think they know everything about politics but know nothing, told us why they lost and why they won. Of course, they are trying to make the division between the Liberal Party and the National Party wider. Until last night's "This Day Tonight" programme, the National Party and the Liberal Party were walking like suckers into these silly little plots laid by the A.B.C. and the other people. If Government members treat those people with the contempt they deserve, they will be a lot better off.

Most politicians are gutless, as I have said on many occasions. Most politicians in this Chamber do not have the guts of a Red-beak. Instead of going out and telling the people, as I tell them and as some of my mates up in Townsville tell them, what the real position is—tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and let them work it out for themselves—they keep running around saying all sorts of things. They are more interested in slamming the other political side than in doing something for the people they represent.

The honourable member for Archerfield was a case in point today. He did not want to say anything for Queensland. He did not want to say anything for the people of Queensland. All he wanted to do was score

off the Liberal Party or the National Party. National Party and Liberal Party members stand up here and all they want to do is to score off the A.L.P. They are not telling the people what the people want to know. They are not telling the people the plain, simple truth and letting the people in their own commonsense way work it out for themselves.

If I can make an appeal to all honourable members: do not underestimate the intelligence of the people and do not play cheaply on the voting intelligence of the people. They know what they want and they know how to get it. All they want is the truth and the facts and they will form their own opinions. They do not want opinions formed for them by radio commentators and A.B.C. television commentators on about \$25,000 a year. Just give them the simple truth and they will form their own opinion for themselves. So stop being just gutless party men and try to be Queenslanders. Try to say, "This State is in a hell of a mess just hovering on the brink, shall we say, of disaster and I am going to do what I possibly can as a Queensland politician to let the people know the truth and at the same time give the people some idea of what they might be able to do in order to improve things."

The honourable member for Flinders has come into the Chamber. I have a note here about him, although I did not wait until he came into the Chamber to make it. Incidentally, these few, sparse notes are my own. We have talked about the rising price of beef, and today I understand that National Party members are cock-a-hoop because they are going to get a beef stabilisation scheme. The graziers are going to be given 30c a lb. flat rate, or something like that, and they say, "Hip, hip, hooray, we have solved the problem of the graziers." What a lot of bunk and piffle that is!

They will not solve the problems of the grazier just by increasing the price that he gets for his meat any more than the problems of the workers will be solved by giving them higher wages. The only problem that has to be solved—and these people apparently do not want to try to tackle it; nobody wants to—is the shocking escalation of prices that they have to pay in order to produce their commodity and the shocking price that a worker has to pay in order to buy essential goods. Rising prices are the trouble with the beef industry, just as rising costs are the trouble with all the people of Australia today. Nobody is going out to tell the people that that is the real problem, and the rest is flimflam, malarkey and gobbledegook, but unfortunately a lot of people believe that it is. I have no doubt that the honourable member for Flinders is quite sincere in his belief that by increasing the price of beef to the grazier we will solve the problem of having excess cattle, but that is a lot of bunk and hooey, and he knows it.

We have in this Chamber another member who has been very vociferous over a number of years about the plight of the unfortunate graziers. He tells us—and I do not doubt his sincerity—that graziers are living on pigweed and nardoo seed, that they are walking off their properties because they cannot make ends meet, and that they cannot pay their council rates. I do know from my own experience—I have been out among them—that quite a number of graziers are having a very hard time indeed and that quite a number of them are struggling. But I say again that an increase in the price of meat is not going to prevent that. Only a reduction in the prices that they have to pay for the things that go onto their stations, whether it be labour, materials, or anything else, will solve their problem.

I wonder what the honourable member for Callide thinks of the intelligence of the people. They thought he was parading himself as an example of this shocking state in the grazing industry—that he was a poor grazier driven to the wall by rising costs and lower prices for beef. I wonder what the people of Queensland thought when they picked up the newspaper on Sunday and read that this poor grazier, walking around without soles on his boots, wearing an old hat that he got from St. Vincent de Paul and a flannel shirt with more holes in it than anything else, had paid \$15,000 for a lovely filly and that the filly has won him \$15,000 in a few races. The people to whom I have spoken since Sunday—and that is only a couple of days ago—said, "Well, if the grazing industry is in such a parlous condition as Mr. Hartwig tells us that it is, why doesn't he make some of his money—some of the \$15,000 and other \$15,000's that he might have—available to his mates in the grazing industry to try to help them over their present distress?" People cannot be fooled. Unfortunately, many politicians think they can. I do not in the least doubt the sincerity of the honourable member for Callide; but I do know that if he thinks he is fooling the people, he has another think coming.

Much has been made, of course, of young people wanting to buy a home. Nearly every young couple, when they marry, want to set up a home as the basis for their family. Naturally, they want that home as cheaply as they can possibly get it, and they do not want any more strings tied to it than are absolutely necessary. Today the purchase of a home by a young couple is completely out of the question because of the staggering spiralling costs.

In Townsville we have an A.L.P. council—by the grace of God and the machinations of a couple of members of the National Party. Also in Townsville—and this can be borne out by facts and figures—we have the highest house prices in Australia. People cannot look at even an old, tumble-down shack in Townsville today for less

than \$20,000. They cannot look at a piece of land, no matter where it is, for less than \$10,000 or \$15,000. If you get a house built, Mr. Kaus, you get a fibrolite box, built on waterpipes for stumps, that will cost you anything up to \$40,000. What chance have the kids got of buying a house like that?

And with the A.L.P. council that was elected only last May—and this is something that the Government publicity men should get into; this is something they should tell us about—already the council has given a salary rise amounting to \$83,000 a year to the Municipal Officers' Association, although the Arbitration Court had refused it. The aldermen have given themselves a 100 per cent increase in meeting fees. I think it should be explained to those who have not served on local authorities that they receive munificent fees not only for attending a local authority meeting but also for attending, say, meetings of the harbour board, the hospitals board, the fire brigades board, the Townsville Regional Electricity Board, the abattoir board and all the other boards on which aldermen represent the council. I think that the law of this land allows an alderman to pull down about \$4,000 a year from a local authority; add the other fees and he is probably pulling down \$8,000 a year.

I was on the council in Townsville in 1936 when the installation of sewerage was begun. A principle followed by every council in Townsville was the provision of a sewerage pedestal free to every home. The A.L.P. council, which is supposed to represent the people, including young folk building their homes, has abolished that concession. Young people buying homes now have to provide their own sewerage installations at a cost of about \$1,000. Even if they buy a house in an established suburb in which sewerage is not installed, they have to provide it at their own cost.

As the result of a staggering rise in council rates introduced only recently by the A.L.P. council, Townsville now has the highest local authority rates in Australia. All but the most essential work has been either cancelled or suspended because the council claims that it does not have sufficient money. This is despite the fact that the rates have been jacked up till they are highest in Australia; many services have been cut out and people are being required to pay for the installation of sewerage. I am a home owner—my home is my only property, apart from my bike—and I know that in Townsville today it costs \$12 a week merely to live in one's own home, in addition to repairs, painting and insurance costs. What chance have young people wanting their own homes when they know that they have to find anything up to \$45,000 to buy a fibrolite box on water pipes out in the Never Never, where their only mates will be goannas and wallabies?

And this under an A.L.P. council! Things were bad enough before but they are infinitely worse now.

These are things that people are concerned about. They are not concerned about dialectics or polemics about the Lockyer or Clayfield by-elections. They are not concerned about alleged arguments between the Leader of the Government, the Premier, and the Deputy Premier. They are concerned only about the facts of life. They want to live as well as they can, and rear their children as well as they can, on the wages they get. We are all aware that in the last year or two many things have, to use a general expression, gone haywire. Many people are in a state of confusion. They want to know what is wrong with the country—where it is going and where are they going? They have only to read "Hansard" to find the answers.

This is where the media fall down on their job. This is where television, radio and the Press are recreant to the trust reposed in them by the people. The media do not tell the people what is wrong with the country. They do not make known how much the recent extravagant increases granted to university students are going to cost the people of Australia. I think the Federal Minister for Education said that it was going to cost an additional \$93,000,000. What is \$93,000,000 to a party politician as long as the throwing away of that amount of the people's money produces a few extra votes?

As the Premier said the other day, Federal politicians are going around giving the glad hand to all countries in the Pacific area. One country in this area was given \$600,000,000. What for? Somare, in New Guinea is being given \$900,000,000 a year. When I was overseas a couple of years ago with a parliamentary party we went to various places in the Near East. One was Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia. There we stayed at a palace called the Burabador Hotel. It was a magnificent place. I walked round talking to the people; I did not spend all my time at official functions although I did not get away from my mates very often.

I said to one fellow there, "This is a most magnificent hotel." He said, "Yes, thanks to Australia." Thanks to Australia for the lovely Burabador Hotel! I said, "How did Australia come into it?" He said, "Aid from Australia." I said, "Isn't the aid from Australia going to lighten the burden of the ordinary people—the farmers, peasants and workers?" He said, "Oh, no. Build big hotel. Build big hotel for da Japaneese tourist and for da Indian tourist and all da people who come to dis country and spend dare money here." We are giving hundreds of millions of dollars of Australian money to South-east Asian countries to build palaces like the big hotel at which we stayed in Jakarta, while the ordinary workers in those countries are getting nowhere and while the workers in Australia could very well do with the money we are giving away.

Thanks to the trade union bosses, the Australian tourist industry has gone to the wall. Townsville has some very fine tourist accommodation places, such as the big Travelodge on The Strand. Quite some time ago it ceased providing mid-day and evening meals. A tourist can obtain a bed and have breakfast in his room. Most of the other big travel places in Townsville are going to ask people who stay there if they will clean out their own rooms and make their beds—I read this in today's paper. These accommodation houses cannot afford to pay the high wages and week-end penalty rates that are imposed on them by the trade union leaders. The workers are driving Queensland's tourist industry into the sea. They fail to realise that they are in danger of losing their jobs because tourists will not be attracted to these places that require them to clean their rooms and make their beds.

It is the duty of Government members to concentrate on issues such as that instead of fighting amongst themselves and picking on one another. Forget about the A.L.P.; it's not worth a thought. The Government's propaganda agency could quite easily handle the A.L.P. There is nothing in a more horrible, stinking, putrid mess than the A.L.P. in Queensland today. It stinks to high heaven. Anyone who walks down near Breakfast Creek, where the A.L.P. has its headquarters, has to hold his nose.

We have heard that the A.L.P. is going to dice Lourigan now, that Lourigan is going to dice Bevis and that Bevis is going to dice someone else. They are all at one another's throat and they are fighting like Kilkenny cats.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: The poor old member for Bundaberg doesn't know whether he is in or out. He is like an incomplete birth. A Caesarian will be needed to get him out—or to put him in; it must be one of the two. He does not know whether he is in or out of the Labor Party or what banner he will carry at the next State election. He has fallen out with some of the boys at the Trades Hall. Some of them, of course, are on his side, but others are sharpening the knives in readiness for running them in between his shoulder-blades, just as Percy Tucker ran the knife in between the shoulder-blades of Jack Houston.

In all the years that I have been in the political game—nearly all my life—I have never known a political party that is in a more hopeless and putrid mess than the Labor Party in Queensland. Yet no-one says anything about it.

I suppose this is understandable, because a Minister's officer is concerned only with boosting his Minister's prospects and others are concerned only with their individual prospects. Let the publicity officers attached to the Government's propaganda set-up get out among the people and tell them what is

wrong in Queensland today. It's no good having milk-and-water men; they've got to be good fighters.

Recently I asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities a question about Mr. Arthur Creedy. I shall not mention again the manner in which he obtained his job, but he commenced on an ordinary salary and with a staff of one, a typist. The Minister's answer to my question shows that he now has a staff of nine and an annual turnover of approximately \$90,000.

Mr. Lane: He should be sacked.

Mr. AIKENS: I said that a long time ago. I wish the honourable member for Merthyr had supported me when I said it. He certainly should be sacked. But, because the people won't put pressure on the Government to dismiss him he won't be sacked. When coming down on the plane today I saw in "The Cairns Post" (one of the companies which are now publishing only half-size newspapers) a picture of the chairman of the Mulgrave Shire presenting a prize to a woman who had submitted a painting that we could understand. I congratulate the Mulgrave Shire on doing this. I knew what it was. It was a painting of the cableway to the top of Mt. Bellenden Ker. As soon as I looked at it, I knew what it was. I said to a couple of newspapermen on the plane, "This painting would never get a prize from some of the so-called experts. Some of the old fellows, the masters of art receiving scores of thousands of dollars a year, most of whom are dirty old men. If today you know what a painting is about, it is not a good painting."

A young man employed in the Townsville Technical College on a big fat salary as a painting instructor entered a picture in a competition held quite recently in Townsville. He won the competition but when the painting was examined it was found to have filthy, obscene words all over it. I asked the Minister for Education by way of question, "Do you intend to keep that fellow teaching decent, young students at the Townsville Technical College to paint that sort of filth?" That picture is to hang in an art gallery that the Townsville City Council (which is run by the A.L.P.) hopes to erect. I know that the Minister for Local Government would have vetoed the purchase of that picture, but it was not purchased by the Townsville City Council. It was purchased by the committee that brought up this dirty old man from the South who awarded the prize. "Geronimo" is the name of the picture. If honourable members get to Townsville, I urge them to look at it. I know what the honourable member for Sandgate, a man of very fine standing with a sense of decency, would do if he got near enough to it with his walking-stick.

We are going to the dogs. Politicians are doing sweet F.A. about it because they cannot see in it any opportunity to attack the A.L.P. The Government should forget

the A.L.P. It is a spent force. Its members are like bits of riff-raff lying in the gutter or at the side of the road. Government members should get on with the job of representing Queensland as it should be represented and of cleaning up the State as it should be cleaned up so that we can avert the catastrophe that I see approaching.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (5.3 p.m.): I am pleased to join in this debate to support this excellent Budget, the first to be introduced by the new leader of the Liberal Party and Deputy Premier (Hon. Bill Knox).

In several ways this Budget gives people priority. Firstly, it respects the right of private-ownership and, indeed, encourages it. That approach is embraced by all honourable members on this side of the Chamber. They embrace the right of private-ownership, the right to work and the right to achieve something in life.

I am proud to have played some part in initiating the move to give relief from death duties. I moved a motion, which registered the support of all Government members for the Government's decision to abolish death duties from January of next year. That approach was accepted by all honourable members on this side and has already received wide acclaim in the community. The abolition of death duties should be accompanied by the abolition of the iniquitous gift duty, and that is being done in this Budget. It recognises that right of private-ownership and the right to do with one's property what one will.

The relief in pay-roll tax points towards the re-enhancement of the role of the private sector and a deviation from the trend towards over-government. There is too much Government involvement in the lives of people. It emphasises the importance of private enterprise. The Treasurer is to be congratulated for adopting that approach. The Budget gives a real incentive to the individual to work for himself and his family and to succeed in life.

At the same time as he is doing that, the Treasurer is recognising the responsibility of the State to the community—an approach which is consistent with the policy of the Liberal Party and its coalition partner. The Liberal Party has a commitment to social reform. We believe, in the words of the Henderson report, "that people are entitled to an adequate income, which is fundamental to a person's security, well-being and independence." We on this side do not embrace the Labor Party's philosophy of class warfare. These days class warfare is dead and buried, despite the many vain attempts by the Labor Party to resurrect it.

Mr. Dean: Who are you kidding? You're only kidding yourself.

Mr. LANE: Does the honourable member believe in class warfare? Does he believe

in the workers against the bosses? Is that what he is saying? I wonder which side he is on.

Mr. Dean: I am certainly not on your side when you make those silly statements. You wouldn't know what class warfare was.

Mr. LANE: There is plenty of warfare going on in the honourable member's party at the moment. If it were not for his impending retirement at the next election, I am sure he would have the knife between the shoulder-blades, just as the member for Bundaberg will have it in the days ahead. Those on that side of the Chamber in safe and secure seats sit there with smirks on their faces knowing that they can comfortably survive any of the troubles in the party, provided they pay tribute to their Trades Hall bosses. I have been interested to see how quickly the new member for Port Curtis has recognised that fact and how he has conformed so well to the requirements of the Trades Hall and the dictates of the Q.C.E.

Mr. Lindsay: He pays them 3 per cent of his salary.

Mr. LANE: He very readily pays that in tribute to that organisation. No doubt the 3 per cent goes towards buying beer and pies and whatever else they eat at the Labor Party headquarters when they have their regular meetings to issue further orders to their parliamentary members.

The present member for Port Curtis is a lot stouter than, although not a shadow of, the former member for Port Curtis, who I thought always spoke in this Chamber with a degree of individual independence. If the present member for Port Curtis ever comes anywhere near his predecessor in performance, he will be able to say he is truly a man.

However, let me return to the Budget and to the economic approach of the parties. We must all recognise the very difficult circumstances and the background against which the Treasurer has had to frame this State's Budget. We live in a society in which more and more people are demanding greater Government assistance and welfare. Indeed, many are entitled to that assistance. Those on this side of the Chamber, of course, have a social conscience. For many years the Labor Party thought that it had an exclusive claim to a social conscience. I think that has been adequately refuted in recent years.

The Federal Government in its recent Budget played its part in maintaining a reasonable standard of living for people who need State assistance. There are almost 1,500,000 people receiving age pensions at present. Recently the age pensions were increased by the Commonwealth Government so that in November there will be a \$2.25 a week increase in the standard single pension to \$43.50 a week and an increase of \$4 a week in the combined pension to \$72.50 a week. That indicates the approach of the Liberal

Party parliamentarians in this country towards social welfare. In Australia, 134,000 people are on the widows' pension.

Mr. Jensen: What has this to do with the Treasurer's Financial Statement? You're supposed to talk about the State Budget.

Mr. LANE: I do not expect a dull individual like the honourable member for Bundaberg to comprehend how the number of people on welfare payments throughout Australia would have to be taken into account by the State Treasurer in framing his Budget. The honourable member will not be in Parliament much longer, so he will have plenty of time to sit back and think about it when his activities are confined to the public bar of that grubby little pub in Bundaberg that he frequents so often.

This background of people expecting greater assistance these days has created many difficulties for the State Treasurer in framing his Budget. Part of this background is the industrial turmoil or the history of industrial disputes that in recent times we have become used to. Anybody who studies the figures coming from the Government Statistician could not help being alarmed at the continuing record of industrial disputes. In the month of June alone, over \$630,000 in wages was lost through industrial disputes. That is money that is not flowing into the economy, not being spent across store counters and not being passed on to manufacturing businesses. Consequently, it is not creating employment.

So we have a large pool of unemployed at the moment. Something like 25 people are registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service for every job vacancy. In the month of August this year 25,083 males and 12,442 females—a total of 37,525—in this State were registered for employment. These people, who are unemployed and therefore not earning or producing, have to be kept by someone. The role so often falls to the Government. Among this group are the people who are down and out and the people who occupy our hostels and places for destitute men and women.

The most notable hostels in this State are those conducted by the St. Vincent De Paul Society in Margaret Street and the Salvation Army at South Brisbane. Those two organisations do excellent work in looking after destitute and itinerant, homeless people in the community. Recently I had occasion to visit the St. Vincent De Paul Hostel and have some discussions with the management on how they were placed at this time. Many honourable members will be alarmed to hear that that hostel is currently bedding down 87 persons per night on beds and on the floor. Nightly, it feeds over 250 people who are without food. This hostel currently exists on grants from its organisational headquarters and on collections made by its association, such collections being subsidised to the extent of 40c per \$1 collected.

Mr. Casey: Did you see the honourable member for Brisbane before you went down there?

Mr. LANE: The honourable member for Brisbane and I are very close friends and I do not have to get his permission to visit the St. Vincent de Paul Hostel and show some concern for these members of the community. I know the honourable member for Mackay does not concern himself with such things; he is too busy dodging the Bankruptcy Court.

The other Government assistance given to this place is a subsidy of 25c per meal, so that as 250 people are fed each night the Government is required to find 25c for each of those meals at this hostel for destitute men. Of course, there are some generous donors in the community who regularly make it their business to give what assistance they can to this establishment. I think it is worth mentioning that Tip Top Bakeries provide not only the St. Vincent de Paul hostel but also the Salvation Army Home at South Brisbane and, I think, the Opal Home with all their bread requirements from bread that is unsold at the conclusion of each day. It is delivered to these hostels.

Mr. Jensen: If they did not do that, they would only give it to the pig farmers.

Mr. LANE: The honourable member is not being very charitable in his remarks today.

Mr. Jensen: You know they send it out to the pig farmers.

Mr. LANE: This is probably another reason why the honourable member has come unstuck with his own party; he does not really care.

Just 12 months ago the St. Vincent de Paul Society was feeding only 120 persons a night. This figure has more than doubled in the past 12 months, so we can see where the economy and the unemployment situation are heading at the moment. The management at the hostel informed me that whereas 12 months ago only 30 per cent of the men who came into that place would in their opinion be employable, today at least 60 per cent of the inmates of that particular hostel are employable. The number of young men who find their way there for a meal and a bed is, I think, a matter of great concern.

The total cost of maintaining this establishment is something like \$66,000 per annum. It is an organisation which does a great deal of good, and I believe that Governments could perhaps give it a little more assistance. It is an organisation which will not accept any payment from the people who go there for help. It will not accept a contribution from the dole or social service payments that most of its inmates receive. I believe it should be recognised by the Commonwealth Government in a more effective way, and some of the money that could well

be saved through the Social Security Department could be channelled into the St. Vincent de Paul Society and the Salvation Army.

Of course, the Commonwealth Government is already doing many good things. Its recent initiatives in respect of pensions and other forms of social service will be well received. In the field of hospital and health services the State is also playing its part. I was very pleased to see in the Budget the provision of over \$2,000,000 in subsidies to senior citizens' centres and homes for the aged in this State. I believe elderly people are in need of assistance. One must always make a judgment, though, about what is legitimate welfare assistance and what is illegitimate, and I must confess some private concern about some of the expenditure of the Commonwealth Government on welfare programmes. The fact is that they are still tied to some of the schemes of the former Labor Government, and I think many of us in this Committee would like to see them phased out.

The grant of \$153,000,000 by the Federal Government for direct assistance to Aborigines is, I think, far too high. Although the Federal Treasurer said, when presenting the last Budget, that there was some curbing of current programmes to eliminate inefficiency, that is not apparent in that figure. As one who has within his electorate establishments run by the Commonwealth Government Department of Aboriginal Affairs, I can see excesses in expenditure that concern me because the taxpayer has to meet the bill.

The two establishments that exist in the New Farm area are the Elan hostel and the Apia hostel, both of which are run by Aboriginal Hostels Limited, a Commonwealth Government subsidiary. A few weeks ago I sought from the Commonwealth Government some figures to show just what the capital costs of setting up these two establishments were and also the recurring costs of maintenance, administration, and so on, since, and honourable members may well be interested in hearing some of the figures.

The Elan hostel, which is situated in Moray Street, New Farm, and has a capacity of 48 beds, is motel-type accommodation. Following my representations of a year or two ago—in fact, following my very loud demands of Canberra—it is now allocated for occupancy by women and children. In the first instance, the cost of setting up the hostel was \$75,012 for the land and \$166,663 for the building and equipment, making a total of \$241,675 to establish a residence for 48 Aborigines.

A person cannot gain admission to an Aboriginal hostel unless he is classified as an Aborigine in terms of the requirements of the Commonwealth Government. I remember asking one of the senior officers of the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs a year or two ago just how a person claimed that he was an Aborigine and that he was entitled to welfare accommodation. The officer said to me, "Well, if he says

he is an Aborigine and he looks as if he might be an Aborigine, we accept it and give him accommodation." That is the sort of way in which money is thrown about.

That cost of almost \$250,000 represents over \$5,000 a bed to establish the Elan hostel. Occupants are required to pay as their tariff 33½ per cent of their gross income if they are working or 50 per cent of any social welfare payments if they are not. As children are accommodated, the average income per person is fairly low. The net cost per resident per week for the Elan hostel over the 12 months to 28 June 1975 was \$37.43 per week. Occupancy during the financial year to 6 March 1976—that is, 40 weeks—has averaged 38 persons, or 79 per cent, at a net cost to the company of \$38.93 per resident per week. Occupancy is lower during the 1975-76 financial year because the hostel was overcrowded in the early part of 1974-75. It certainly was overcrowded! It was full of drunks and criminals from the Born Free Club at South Brisbane, who were moved into the hostel at New Farm and who slept on the floor under inadequate supervision. So the taxpayer is paying a net cost in respect of that establishment of \$83.43 per person per week.

The Apia hostel, which has a capacity of 39 beds and is classified as a residence for homeless men, was established at a total cost of \$410,363. That sum was made up of \$120,075 as the cost of the land and \$290,288 for buildings and equipment. The average occupancy of this establishment during the period of 19 weeks in which it operated in 1974-75 was 28, which was 72 per cent of its capacity of 39. The residents at that establishment also pay tariffs of 33½ per cent of their gross earnings if employed or 50 per cent of any social service benefits.

Difficult operating conditions were encountered by the company during the major part of the 19 weeks in which it operated and these conditions, together with the start-up costs, produced a net cost to the company per resident per week of \$56.05. Those difficult operating conditions were, of course, brought about by the Labor Government's policy of picking out one of the Aboriginal militants round town, a fellow with a criminal record and a large family of sons, cousins, nephews and the like, all of whom were either just going into Boggo Road gaol or just coming out, and giving him special welfare accommodation at Apia.

Occupancy during the last financial year to 6 March 1976, a period of 40 weeks, averaged 33, which is 85 per cent of full occupancy, at a very much lower net operating cost to the company of \$37.50 per resident per week. That is what the taxpayer is being required to pay. Apia cost the taxpayer \$1,127.50 a week to accommodate an average of 33 persons, or \$58,630 per annum. Elan, for the accommodation of women and children, cost the taxpayer \$1,459 per week, or \$75,918.92 per annum. I think members

will be interested to know how much Aboriginal welfare money is paid, where it goes and who is receiving it.

I have had some words to say publicly in this Chamber and in other places about the inadequacy of supervision over establishments of this type. I must say that under the new Government it has improved to some extent, but I am still not happy with it. I am not happy with the increase in the number of bashings and other acts of thuggery that have taken place in this suburb since the establishment of the Apia hostel. If there are to be places that cater for itinerants, alcoholics and homeless people, those conducting them should look to the experience of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and the Salvation Army in the laying down of rules of conduct for the inmates.

If the taxpayers have to meet the cost of maintaining such places to the extent that I have detailed, they are entitled to expect a code of reasonable behaviour in them. There have been too many bashings by Aboriginal men in the vicinity of these hostels and there have been too many fights and brawls in the nearby hotels. This has played a large part in making that section of New Farm, which was formerly a very peaceful place, an area into which many people feel it is unsafe to venture.

Aid to Aborigines is not the only field in which the Commonwealth Government has continued a policy of open-handedness which I think still contributes to inflation and reduces people's will to work.

Probably the most outstanding scheme that was brought down by the Federal Government in the welfare area was that known as the Australian Assistance Plan. It is a scheme that I hope will within the next 12 months be buried very deeply in a lead coffin. It has done little or no good for the community, particularly in this State.

Mr. Jensen: Can you see anything good in the Budget to talk about instead of talking about the Federal Budget? We heard all about the Federal Budget last session.

Mr. LANE: That can't be an A.L.P. badge that the honourable member is wearing on his lapel.

Mr. Jensen: No; it's a Queensland badge.

Mr. LANE: The A.L.P. slogan "Unity of Labor is the hope of the world" does not give much hope to the honourable member for Bundaberg.

In the 1975-76 financial year the Australian Assistance Plan had appropriated to it by the Commonwealth Government the sum of \$7,400,000. Of that sum, \$2,900,000 went in administration costs and nearly all the remainder in grants to welfare organisations in other States. Very little crept through to legitimate welfare organisations in Queensland. These figures alone stand as an indictment of the scheme and show how useless it was.

The Australian Assistance Plan has been referred to as a pilot scheme. In heralding its demise a few months ago, Senator Guilfoyle said—

"The Australian Assistance Plan was introduced in 1973 as a three-year experimental programme. The pilot programme concludes on 30 June 1976."

I do not know that Australia can afford experiments and pilot programmes that spend such a large proportion of the taxpayers' money for such little benefit to the community.

In the Greater Brisbane Area alone, up to 15 April this year a total of \$151,550 had been paid to the A.A.P. Brisbane interim committee, of which I am a member. All of that money was spent on administration costs and on salaries of community development officers. The administration component was \$66,050 and the community development officer grant was \$85,500. Not one cent found its way to a legitimate welfare cause.

The Australian Assistance Plan seemed to gather round it people who sit in comfortable jobs and receive very high salaries. Their task is described as community development. Anyone who talks to some of these officers would wonder if they would not be better occupied doing some practical work for the community. At meetings of this organisation I have suggested that the money would have been better applied to some practical welfare work.

When the scheme was introduced, the Liberal Party spokesman at Federal level on the matter, Mr. Don Chipp, acclaimed it as a great initiative. Within months of saying that, he went back on his words. He said—

"It was a scheme which had the potential of pork-barrelling political patronage." Indeed it had.

Mr. Neal: He woke up.

Mr. LANE: Exactly. Mr. Don Chipp is very slow in getting the message. He is very reluctant to admit his mistakes. I am pleased that the current Prime Minister has recognised his worth and how much common sense he has and has left him where he should be—on the back bench.

Recently the Australian Assistance Plan came up for evaluation, and on 26 May this year Senator Guilfoyle issued a Press statement, her pronouncement as to its future. She said—

"The Commonwealth Government will continue to provide funding for a maximum period of 12 months from 1 July 1976 to meet salary and administrative costs of staff employed by the 37 Regional Councils for Social Development. This involves a maximum commitment for 1976-77 of \$3,000,000.

"Sufficient funds will be provided in 1976-77 so that commitments on projects which extend beyond 30th June 1976 are

met. The estimated cost of this commitment in 1976-77 is \$2,000,000."

In her wisdom, Senator Guilfoyle has decided to continue to supply funds until the end of June next year to the extent of a further \$3,000,000 for administration costs. We can add that \$3,000,000 to the \$7,400,000 appropriated in the previous 12 months. I wonder just what could have been done with this sum of almost \$11,000,000 if it had been applied to some other purpose—if it had been given for allocation through legitimate State Government channels to established welfare organisations that have a record of performance, a record of compassion and a record of carrying out practical work in the community? Some of the money could have been allocated to local government so that the more minor role of social welfare carried out by local government could be continued. But this was not to be. I am disappointed that Senator Guilfoyle has seen fit to let the scheme run on until the end of June next year with the waste of an additional \$5,000,000 in that time. I love the glib way that Federal politicians talk in millions!

Mr. Moore: The taxpayer pays all the bills.

Mr. LANE: That is true.

In Greater Brisbane the interim committee expects \$30,000 to \$40,000 in the next 12 months in administrative costs, plus the salary of a number of community development officers. At least at that level some wisdom has prevailed. At a meeting I attended recently a decision was made by the interim committee, under the guidance of the chairman, the Rev. A. W. Lawrie, who was representing the Queensland Council of Churches. A recommendation was made by him to pass the remaining administrative funds and salaries of community development officers over to an established organisation, namely the Queensland Council of Social Service, so that it could put the money to practical use for the Brisbane community until the end of June next year.

I am not sure that I agree with the money being channelled to this organisation in this way. I believe it was done with the agreement of the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle). I think it would have been more appropriate if she had had the courage and common sense to give this money to the State Government. She could have done so with a recommendation that the State Government hand it on to the Queensland Council of Social Service to be used in its work. I am sure that the State Government would have been glad to do that. By her action she has left the interim committee for the city of Brisbane under the Australian Assistance Plan as a shadow to handle the funds. It will have to maintain an office, a filing cabinet and a bank book so that the money can be passed through its hands on to the Queensland Council of Social Service. The interim committee has established a small financial

committee that will meet regularly merely to authorise the signing of cheques on a monthly or three-monthly basis to pass the funds on to the Queensland Council of Social Service. I am a member of that small finance committee. I took the responsibility in a watch-dog capacity and shall continue with it so that I can at least play my part in seeing that the funds of the taxpayers are not wasted.

The Brisbane interim committee, which was established in the first instance to set up the Regional Council for Social Development throughout Brisbane, has gradually grown in size over the years. It has co-opted to its ranks a number of people from the community so that now it numbers 21 in all. For several months I attended meetings of that committee while it was viable; yet it could never seem to get together a quorum. A number of meetings were aborted because of the lack of quorum; but when something important to the Labor Party was proposed, there would always be a good roll-up of people. On that committee are still people from the Brisbane City Council who have lost any legitimate claim to office. There is Mrs. Beattie Dawson, a former alderman for Hamilton, who was defeated in the last elections.

Alderman Dawson went to the committee as a member of the Lady Mayoress's Social Welfare Committee. Although no longer an Alderman, she still occupies a place on the interim committee. The former Alderman Burton, who was a Brisbane City Council representative on the committee, is still there in the capacity of treasurer, although he is no longer an alderman. Mrs. Ian Brusasco, also from the Lady Mayoress's Social Welfare Committee, still occupies a post on the interim committee, although her husband was defeated at the last council election. Mr. Jud Harding, a former councillor of the Albert Shire, I think, is still on that committee, although he also was defeated at the last council election. There is a representative of the trade union movement, Mr. Tom McHenry of the tram and bus employees union. He is a representative from the Trades Hall. Alderman Brian Mellifont, who managed to scrape home in the council election, is there, too. Of course, the honourable member for Archerfield (Mr. Kevin Hooper) was co-opted to the committee. I make no comment about any of the university people, who are committed Labor people, who occupy positions on the committee. So it is not surprising that that committee continues with its current attitude.

At one recent meeting I was surprised to see a man come before us with a recommendation from the chairman for appointment as the organisation's executive officer. Mr. Len Keogh, the former member for Bowman, who is another defeated Labor man, was recommended to be the committee's executive officer on a good salary.

Mr. Frawley: Did you agree with that?

Mr. LANE: He came before the full committee for an interview. I had an opportunity to ask him several questions about his intentions. I asked him in the first place whether he still held membership of the Labor Party and felt some obligation to its aims, objects, printed platforms and policies. He said quite clearly that he did.

Mr. Jones: Does that debar him?

Mr. LANE: Of course not. I asked him if he would give a guarantee that he would not use his position as executive officer of the interim committee to propagate the Labor Party's policies and platform. He said he would give no such assurance. I asked him whether he would, as a gesture of honour and good will, preclude himself from Australian Assistance Plan activity within the Bowman federal division where his former political ambitions lie and probably still do. He said he would not feel any obligation to make that commitment, either.

Mr. Jones: Why should he?

Mr. LANE: Why should he be on the public pay-roll to work for the Labor Party?

Mr. Jones: You're on the committee.

Mr. LANE: The honourable member has a peculiar system of logic. The honourable member for Cairns has been pushing his broom around the platform of the Cairns Railway Station for so long or peddling A.L.P. propaganda among railway workers in North Queensland, most of whom I understand rejected it anyway, that he thinks it is normal for the taxpayers in Queensland to pay public servants and statutory employees a salary to be political activists for the Labor Party. It is something that he cannot grasp or understand.

Mr. Jones: You're saying this under privilege. Say it outside.

Mr. LANE: I have no fear of saying that about the honourable member anywhere. The honourable member for Cairns is well known as a loafer. Recently I visited Cairns and I was disappointed that the honourable member for Cairns did not seem to be taking the slightest interest in the Cairns centenary celebrations which are being conducted in that city right throughout this year. As a matter of fact I was the host on the stage of the Civic Centre only two weeks ago with an Italian choir from Brisbane which appeared before an audience of 500 people. I introduced the choir to the people of Cairns. I looked around for the honourable member for Cairns to see his interest in this sort of activity, in the ethnic community—the Italian community—in North Queensland and in some sort of cultural activity. He was nowhere to be seen. I understand that he was at a two-up game down behind the goods shed in the Cairns railway yard drinking cheap plonk from a round bottle.

I shall now return to the interim committee of the Australian Assistance Plan. The qualifications that I have outlined of dedication to Labor Party activity by Mr. Keogh recommended him to the interim committee for appointment as executive officer. The Labor Party has the numbers on that committee. A vote was taken on his appointment. I voted against it on the basis that I would like to see the money spent as salary for someone who would apply himself to social welfare work rather than political activity. We lost the vote 9:3 and honourable members would not have to guess who were the nine—people who had not turned up at the previous two meetings; all of those people whom I have outlined as Labor activists who have found their way onto that committee over the years.

The recommendation went to Senator Guilfoyle. She recognised the wisdom of keeping the job and the taxpayers' money for someone who did not have a political motive. She rejected the recommendation and Mr. Keogh did not get the job. So the honourable member for Cairns is right out of step. Mr. Keogh is not the executive officer.

The money has now been allocated to the Queensland Council for Social Service. It is very good that it has been because it will use the money wisely and well to provide for the needy people in the community, many of whom will be accommodated and assisted by this excellent Budget, which was brought down recently by our new Treasurer. In it he has recognised once again the social commitment of members of the Liberal Party and the National Party in this Parliament to give everyone a fair go. It is something that I only wish honourable members opposite, particularly the man who runs the swy game in Cairns—the honourable member for Cairns—would recognise the need for in the community.

Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (5.50 p.m.): First of all, I would like to congratulate the Treasurer and the officials of the Treasury Department who gave him valuable assistance in the presentation of his first Budget. It is a fairly good Budget despite some of the criticism levelled at it by the Leader of the Opposition. He is nothing more than a big bag of wind. He made this statement—

“A Labor Government would, in current circumstances, budget in Queensland for a responsible deficit rather than an unnecessary, uncontributive, tiny surplus.”

That showed just how little he really knows about Budgets. It was typical Labor thinking; overspending, and when short of money print a few more dollar bills. This Budget should produce a small surplus of about \$149,000 as at 30 June 1977. And is that not good housekeeping, no matter how small the surplus? Any Budget of this magnitude that can provide a surplus is well worth

while. If Labor ever becomes the Government again in Queensland, woe betide the State because they will not have a Budget worth thinking about.

Mr. Neal: They will do the same as they did in Canberra.

Mr. FRAWLEY: They will do worse than that. I could tell honourable members stories about what happened in 1949 when I was working here as a maintenance electrician. They sold the furniture out of the place. Vice and corruption were rife. They used to charge £5 to have somebody made a justice of the peace. That is what they were like—a mob of crooks. They ran this place into the ground for their own benefit. If Labor were elected to office in this State, law and order would cease to exist.

We had an example before the recent Federal election of just what the Labor Party thinks about law and order. We saw a newspaper headline which read, "Violence 'if Labor loses'". The article continued—

"A wave of violence will sweep over Australia if the Labor Party loses the election, ALP candidate for Petrie, Mr. John Hungerford said this week . . .

"But I hope it isn't going to be a violent campaign," Mr. Hungerford said.

"I regret to say the violence will come if the Labor Party loses the election."

"If we lose the election I'm afraid people will feel very bitter."

We all know what has happened since that election. The Labor Party has constantly fed the flames. It has all these rat-bags and idiots from the university who come along to demonstrations against Sir John Kerr, who did the right thing by getting rid of the Whitlam Government before it finally ruined the whole economy. The Labor Party has a plan to get rid of the Governor of Queensland. If members opposite ever became the Government, the Governor would be the one person who would stop them from running riot, and they have a plan to get rid of him at the earliest opportunity. But I understand we have something in mind to prevent that.

The attitude of the A.L.P. towards all that is decent and good in this country can easily be seen from the results of the 1974 conference held in Cairns from 29 September to 4 October when some awful decisions were made. Its committee on law reform recommended that a State Labor Government remove the offences of vagrancy, drunkenness and drug-taking. It also wanted the legalisation of marijuana.

The Young Labor movement is just as bad in this area. At its State conference in September 1974 a motion was passed that the relevant laws be amended so that the possession of marijuana would not be an offence. Delegates also wanted the Government to establish an agency to produce and distribute marijuana within the State although

—I will give them credit for this—they did say that a proportion of the profit made by this agency should be applied to research into problems arising from abuse of drugs. They wanted the cultivation of marijuana for self-consumption to be made legal. Fancy putting up something like that! They also wanted to liberalise the laws relating to homosexuality, abortion, prostitution and censorship and they claimed that they wanted to maximise human freedoms.

I know that during this debate a number of members have been accused of speaking about everything but the Budget, but this is one of the few times in this Chamber when a member is given the opportunity of speaking about whatever subject he chooses. The only other debates in which a member can do this are the Address-in-Reply debate and the debate on Matters of Public Interest. And as so many members wish to speak in the Matters of Public Interest debate a member is lucky if he is able to speak more than once a session, and I am not opposing that. The Budget debate and the Address-in-Reply debate are the only other two debates during which a member can speak about anything concerning his electorate, so if I speak about things not concerned with the Budget, that is my business and I intend to continue. I do not care who criticises me.

I want to say a few more things about the Labor conference to which I referred. It does not hurt to refresh the memories of honourable members about this conference, because some of the newer members might not have heard it. The Murrumba committee made certain recommendations. It is composed of people from the electorate I represent. They have tried damned hard to get rid of me but they are wasting their time. They wanted a referendum to abolish State Parliament and they wanted Queensland to become a Federal territory. Can honourable members think of anything worse than Queensland's becoming a Federal territory under Gough Whitlam?

Mr. Gygar: What did Tom Burns say about that one?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not know the vote on that motion. I had a couple of spies up there and they did tell me what happened, but they could not give me the result of the vote on that motion. I know it was carried; I am sure of that. They carried the motion that Queensland become a Federal territory and that the State Government be abolished.

The honourable member for Bulimba, who entered the debate earlier today, spoke about the absence of members from the Chamber and criticised the Premier for not being here. Everyone knows that the Premier of the State has more commitments than any backbench member or any other Minister. Everybody wants to see him, and he is meeting deputations during the day while he is not in

the Chamber. I do not doubt that the Leader of the Opposition meets deputations while he is absent from the Chamber.

Although the honourable member for Bulimba criticised members for being absent from the Chamber, members of his own party are the worst offenders. When numbers are down, sometimes one of his mates will call for a quorum. Then, after the bells have been rung and members have come into the Chamber, he slinks out like a big carpet snake.

A Government Member: Who is that?

Mr. FRAWLEY: Any member of the Opposition. Three or four of them have called for a quorum to be formed. The honourable member for Archerfield is one of the worst. He called for a quorum to be formed recently, then slunk out of the Chamber.

A Government Member: He wanted to get out.

Mr. FRAWLEY: He wanted to go somewhere. When members come in after a quorum has been formed, A.L.P. members are conspicuous by their absence. I took particular note that last Thursday, 14 October, there were never more than two members of the A.L.P. in the Chamber at any time after 7.15 p.m. Of course, the fact that the dogs were running at the 'Gabba might have had something to do with that, because it is well-known that Labor members get into the 'Gabba on the grouter. They never pay to get in at the gate; they always get in on the nod. So I would not doubt that the absence of Labor members here on Thursday night was due to the fact that the dogs were running at the 'Gabba.

Dr. Scott-Young: Remember what the honourable member for Townsville South said. Don't rubbish them too much.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Every member has to make his own speech.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition is here. It is one of the few times he is here. The honourable gentleman said in his speech in this debate—

"My stand is perfectly clear. Where Queensland employment and Queensland productivity are at stake, I'm protectionist to the hilt and proud of it."

Mr. Jones: You are not allowed under Standing Orders to read from a "Hansard" pull.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am sorry; I didn't know that. I shall quote from memory. The Leader of the Opposition said that, and I was here to hear him say it. However, he spoke with tongue in cheek because he has never once tried to protect any of the industries in this State.

Mr. Gygar: Have you noticed that the Leader of the Opposition has shaved his sideburns and found a new tailor in the last few weeks?

Mr. FRAWLEY: He might have found a new tailor. I can remember the time when the Leader of the Opposition claimed in this Chamber that his suits had been stolen by his political enemies. I asked a question—

Mr. Burns: The whole 36 of them!

Mr. FRAWLEY: No. I think the honourable gentleman said that he had a dozen suits and they were stolen. However, I know he got some from St. Vincent de Paul in the Valley only a week before.

To get back to the Budget—I am pleased to see that it sets out to minimise the burdens on industry. I agree that State Government departments should not be permitted to increase their staff numbers above the levels approved at the end of June 1976. I think that is fair enough. We must not allow an undue growth in the Public Service, and I congratulate the Treasurer for including that provision in the Budget. I think it is very worth while.

I do not intend to speak about death duties and gift duty, as everyone else has had something to say about them. The increase in pay-roll tax exemption will be of great benefit to the small businesses in my electorate. I have received many complaints about pay-roll tax from small businessmen, and I really believe that the increase in the exemption will enable many small businesses to employ more people.

Mr. Burns: How many more people would you have put on at your garage if you had not had to pay pay-roll tax?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I did not have to pay pay-roll tax, because my business was not as big as that. I had partners.

Mr. Burns: The facts of life are that employers do not employ people simply because there is no pay-roll tax.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I think they will employ apprentices. The honourable member for Rockhampton complained bitterly in this Chamber the other day—and I agreed with him, too, because I have the welfare of apprentices at heart—that apprentices were not getting the same opportunity of employment that they had previously. I believe that with the raising of exemptions from pay-roll tax, small businesses such as garages—I am pleased that the honourable member for Lytton mentioned them—electrical contractors or small fitting and turning workshops—and there are some in my electorate—will have the opportunity to employ an additional apprentice or two. They will be able to do it; I hope they will do it.

Mr. Burns: An apprentice's wages for a year would not put much on the pay-roll.

Mr. FRAWLEY: There is a lot of value in employing an apprentice, and this will be an incentive to small businesses to do so. I think they will do it. In my opinion, increasing the exemption from \$41,600 to \$62,400 will make a difference. When it finally increases in 1978 to \$100,000, it will make a further difference. I cannot see anything wrong with that. I think increasing the exemption is quite a good gesture on the part of the Government. From 1 November, road transport permit fees are to be further reduced by 50 per cent to 33½ per cent of the level that applied when we first promised their removal.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I think that many businesses are operating so close to the borderline that they are holding off employing additional workers even though they might need them. They have jobs for more workers but they are trying to do without them at present because of the prevailing economic circumstances.

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

Mr. FRAWLEY: On 18 September 1975, I asked the Minister for Police by way of a question whether or not he was aware that ex-Police Inspector Corner was known as "Freeloader Charlie" when he was stationed in Mt. Isa because he did not pay for meals at cafes. The Minister's reply was that he could not answer the question at that time. I asked that question as a result of information received by me from a supposedly reliable source. I had fair and reasonable grounds for believing the truth of that information.

Mr. Yewdale: Are you reading that speech?

Mr. FRAWLEY: No. These are notes that I am reading. Since that time I and the member for Mt. Isa have made extensive inquiries into this allegation and I have found that, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Corner was never known as "Freeloader Charlie". I apologise for any embarrassment that may have been caused to Mr. Corner as the result of that question.

On 24 August 1975, "Sunday Sun" previewed a book written by Mr. Corner about the Queensland Police Force. In the book he accused police generally of being deeply involved in graft payments from publicans, gamblers and criminals over many years. He also claimed that some magistrates were dishonest and that some judges were incompetent. He did not mention any names. He did cast some doubts on the honesty of policemen, so it is reasonable to assume that many honest police officers were upset by his allegations, which may or may not have been true.

To turn to another subject—a typical example of the Labor Party's standover tactics is its attempt to blackmail the member for Bundaberg. For some time now I

have been determined to bring this matter before the House. The honourable member for Bundaberg is a good, strong Right-wing member of the Labor Party and a man who typifies all those qualities that it is expected would be found in a true Labor man. He is a typical example of the old-time Labor man who used to grace this Assembly many years ago. He is a genuine Labor politician.

The member for Bundaberg is in danger of losing his endorsement because of his stand in opposition to the Q.C.E. He has refused to pay blackmail to retain his endorsement. He has refused to pay a levy of 3½ per cent of his salary. Consequently his first application for endorsement was refused. The A.L.P. has now called for fresh nominations in the seat of Bundaberg and the Q.C.E. has refused to accept his nomination unless he agrees to pay 3½ per cent of his salary as a condition of endorsement.

This matter should be referred to the Committee of Privileges. It is an attempt at blackmail and a gross breach of privilege of a sitting member of Parliament. The Q.C.E. is standing over the member and insisting that he give 3½ per cent of his salary to the Labor Party.

Mr. Lester: Do you think that is a real knock to the people of Bundaberg who supported Mr. Jensen?

Mr. FRAWLEY: It is a shocking thing to do to them. I intend to bring this matter before the Committee of Privileges. The people of Bundaberg should be told that the candidate who will be endorsed by the Q.C.E. will be completely subservient to that body. All other members of the Opposition have agreed to pay this 3½ per cent levy. The only way they can obtain endorsement is by paying it to the Q.C.E.

Mr. Jensen: You are talking rubbish again.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am pleased the member for Bundaberg has entered the Chamber. It is about time someone defended him; he can't do it himself. I have taken upon myself the role of champion of the member for Bundaberg to try to get him a fair deal. He should be ashamed of himself for interjecting while I am trying to help him retain his seat. I will even go up to Bundaberg and campaign on his behalf.

Mr. Jensen: Do you still sleep with a hammer under your bed?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am pleased the honourable member made that interjection. When we were in Japan together we slept in the same room—not in the same bed. He was so afraid of the dark that I had to sleep near the door to look after him. He was frightened that the Japanese might get in and attack him.

The latest candidate endorsed by the Labor Party for the seat of Nudgee is Mr. Vaughan, a well-known Left-winger and an

associate of Communists. He is the type of fellow who pays the 3½ per cent levy to obtain endorsement.

Mr. Marginson: How much do you pay to your party?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I don't pay 10c to my party for anything, and I never will. I will not pay anything to retain my endorsement. If I cannot be selected on my own qualifications, I damn well don't want to be. I will never pay for anything.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about those watches you used to have when you were working on the wharves?

Mr. FRAWLEY: What's the honourable member talking about? I have never worked on the wharves in my life.

I shall now deal with the attempts by many people to prevent the State Government from redeveloping the site on which the Bellevue building stands. Many of the protesters are absolute hypocrites, people who are not genuinely concerned with the preservation of historic buildings. There are some genuine, sincere people who wish to preserve many of our historic buildings but they are in the minority. Until the State Government purchased this hotel in 1967 for \$660,000, very little interest had been shown in preserving the building. As soon as the Government took over, all the ratbags wanted to preserve it and in jumped the knockers for their chop. The majority of people who jumped on the preservation band wagon are complete hypocrites and ratbags.

Jack Munday, a well-known Communist and a traitor to Australia, set the pattern by imposing green bans on many building projects in Sydney—ostensibly in the interests of culture. He and his union were really black-banning the builders into kicking in money to union funds.

Blackmail is also prevalent in the building industry in Victoria. The Victorian branch of the Builders Labourers' Federation placed a black ban on the Newport Power Station but when \$40,000 was paid to the Builders Labourers' Federation the ban was lifted. This union is led by a Communist named Norm Gallagher. He is a big, loud-mouthed, standover bully who has organised many bashings in the building trade in Victoria. He is a criminal who has never been convicted. Australia should deport men like him. We should throw him out of the country.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! I remind the honourable member for Murrumbidgee that, while this is very interesting, it has nothing whatever to do with the Budget.

Mr. FRAWLEY: With all due respect, Mr. Gunn, in the Budget debate an honourable member can range widely on any subject.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member return to the Financial Statement.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about this famous threat of yours to tip a bucket on John Hodges? You have not the intestinal fortitude to do that.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will continue with his speech.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It is well known that I do not tip buckets on anybody.

Although I respectfully disagree with your ruling, Mr. Gunn, I shall accept it.

The increased allowances to student teachers and other scholarship-holders should be quite satisfactory.

Mr. Marginson: Why didn't you support them?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I supported them. I also supported the per-capita grants to non-Government schools that are to be increased from 1 January next. I am particularly interested in the payments made to school-bus operators because there are many of them in my electorate.

Mr. Houston: How many do you own?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I own no buses in my electorate.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will not acknowledge the honourable member's interjection. After I defended him against the Q.C.E.—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member ignore the interjection.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I shall do so.

The amounts payable are fairly reasonable. I see nothing wrong with them. Bus drivers are now getting a reasonable amount for taking children to school.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Bundaberg has had an opportunity to make his speech.

Mr. FRAWLEY: And he made an awful botch of it.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not know why the honourable member does not make a reasonable contribution to the debate.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about the Hornibrook Highway?

Mr. FRAWLEY: The Hornibrook Highway was not referred to in the Treasurer's Budget speech. I was very disappointed that I did not see an amount of \$8,000,000 for

the building of the highway but I have been assured by the Minister for Main Roads that it is to be done this financial year.

Mr. Houston: It was not mentioned in the Budget.

Mr. FRAWLEY: No, it was not.

Mr. Houston: How can it do it?

Mr. FRAWLEY: The Government can do anything if it really wants to.

The total appropriation for education is \$396,700,000, which represents a big increase over last year's allocation. It is interesting to note that when the Labor Parliament was in power in the 1950s it treated Education as a junior portfolio. In fact, the Education Minister was lucky to get a say in Cabinet meetings.

Mr. Houston: You have said that 50 times before.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I have not said it before. Education was sadly neglected.

Mr. Houston: Good scholars were turned out.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It certainly was not as a result of the efforts of the Government that good scholars were turned out. I can assure the honourable member of that.

Money should have been allocated in the Budget to deport some of those Communists out of the country. Unfortunately that was not done. Budgetary consideration should always be given to getting rid of Communists. The Communist organisation in Queensland should be declared illegal. All the assets should be liquidated and the money given to charity at the earliest opportunity.

An Opposition Member: Are you saying they should be shot?

Mr. FRAWLEY: No, they shouldn't be shot, but they should be deported from the country. All premises occupied by them should be declared illegal.

Mr. Yewdale: What has this got to do with the Budget?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am saying that in the Budget money should be allocated to get rid of these Communists. That is what we should have done. We made a bad mistake by not doing it.

Mr. Houston: You want to secede from the Commonwealth.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will continue with his speech.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will be honest with the honourable member. I am a secessionist. If we could secede I would advocate it. But we can't; we must stay in the Commonwealth.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Do you think the Premier should get Beryl out to bomb Tweed Heads?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I think the honourable member for Archerfield should be bombed.

All Communists should be dismissed from employment in any of the Government services. No Communist should be allowed to hold an official position in a trade union. I was a member of a trade union for 20 years. During the time the honourable member for Windsor and I were in the Electrical Trades Union, it was not a Communist organisation as it is today. As the honourable member for Bulimba knows, it is now under the domination of Left-wingers and Communists—and he is a member of it.

Mr. Houston: Don't talk such nonsense.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not accusing the honourable member of being a Communist; I have said that before.

Mr. Jensen: Did you have anything to do with that business of sabotaging petrol?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I had nothing to do with it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will continue with his speech and return to the Budget.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will return to the Budget all right.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about the petrol?

Mr. FRAWLEY: Petrol is not included in the Budget, so I am not allowed to refer to it.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You're too frightened to bucket John Hodges.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not frightened to bucket anybody.

The increase in rail freights by 15 per cent will seriously affect many of the fruit growers in my electorate. Murrumba has many fruit growers in Wamuran, Burpengary and Narangba.

Mr. Houston: You've done their votes. You're all talk.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I haven't done their votes at all. I'll kill the A.L.P. in Murrumba next time. They can send anyone they like to campaign against me and they won't run a drum. That applies to anybody else, for that matter.

The 15 per cent increase in freights is an imposition on the fruit growers, especially those in the Wamuran district, who have to rail their goods to Brisbane. It is a direct imposition on them and I really believe that the 15 per cent was just too much.

Mr. Jensen: They use road transport.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Road transport is used in the Dayboro and Narangba areas; but from Wamuran rail transport is used. This 15 per cent increase in rail freights will be a direct imposition on them.

Mr. Houston: Does the road haulier give concessions on freight as the Railway Department does?

Mr. FRAWLEY: The road transporter has had his costs reduced already. The permit fees have been reduced by a further 50 per cent.

Mr. Houston: Will he pass it on to the consumer?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I hope he does pass it on to the consumer.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the honourable member that I am still in the chair. He is having a conversation with members of the Opposition. I would ask him to return to the Budget.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It seemed to me that members of the Opposition were vitally interested in what I was saying, and I always like to help them. I thought they wanted to know something important about the road permit fees. I was only answering the interjections in order to—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can have that out with them later on.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am sorry, Mr. Gunn. I wish to speak about Housing Commission homes—and that is provided in the Budget.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am protesting at the fact that we have been cut down to 800 houses this year. Not all the blame can be laid at the feet of this Government. Federal money has not come through to build houses. I join with the member for Salisbury in saying that some of the people at the counter at the Housing Commission do not tell the truth all the time. Many people from my electorate go to the Housing Commission and they are told a pack of lies by someone or other. When I ring the Housing Commissioner about it, he denies all knowledge of it and says that everybody on the counter is a saint.

Mr. Yewdale: That's the Minister's job.

Mr. FRAWLEY: How can the Minister be up there to check on what the men behind the counter are saying? They promise people Housing Commission houses. They lead them to believe they are going to get a house in no time flat, when they know full well that that is not so. When people go to the Housing Commission to ask about a house, they should be told the truth. They should be told that they are not going to get a house quickly; but they are led up the garden path. It is time applicants were told the truth.

Mr. Houston: The Government has let them down.

Mr. FRAWLEY: The Government has not let them down at all. It has not let them down one bit.

The Treasurer referred in the Financial Statement to some of the Commonwealth Government expenditure restraints. People should not be fooled by any Federal grants at all. Any money that comes from Canberra is only part of the money paid by Queenslanders in income tax. It is only our own money coming back and it comes back less a large proportion. Whatever the Government in power in Canberra, the money that is given to the States as grants is only our own money being rightfully given back to us.

Mr. Jensen: The price of houses has doubled in the last—

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not worried about the price of houses being doubled. I am worried about the unavailability of houses. Plenty of people will pay double the price to get a house, but they cannot get one. It is not a matter of being worried about the cost. They cannot get the houses even at double the price, so the price does not matter.

A Government Member: Gough caused inflation.

Mr. FRAWLEY: He certainly did. Everyone knows he caused inflation. There is no need to speak about it.

When people are elected to Federal Parliament, they get big, fat, swollen heads and think that they are above State members. They want to get in and roast State members every chance they get. I tell them straight now that any time a Federal member comes to my electorate he will be received with the courtesy that his position demands, but if he starts anything—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! The honourable member is straying from the Budget once again.

Mr. FRAWLEY: With all due respect, Mr. Gunn, I am not the only one. It is a Budget matter. I am referring to the Commonwealth Government expenditure restraints and they are the result of some of these Federal politicians who have got swollen heads and think they can lord it over the States. Mr. Gunn, I believe that I am within my rights in referring to this subject.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am not saying who it is. When I want to do anything in this Chamber, I will do it without any assistance from the Opposition.

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much cross-firing in the Chamber. The honourable member for Murrumba will continue with his speech.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I have been harassed by the Opposition.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member does not have to heed interjections from the Opposition.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It is very hard not to. I should now like to speak about the railways. There is a \$70,700,000 operating loss. I should like any honourable member to tell me of any railway system in Australia that makes a profit. The New South Wales system does not. No railway system that I know of makes a profit. If there is one I should like to be told about it.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am talking about the whole of the State. I know that a profit is made on the haulage of minerals. The Labor Party has been trying to stop that. It does not want us to get it.

Mr. Lester: Would you agree that the railways make a profit in Central Queensland because of the good members there?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I would have to go along with that.

I did not see much in the Budget about the police. I know that there is to be a slight increase in Police Force numbers. There will not be any increase in establishments but the Police Department will be enabled to recruit a further 228 personnel. I hope they are not recruited to fill in these damned, atrocious field interrogation reports, which are an invasion of privacy. The Commissioner of Police (Mr. Whitrod) wants to start some damned private F.B.I. in Queensland of his own making and he wants these field interrogation reports filled in. I know an old lady of 70 years of age who was on her way home from church in Redcliffe. She was stopped by the police and had to answer all of the questions to fill in a field interrogation report. This is a shocking breach of privilege.

An Honourable Member: It is wrong.

Mr. FRAWLEY: It is wrong. It is a breach of privilege. It should be stopped and I hope that the Minister does something about it.

The majority of police constables to whom I have spoken about these field interrogation reports have told me that they are completely against them. Some of them even go through the telephone directory to get names to save the trouble of questioning people, because they do not like filling the reports in.

Mr. Newbery: I will talk to you a bit about that tomorrow.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I assure the Minister that they do not like it.

Mr. Katter: The shadow Minister for Justice pushed the introduction of these reports.

Mr. FRAWLEY: He did some years ago. I am not blaming the Minister for it. He has only been in the saddle for a short while and he has to be given a chance to look at the Police portfolio.

Mr. Houston: Are you blaming Petersen?

Mr. FRAWLEY: No. I am not blaming anybody. A Minister cannot check on every piddling thing that goes on. This is bigger than that and has to be checked.

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

Mr. FRAWLEY: I am addressing the Chair. I am looking straight at you, Mr. Gunn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The honourable member could have fooled me.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Just think of the possibilities if a policeman fills in field interrogation reports by getting names out of a telephone book. He could inadvertently place an innocent person at the scene of a crime. I know that some policemen have gone into cemeteries and copied down the names of people from gravestones, and I have that here in black and white.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! The Chamber will come to order. The honourable member will continue with his speech.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Some policemen have even taken the names out of newspaper death notices to fill in these field interrogation reports because they do not want to do them. The average constable does not want to go and submit people to intimidation in order to fill out these field interrogation reports. I wish one of them would stop me one day and try to get a field interrogation report filled in. I would tell him to go to hell.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Bundaberg will cease interjecting.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I advise everybody in the entire country not to fill in these damned rotten field interrogation reports. They will end up making a private F.B.I. dossier for Whitrod. He will want everybody here fingerprinted. It is about time we got rid of him. If this Government had any guts we would throw him out straight away.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You would be the worst bucket-tipper in Queensland.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will cease interjecting.

Mr. FRAWLEY: The honourable member ought to know. Look at the damn rubbish he tipped. I carry this photograph with me all the time. Look at this big old pair of trousers the honourable member for Archerfield threw into the Blunder. Everyone will recognise them. He wore

those pants here in 1972 when he took the oath, or when he did not take the oath.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FRAWLEY: Look at that! What other posterior would fit into those trousers?

A Government Member: Table it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: A man should table it.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I do not want to be taken off the track any more.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest the honourable member ignore the interjections.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Members have criticised the railway refreshment cars. I have heard the honourable member for Bundaberg carry on here about railway refreshment cars. I have heard the honourable member for Windsor and other Government members criticise them. The food in those refreshment cars is damned good if a person wants to eat plain, wholesome food. But if people want fancy six-course meals with caviare, what the hell do they expect on any railway line? They serve decent meals for people who want to eat plain, wholesome food.

Mr. JENSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has never travelled on the "Sunlander" or the "Capricornian". He only lives in Caboolture and he doesn't know what the food is like.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no valid point of order.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I have travelled on the "Sunlander", not because I wanted to but just to see what the service was like. I travelled to Townsville to the electorate of the honourable member for Townsville South, and he welcomed me right royally. He gave me a damned good time.

Mr. Jensen: How would you know?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I once travelled on the "Sunlander" to Sarina in the electorate of the Minister of Police and the food was excellent. I am not going to stand here and let anybody criticise it. The honourable member for Windsor is one of the worst offenders. He is always criticising the griddle-cars on the "Sunlander".

Mr. Moore: It is a shocking indictment of the Government.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much cross-fire in the Chamber.

Mr. FRAWLEY: The griddle-cars serve decent food and I am not going to let any member criticise them. It is all right

if a person wants a six-course meal with wine and beer; he should travel by T.A.A. and not the "Sunlander". But if people want decent, wholesome meals, then they should use the griddle-car on the "Sunlander" because there is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. Gunn, because you have so cruelly stopped me from getting across some of the very important points I wanted to make tonight, I am going to resume my seat right now.

Mr. NEAL (Balonne) (7.39 p.m.): In rising to speak in the Budget debate I would like to congratulate the Honourable Bill Knox on his election as Leader of the Liberal Party in our coalition Government and also on his elevation to the job which goes with it, that of the Treasury portfolio. I am sure he will do a good job in that portfolio, and I look forward to his occupying that position for many years and introducing many good Budgets.

I would also like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Sir Gordon Chalk, who had been Treasurer for a long time and did an extremely good job in his handling of the finances of this State.

In supporting the Treasurer in the introduction of the Budget, I also acknowledge the difficulties under which it has been brought down. Although I am happy with most of the Budget provisions, there are areas about which I must express some concern.

Over the last decade we have witnessed a decline in the profitability of the rural sector, especially during the years when the Labor Government was in office in Canberra. Rural producers, as we all know, are dependent on seasons and, in the main, export markets for the goods they produce. Some commodity prices have increased; others have decreased. On the other hand, costs have escalated enormously. The primary producer, being on the end of the line, is compelled to take what he gets for his product and at the same time absorb the escalating costs. He cannot pass on these costs. He has absorbed them to a degree by increased efficiency over the years. However, he cannot continue to absorb them.

The loss of profitability not only affects the primary producer; it also affects people living in the towns and surrounding districts. I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee an article published in the last edition of "The Queensland Grain-grower", in which it was stated that primary producers have run up a debt of \$500,000,000. It says—

"Australian primary producers incurred a huge \$500,000,000 in debts during 1975-76.

"According to the Reserve Bank, this is a 28 per cent increase in the level of rural borrowings from the major trading banks.

"Among the loans was \$108,000,000 in new borrowings for farm development—a 60 per cent increase on the previous year and a significant measure of confidence within the rural sector.

"The bank also approved \$31,000,000 in rural term loans, which is 21 per cent more than 1974-75, while overdraft approvals ran up by 22 per cent to \$358,000,000—a pointer to the precarious economic position of farmers."

As that article says, this has been interpreted as a significant measure of confidence within the rural sector but also as a pointer to the precarious economic position of farmers. That is the very point I wish to make, as absolute chaos would result in the event of any significant fall in commodity prices. Beef and wool prices have increased marginally at present. However, they are still nowhere near a really profitable level. Wheat prices have dropped in the last year and are down \$40-odd a tonne. If there were a general slump, the rural sector would not be able to service this debt. Of course, this is exactly the situation that exists now in the beef industry.

For many years much has been said about the need for a rural bank. Primary producers have special borrowing needs. They experience either a flood or famine, and over the last few years it has been mostly famine. Lending institutions usually charge at least 11 to 14 per cent interest. Hire-purchase companies—and I think that at this stage that should be spelt "higher" not "hire"—charge in the vicinity of 18 per cent interest, sometimes more. When times are favourable, primary producers could probably meet their commitments quite easily. However, when times are unfavourable—that is, in drought years, when there is a slump in prices or crop failures, or a combination of any or all of these factors—they have difficulty in meeting their interest bills, let alone meeting redemptions. This is when they are in trouble.

Many are already paying interest on interest. A more favourable interest rate, with repayments reduced because of the longer spread, would have beneficial effects, especially if producers are able to get the majority of their borrowings under the one roof. It would have the effect of a restructuring of their debts similar to that being done at present by the Rural Reconstruction Board. It would allow the borrower to retain a greater share of his income for directing into areas of increased production or purchasing drought bonds or making any other investment as a hedge against bad times in the future. Normally primary producers do not have carry-over funds and they are unable to meet their commitments when they are hit by bad times. I sincerely hope the Federal Government honours its promise to establish a Rural Bank at the earliest possible moment.

It has been most disturbing to learn that owing to early overcommittal of funds the Agricultural Bank is unable to accept new clients and is forced to restrict its operations to existing clients. I know the Minister has been doing all in his power to correct this situation, and I hope that the problem can be overcome in the near future. The Agricultural Bank's activities should be broadened so that it can offer greater scope to borrowers and thereby take up some of the slack in lending to which I previously referred.

I have said that the Budget contains certain areas of concern. I refer particularly to the huge losses incurred by the Railway Department. In 1975-76 the department incurred an operating loss of \$70,700,000 before provision is made for charges of \$26,500,000 applicable to the railway general debt and for a real loss of \$135,000,000 on general operations without mineral profits. Whilst we do not like to see the Railway Department incur such huge losses, we must admit that it provides an essential service. Therefore we have to learn to live with these losses. I would not suggest for one moment, however, that we should not strive for increased efficiency and economy.

I am not happy with the 15 per cent increase in rail freights. It is another imposition on people living in western areas, where freight is paid two ways—on output items to market and on input items to the towns and districts. Freight costs affect all the people of the West and of other towns far removed from the cities and seaboard.

On a brighter note—it is pleasing that beef producers will continue to receive rebated freights to the tune of \$4,000,000. This measure is a worth-while contribution to the beef industry, which is going through hard times at present.

The decision not to increase grain freights is a wise one. There is no disputing the fact that the haulage of grain is a profitable operation. However, the stage is being reached where grain freights will reach saturation point and where any further increase in rail freights will result only in more intense competition from road transport. It would be most unreasonable to expect grain growers to use the dearer form of transportation for the cartage of their product.

Further increases in grain rail freights would have the following adverse effects: roads would be clogged by heavy trucks; roads would be damaged; there would be an increase in the number of traffic hazards; and the Railway Department would incur even greater losses. Rail haulage is the most convenient form of transport of grain. However, it must remain competitive.

The two major forms of internal transport are rail and road. Countless millions of dollars are invested in both methods. With rail transport we can pin down capital investment, running costs, maintenance, improvements and revenue, with the result that we

know the actual losses and where they are incurred. It is an entirely different matter with our system of roads. We get indirect revenue from excise on fuel levied by the Commonwealth Government, and registration and other duties and fees levied on road users, whether they use roads for profit or pleasure, and transport fees which are being phased out as promised. While we know how much revenue is derived from these sources and the capital invested, as well as road improvement and maintenance costs, there is no way of estimating the profitability or non-profitability of our roads.

For instance, we cannot say that a particular road has shown a profit or loss as we can with a railway line, unless it is the Hornibrook Highway or a similar one that is being considered. We expect to have good roads and accept that they will cost millions of dollars every year. I believe that we must treat rail services in a similar manner.

This leads me to a consideration of a fairer means of taxing road users by imposing a fuel tax, which would replace charges such as vehicle registration, third-party insurance and road maintenance tax, etc. A fuel tax would provide a much broader system of vehicle-taxing. In other words those who use the roads would pay in proportion to the use they make of them. Present exemptions such as those applying to the earth-moving industry, the mining industry, vehicles used by the Commonwealth, the State, local government and primary producers (which includes duty-free distillate) would have to be safeguarded. The tax would be collected automatically and could not be avoided. People who use their cars would pay directly for the amount of road use. Those persons with a second car sitting in a shed for much of the year would also pay in relation to their use of the roads.

The Commissioner for Transport referred in his annual report to a fuel tax. Such a tax would be a much fairer way of levying road users. However, we must be assured that the money collected from any such tax is returned to the Main Roads Department for construction and maintenance of roads. We should accept this principle and get on with the job.

The abolition of succession duty and gift duty, the increase in the pay-roll tax exemption and land tax exemption are all worth-while Budget provisions which will afford a measure of relief. Succession duties have always been regarded by many people as an unjust tax. I have seen many instances of extreme hardship and heart-break caused by this tax. It is a tax on assets and ownership, not a tax on earnings. No consideration has ever been given to the profitability of a business or its capacity to pay. The only concession given has been deferral of payment, but in the past the tax has had to be met in full. It gives me pleasure to speak in this Budget debate because the

abolition of succession duties by this Government is a milestone in the history of this State. People are taxed throughout their lives. It has always been accepted that parents want to hand down their assets to their children. In many cases the children would have contributed a great deal towards the building up of the estate. With the abolition of succession duties, obviously gift duty had to go as well. I am certainly pleased to be associated with that measure in the Budget.

Pay-roll tax has had a dampening effect on small business over the years, especially in years of high inflation. Small business is still battling the effects of inflation. That tax is levied without consideration to profitability or the capacity to pay. Consideration should be given to relief from that tax as an incentive to decentralisation. While I believe the increase in the exemption levels is long overdue, it will be beneficial, and it is hoped that certain benefits will flow on from the incentives and savings that result from the increase in levels of exemption.

Land tax is another impost that bears no relation to profitability or capacity to pay. It, too, is a tax on ownership—a tax on assets. The increases in exemptions in this Budget are also worthy of support.

I have previously referred to the further reduction of road transport fees. Many operators have avoided the payment of these fees over the years wherever and whenever they could. As a result honest operators have been penalised for doing the right thing and paying.

Dr. Crawford: The others have slipped over the border and come back.

Mr. NEAL: They don't have to slip over the border. They just don't get permits.

The honest operator has been penalised for doing the right thing, because the price he has quoted takes into consideration the road permit fees. When he is tendering against somebody who has not been paying those charges, obviously he must be at a competitive disadvantage. So I am pleased to see this 50 per cent reduction, which was promised some time ago. That is 50 per cent of the two-thirds that was left after the reduction in the Budget last year.

I now turn to education. The Treasurer has said that the increases in the various forms of assistance will ensure that existing levels of service are maintained. As outlined in the Budget document, the total allocation of the Department of Education this year is some \$396,700,000, which is \$67,600,000 or 20.5 per cent above the 1975-76 allocation. The Treasurer went on to say—

“This increase results in the main from the costs of 1975-76 Award and Basic Wage increases, the additional requirement of the full year's cost of increased numbers of teachers and other staff employed for only part of 1975-76 and a

provision for the increase of costs generally for the last year. However, it also provides for a further moderate level of improvement in education services in accordance with the continuing effort to improve educational standards that has been a feature of the policies of this Government."

Whilst I agree with that concept, I also agree with the tenets of the Budget as outlined by the Treasurer, especially when he said that there will be no significant expansion of Government services. There are some acceptable increases in payments, but, although we hope that the education system will continue on its way, we have to see where economies can be made in our departments. It is pleasing to see that the per-capita grants to non-Government schools are to be increased from 1 January next year.

Another pleasing matter is that school-bus operators will benefit from a lift in the rate of payments as from 1 November. Perhaps we should look at a new formula here, because some of the operators have conditions that are entirely different from those of other bus operators. Bus operators in my area use gravel roads. The consequence is that they have much higher running and repair costs. When their conditions are compared with those of a bus operator using bitumen roads, the men using the unfavourable roads are at a distinct disadvantage. Surely some consideration should be given to this problem.

Another problem exists in relation to conveyance allowances. I know that these allowances are not a very significant part of the Budget, but conveying children to school is an inconvenience to the people concerned. It costs a considerable amount of money to get children to a school. While the increase in the allowance for the conveyance of students in private vehicles is welcomed, many children in rural areas are conveyed to school in station vehicles which are very heavy on fuel. If the distance is 4.8 km, the increased amount of \$57 per annum is payable for the conveyance of one child to a school in a station vehicle. If two children travel in the same vehicle, the allowance doubles and there is an increase for each extra child conveyed. If four children are conveyed in one vehicle, the owner gets four times the amount of money received by his neighbour who takes only one child in a similar type of vehicle.

I note also that additional finance has been arranged to cater for the increased number of remedial services and units for physically handicapped children in special schools and that 42 teacher aides will be engaged in 1977. This is a step in the right direction. Teachers in some schools for the handicapped are at a disadvantage because of the children whom they have to try to assist and educate. Their need for teacher aides is far greater than it is in the normal school situation.

Another matter I should like to refer to concerns the senior remote area scholarship. The introduction of this scholarship last year was welcomed, but I believe that there is a need to ease the means test for eligibility. If a person is isolated, it does not matter whether he has one child or five children, he still has to send them away to school. A person who is just eligible under the means test and has one child away at school is in a far better position than his neighbour who cannot meet the means test and has two or three children away at school. I believe that the means test has to be looked at and that families with two or three kiddies who, by reason of remoteness, have to board their children at school must be taken into account.

Another problem which has arisen, and I hope the Minister for Education will look into this matter, concerns a study that was undertaken earlier in the year by the Isolated Children's Parents' Association. In its report it said—

"Members who undertook the study found that total lack of knowledge of the Scheme, combined with poor understanding by those who 'had heard there was some sort of a scheme', led back to the one factor communication. Parents, in particular those residing in the country and with children already at Boarding School were already aware of various forms of assistance available, and the Department's action in sending an application form direct to each parent who was receiving the State 'Remote Area Allowance', accounted for the fact that most scholarships went to children who already were at boarding schools."

So I hope that those children who are without the assistance of a State remote-area scholarship will be able to get an education. I sincerely hope that the Minister will ensure that this scheme is widely advertised and that school principals and parents are informed so that the parents of children attending these schools will know all about it and be able to participate in the scheme if they are eligible.

Dr. Crawford: A lot of people don't know it exists.

Mr. NEAL: That is dead right; a lot of people do not know it exists and that is why many of the scholarships were not taken up.

Another matter I wish to refer to is the provision of high schools in certain country areas. I have raised this matter quite a number of times in this Chamber, and I say again that I believe that the numbers required for the establishment of high schools in some of our remote areas have to be lowered or there will never be high schools in those areas and many children will just not be able to obtain a higher education. I believe that we as a Government have to accept that. Naturally I have to be parochial in this instance and state the case for St. George, where people have been struggling for many, many years to try to get the numbers necessary for the establishment of a high school.

While they have been knocking on the door for many, many years, they are only now obtaining the appropriate numbers and I hope that we can see the establishment of a high school in St. George in the very near future.

Another matter which concerns me is the introduction of Medibank.

Mr. Elliott: It concerns a lot of people.

Mr. NEAL: That is right, but this scheme that was thrust upon us by Mr. Hayden in my opinion is nothing but an utter scheme.

Mr. Houston: It was going all right under Labor.

Mr. NEAL: It was never going any good, and it never will go any good. I wish we had never gone into this scheme; I wish we had never seen it. People come to me and say, "We don't know what the scheme is about. We don't know which scheme to enter." It is nothing but a complete mess.

Mr. Houston: That's your own fault. Your own Government did that.

Mr. NEAL: That is fair enough. I am lodging my objections, and I am pleased to see that the honourable member is against it. He was not against it when Mr. Hayden introduced it.

Mr. Houston: Because everyone was covered.

Mr. NEAL: No; the honourable member thinks it is a great scheme. The honourable member for Bulimba loves this scheme. He did not object when Mr. Hayden introduced it. He thought it was lovely, but he is starting to object to it now. He will object to it all right, especially when he gets 2½ per cent knocked off his taxable income. But the thing I object to most strongly is the compulsion of this scheme. Ever since I became a wage earner I have been a member of a medical benefits scheme, and that was my choice. I believe the people should have the right to choose. I believe they should have the right to say whether they are going into Medibank or whether—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What do you think about three-cornered contests?

Mr. NEAL: The honourable member himself is three-cornered and he comes to a point at the top. He wouldn't know.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will cease interjecting.

Mr. NEAL: I am saying that I believe we should have the right either to join Medibank, join a private fund of our own choosing or stay right out of the lot. For the life of me, I cannot see why a scheme similar to that which operated in Queensland could not have been adopted earlier. At least people had a choice under those circumstances. They knew what was available;

they knew what they could get. It was quite good, although I will admit that there could have been deficiencies.

Mr. Marginson: Fraser made it compulsory. What are you talking about?

Mr. NEAL: I am not going to argue with the honourable member about that.

Let me turn now to the 2½ per cent levy. It leaves a bitter taste in my mouth and in the mouths of many people in my area, because they will be paying 2½ per cent of their taxable income for medical services that are not available out there. As far as I am concerned, Medibank is nothing but a Frankenstein monster. It will not do anything but gobble up untold millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. It should never have been called Medibank; it should have been called Mudbank, because we are stuck with it!

I believe that it is in a person's interest to see a doctor or get medication if he is sick. That is his prerogative, and surely it is in his own interest to remain healthy. I have no objection to paying tax to assist persons in unfortunate or necessitous circumstances, but I do object to paying a tax to keep a bunch of hypochondriacs on pills or to enable someone to take an unwarranted "sickie".

I should have liked to deal with a number of other matters, but I am receiving notes—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Sit down!

Mr. NEAL: I will not sit down on the honourable member's say-so.

As to local authorities—I am pleased to see in the Budget that the State Government will maintain its assistance at a level not lower than in the past. Although that is not what one would have hoped for, it is better than a reduction.

The aggregate grant to local government from the Commonwealth Grants Commission has increased from \$13,800,000 to \$24,200,000—75 per cent—and this is very welcome. Local authorities have faced problems over quite a number of years, and it must be remembered that they play an important part in our community. In fact, in many areas they are one of the largest employers of the work-force.

In conclusion, I again say that the Treasurer, in his first Budget, has presented a blueprint for keeping the State on an even keel in very difficult times, and I congratulate him for that even though, as I said earlier—

Mr. Houston: Oh!

Mr. NEAL: Before the honourable member for Bulimba came into the Chamber I said that there were areas of concern and areas about which I was not entirely happy. As is always the case, I must take the good with the bad.

Dr. CRAWFORD (Wavell) (8.13 p.m.): The Budget debate gives all honourable members an opportunity to see whether the State's dollar is being spent wisely and with due regard for the general needs of the State, and I believe that we all attempt at this time to bring our thoughts to bear on matters that concern us as individuals and perhaps on matters that need to be considered for the general welfare of the State as a whole.

I should like to discuss tonight some aspects of the treatment of psychiatric patients in this State and to refer to the recent past history that has resulted in some change to the Acts associated with the administration of the mental health in Queensland.

The 1973-74 Act, as I have remarked before in this Chamber, was no credit to the Government and has in fact been described as a confidence trick because it was placed on the table and allowed to lie there for six months, with the proviso that submissions could be accepted and that the Minister at the time would look at those submissions and see whether the more worthwhile of them could be incorporated into the Act. That, of course, was never carried out, and I do not believe it was ever the Minister's intention to carry it out.

It is difficult to change procedures that have traditionally been carried out in a particular manner, either in government or in business. We need to realise that times change and that we must take a new look at certain matters, trying to determine the best method by which a particular piece of legislation can be amended so that patients and others to whom it applies can be treated with the greatest possible dispatch and expertise.

Years ago, if a person sat on his veranda in a Jacky Howe singlet he was considered to be a blot on the landscape; nowadays, if he sits on his patio in a Hawaiian shirt he is considered to be a typical example of gracious living. That illustrates the way things have changed in our society.

As to lack of change in our mental health system, early this year we had the undignified exhibition of Messrs. Gardiner and Wilson, who made hysterical comments about the way the Mental Health Act was functioning. As a result of that, no advance whatever was made with respect to the overall functioning of these facilities in the community.

It has always appeared to me that the important parts of the Mental Health Act are those concerning mental health tribunals and the official visitors. The latter, traditionally, are a combination of doctor and lawyer. Over the years they have played a useful role, but they have not been allowed to function to the full. Although official visitors are not necessarily attached to the Health Department, they are in many respects employed by it or under its auspices. This is a disadvantage.

Although a member of this Parliament or any individual can ask that the official visitors call upon a particular person to determine whether he is being treated justly or otherwise, this does not necessarily mean that action that is advantageous to the patient will be taken. I have seen examples of this over the years.

The difficulty lies in ensuring that a just admission to hospital of a patient with acute mental illness actually occurs in practice. In the past this has been most difficult. When I was in general practice many years ago, the police would not take action unless the person who was suspected of suffering from mental illness actually injured someone, say, with an axe, a hatchet or what-have-you. Fortunately that is only a past memory.

For many years problems have arisen with respect to this whole process of attending to mental health. The community regards as mental health problems certain problems that do not fall into that category. I refer particularly to alcoholism, drug addiction and criminal activities associated with those problems. These days, for example, youngsters break into chemist shops and doctors' surgeries seeking drugs. Problems of this type will continue to arise and, whereas in the past they were considered to be associated with mental health, nowadays they should be divorced from the aspect of treatment of the average psychiatric patient.

Dependency problems in our community are generally becoming crystallised. It is true that between 5 and 10 per cent of the community have dependency problems. Literature shows fairly conclusively that people are dependent on a whole range of artificial aids, such as alcohol, nicotine, marijuana, heroin and barbiturates. But the important matter is the position of the person who is dependent. His dependency is determined more or less fortuitously by whichever drug with which he happens to come into contact.

The community is faced with another emerging problem and one of grave concern. Recently I attended a seminar on the problems created by young motor-cyclists. It would appear that Queensland is spending over \$3,000,000 each year on the treatment of results of motor-cycle accidents.

Mr. Jensen: There are so many rat-bags.

Dr. CRAWFORD: That is not wholly true. About 15 per cent of fatal road accidents now involve motor-cycles. As well as that, honourable members may be interested to hear that approximately 50 per cent of the operating time of orthopaedic surgeons is taken up in attending to people who have been injured in motor-cycle accidents.

There are two matters of importance in this. The first is that we grant a licence to motor-cyclists at a very immature age and we have no provision whatsoever in our code with respect to whether that person is thoroughly trained in handling a powerful machine. Secondly, I believe that we

should take appropriate action. We should set up by legislation, if necessary, a training programme for young motor-cyclists, and, although it would go against vested interests, we should have a programme in the community by which a licence for riding a powerful motor-cycle is not granted to a person until he is a very experienced driver. The present situation is causing very grave concern to doctors, particularly orthopaedic surgeons. The stage has almost been reached where a 960 c.c. motor-cycle ridden by an inexperienced driver is an inevitable accident combination in which he may well be killed.

Mr. Jensen: Why don't you do something about it?

Dr. CRAWFORD: I am trying to do something about it now. That is why I am talking about it.

When the 1973 Mental Health Act was being considered the Australian Psychological Society made a submission which in no way influenced the subsequent legislation. It was concerned with the individual rights of the patient, and particularly with what it considered to be the neglect of patients. It stated—

"Section 59 of the Act dealing with possible ill-treatment of patients is one of the few sections of the Mental Health Bill which explicitly states the consequences to others of their violating the patient's individual rights. It was unacceptable to psychologists that the term 'security hospital' is excluded from clause 20 of this section. The section as a whole may be taken presently to imply that wilful neglect or ill-treatment of the patient is permissible within a security hospital. It was recommended that the Act should be rewritten to more clearly accord with the cardinal principles on which the Bill has been based. It should affirm quite unambiguously that wilful neglect of a patient is reprehensible regardless of the setting in which it occurs. This section of the Act should also be rewritten to acknowledge the right of the patient to institute proceedings concerning an alleged offence without first having to gain the prior consent of any person. Section 59 (3) should indicate, then, that initiation of proceedings is not dependent first on the judgment of the director-general."

Secondly, under the heading "Correspondence of Patients" it was submitted—

"Section 53 of the Act dealing with the correspondence of patients is excessively restrictive and it violates the basic tenet that no one should be subjected to unnecessary or arbitrary interference with his privacy. The Act does not make explicit any reason why outgoing mail should be interfered with by the hospital administrator."

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! The Chair has made repeated requests for less audible conversation in the Chamber. Until that is achieved, the debate will not be resumed.

Dr. CRAWFORD: It was submitted that as the Act is presently written it is dishonestly expressed and there is no way of making the necessary judgments about appropriate reasons for interference without interfering with correspondence in the first instance.

Under the heading "Official Visitor" it was submitted that in the judgment of the society—

"Such is the importance of the mechanism of 'official visitor' to this Act that section 12 of the Act should be rewritten to state that the Governor in Council 'should' (not 'may') from time to time, appoint, in relation to any hospital or any part of the State, two or more official visitors. These visitors serve in a valuable way to protect the interests and welfare of the patient and the Act here must therefore recognize explicitly that visitors should consult with individual patients, and not just the 'hospital to which he or they may be appointed'.

"The Australian Psychological Society endorses the viewpoint that has been expressed by others that the functions of the 'official visitor' must be made meaningful to patients under custody. A mechanism should be established to protect the rights of the individual by informing all concerned that such a 'visitor' exists. And when the appropriate avenue of communication is set up, all patients together with their next of kin should be informed as to their rights under the Act. The requirement should be written into the Act under section 13."

Dr. Edwards: That is done in a booklet now.

Dr. CRAWFORD: I am pleased to hear it.

Under the heading "Mental Health Review Tribunals", the submission continued—

"Sections of the Bill dealing with Mental Health Review Tribunals (sections 14, 15 and Sixth Schedule) constitute an important part of the Act and as such the procedures that are laid down should be phrased carefully. The Act should stipulate the functions and structure of the tribunals in unambiguous fashion and in a way that shows sensitive appreciation of the rights of the patient. Section 14 (3) of the Act should be rewritten to ensure that the patient himself is represented at the tribunals and that the judgments of responsible professionals are sought as widely as possible across relevant disciplines—paramedical as well as medical. The tribunals themselves must be independent of the Department of Health, and the membership structure of them should represent primarily those persons whose expertise and training are directly related to the areas of 'mental illness' most often considered."

Under the general heading "Matters of Professional Concern" the submission continued—

"(i) Problems of definition within the Act.

The lack of definition in the Act of the term 'mental illness' creates problems which are of concern to this society. Recognising that it is impossible to provide an adequate,

comprehensive definition of mental illness that is satisfactory for the purposes of the Act, or would remain viable over time, the society is of the opinion that more precise criteria can nevertheless be laid down by means of which mental illness can be distinguished from other states. Drug dependence, alcoholism, mental retardation and criminal misdemeanour, which are distinct from mental illness, should be excluded from the Act. These states may nevertheless require separate legislation.

The definition of 'treatment' is misdirected in the Act. In section 5 (lines 35-38) the term 'where necessary' should be eliminated from the Act to avoid the inference that persons relating to this Act need to be detained for medical reasons only. The definition of 'treatment' should read: 'includes any form of treatment, including medical treatment, training, education, psychological treatment, supervision, social rehabilitation, help and advice.'

With respect to treatment, section 18 of the Act (Application for admission) should be expanded to read 'Regulated admissions shall be entitled to such care and treatment as is necessary in order to ensure their return to the community in as short a period as is reasonable.'

"(ii) Enlisting Relevant Professional Aid.

If essential ambiguity is to remain within the Act with respect to the definition of mental illness, the Act must take every step to minimise patients being classified misleadingly. Specifically, it is essential that firm safeguards be built into the Act to reduce the risk that a person will be admitted to a psychiatric institution who is not, in fact, 'mentally ill'. It is the opinion of this society that this risk is reduced substantially by acknowledging the necessity for the responsible medical practitioner to enlist the aid of other professional workers when the boundaries of his competence have been exceeded with respect to the individual patient who is being admitted. Such persons include clinical psychologists, social workers and other paramedicals."

In the same submissions, which I repeat were prepared in the period 1973-74, the same society dealt with compulsory detention, visiting and examination, information to patients about the circumstances in which they were placed and assumption of long-term illness. In recent times, because we are again in the situation that that Act has its faults, I have made some inquiries from learned bodies with regard to changes to the current Act. The Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, in answer to a request of mine, informed me that it was worried about the admission of patients and the position of a person after he has been detained and when he wished to remove himself from a place of detention. It is also concerned about the regulated admissions under section 18 of the Act and removal to places of safety by a warrant or by a police officer, and the protection of the

rights of patients in regard to the operation of the Mental Health Tribunal. In its submission it said—

"The council considers that, in applying the standards of natural justice which are accepted in our community, a patient should be given as free and as unfettered a right as possible to go before the Mental Health Review Tribunal and furthermore that he should have the right to appear before that tribunal as of right by his legal representative and/or other professional adviser and with the leave of the tribunal by such other person as he may designate if he does not wish to appear himself. It is the council's view that before a tribunal hearing takes place, unless it is established to the tribunal's satisfaction that it would be deleterious to the patient to have information, all information on the patient's file should be made available to the patient or his professional advisers so that he may cross-examine thereon or draw evidence in rebuttal if it should be available. Furthermore, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the tribunal that to do so would be detrimental to the patient's health, the tribunal's decision and reasons therefor should be communicated to the patient."

"Dealing with the admissions of patients in general—it is worth remembering for a moment some of the provisions of the Act as it now exists. The Mental Health Act 1974" (which is the Act I mentioned before) "provides for a system of voluntary admission as opposed to systems of (i) regulated admissions and (ii) removal to places of safety by a warrant or by a police officer."

"The council feels some dissatisfaction with the method of regulated admissions and removal to places of safety upon a warrant. Except in the case of emergency where immediate action is required to safeguard either the patient or his property or the public or any property notice ought to be given by an applicant or an informant that it is the intention of that applicant or informant to take steps to have the person detained in a hospital."

"Section 18 of the Act which deals with regulated admissions provides that a person may be admitted to a hospital, other than a special hospital, upon an application for admission founded upon a medical recommendation. When application for admission is made by a relative of a person the subject of the application, it must be supported by a medical practitioner who has heard over a period of time that relative's version of the facts. It can be appreciated that if the medical practitioner is not familiar with the person to be examined in any real sense, then, upon the examination actions which may have an otherwise innocent explanation on the part of the person examined, may well appear to have a more sinister context in the light of the medical practitioner's preconditioning. Without notice of the examination and of the application for admission a prospective

patient is prevented from coherently and cogently placing his version of the facts before the examining medical practitioner and he is prevented from effectively obtaining other medical advice. Under the old Act where a hearing which took place before a stipendiary magistrate sometimes revealed that the factual matters alleged by applicants were in fact false or mistaken and on ascertaining the facts as they truly were it was quickly shown that the proposed patient was not mentally ill at all. In the present situation as the Act now stands, the patient is not able in many cases to fully canvass the facts before the examining doctor. If he is detained shortly after the medical recommendation is given he may also be effectively prevented or at least delayed in establishing his version of the facts after he has been detained in hospital. It must be remembered that a situation has existed in the past where, when a false story has been alleged by one or more people against a proposed patient in the absence of a resolution of the factual controversy when the facts are disputed by the patient, the doctor is left in a state of quandary and must of course be cautious."

"The council considers that a patient ought to be able to be represented as of right before the Mental Health Tribunal by his barrister or solicitor. As the tribunal is operating in the developing area of social welfare it may also be the case that certain other professional persons such as a medical practitioner, a social worker, a psychologist and so on, ought also to appear as of right before the tribunal on behalf of the patient. The patient should also have the general right to be represented by such other person as he may require and authorise in writing subject to the leave of the tribunal in regard to non-professional persons. It is noted that section 70 of the Act reserves certain fundamental powers to a Supreme Court judge for the protection of a patient. In addition to that protection which must be regarded as a protection of last resort because of the necessary formal technicality of an application to the Supreme Court the council considers that it would be proper in the circumstances for a right of appeal to exist from a determination of the tribunal. The tribunal is a specialised tribunal in the administrative law sense and no doubt an appellate court would be loath to interfere with the findings of fact of such a tribunal unless they were manifestly incorrect. The approach of an appellate court however to errors of law on the part of the tribunal would no doubt be such that any error in law would be corrected readily by the appellate court."

"The patient ought to have the same rights of appeal as the director. In that regard the council would recommend that section 15 (9) be recast so as to provide a general right of appeal by way of an application to a Supreme Court judge to set aside any order of the tribunal and that such application is able to be made by either the patient or the director."

The Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists also has an opinion about these matters. It has always envisaged difficulties which of course arise from any Act in respect of the way in which the Act was used by members of the medical and other professions, and it realised that it is necessary that there be good quality of information provided in all cases in which certification takes place under a Mental Health Act. It was felt by the college that no Mental Health Act can be effectively applied unless hospitals for the treatment of the mentally ill are adequately staffed, and the Government should give due consideration to this aspect of proper staffing of institutions. An autocratic approach to staffing of any hospital by any Health Department is, I believe, unacceptable in this day and age, and constantly needs revision.

I heard recently of a British migrant doctor who was coming out on a plane and was met quite accidentally by an Australian doctor. The British migrant doctor was being appointed to a hospital in Charleville. He was very excited because he realised he was coming to Australia and was looking forward to doing some surfing. When he inquired from the other doctor about the possibility of doing surfing, he was somewhat disappointed. That is a true story.

Dr. Edwards: No doctor has been appointed to Charleville for the past five years.

Dr. CRAWFORD: This might not have occurred recently, but that was the story I was told. The College of Psychiatrists said that some patients who appear before the Mental Health Review Tribunal are given an inadequate explanation, and it is necessary that the difficulties which they have in the presentation of their case should be appreciated. It may be advisable to have some lay advocate to assist them in the presentation of their case to the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

It was thought by the College of Psychiatrists that medical practitioners generally were not familiar with the new Act—I think this is important—and that the Health Department should consider circulating medical practitioners with some explanatory notes relating to the 1974 Mental Health Act and provide doctors in practice with the necessary forms for medical recommendations and applications for admissions under the Act. It also felt that the Government should consider moves towards the appointment and training of mental health welfare officers. People to whom I have spoken are very emphatic about this point. These mental health welfare officers should be attached to the psychiatric units of general hospitals and mental hospitals and they would then be available to assist the courts and the police in the ascertainment, follow-up and after-care of the mentally ill.

It was felt by the College of Psychiatrists that the documentation provided on the relevant forms and supplementary documentation

about the clinical histories of patients was at times not adequate with regard to the certification of patients to psychiatric admission centres or to mental hospitals.

It also said that the Government could consider setting up a body to review the documentation provided when patients are certified and to see that these documents are being adequately prepared and used by medical practitioners and other persons utilising the Mental Health Act. Such a body may also see a role in ascertaining that adequate treatment facilities are provided for those patients who are certified under this Act.

As the College of Psychiatrists pointed out, there is always discussion and always great difficulty regarding the actual definition of the term "mental illness" as it appears in the Mental Health Act. Other definitions have been suggested, but I think it is important that there should be no ambiguity whatsoever, and certainly no confusion, so that the term "mental illness" should not be used to cover cases of drunkenness and psychopathic anti-social behaviour which does not involve mental disorders as such.

The Australian Psychological Society, whose previous submissions in 1973-74 I have mentioned already, is also, of course, interested in revising the current Act, and one important point is that the Mental Health Review Tribunal as currently construed under the Act would not be able to review each case for regulated admission. It is physically very difficult. Hence in its view there is a need to reconstitute these tribunals.

Its other main point is that official visitors, who, as I said before, provide checks and counter-checks with regard to the activity and the treatment which the patient has received, should be continued and expanded to provide a legal safeguard for patients. This then raises the possibility of creating a hospital ombudsman or patient advocate to fulfil this role.

The third major problem to which the Psychological Society wishes to direct its attention is that of forensic and restricted admissions. This organisation has provided an appropriate form of words which I will bring to the notice of the Committee.

The three major points which I will reiterate are: the definition of mental illness; the role of official visitors; and the admission and treatment of patients. It is difficult to define the term "mental illness" and perhaps the term "mental disorder" is a better one, as long as one realises that this term does not include the drug addict, the alcoholic or the mentally retarded person.

It is said by the society that the role of official visitors should provide a protective safeguard for the welfare of individual patients. However, as stated in the submission which the society made in 1973, the roles and function of the "official visitor" need to be extended under the Act to incorporate the following principles:—

"(i) The mechanism is too important merely to allow the possibility of an appointment of an official visitor. The appointment of official visitors should be mandatory under the Act.

(ii) The official visitor should consult with individual patients.

(iii) The function of the official visitor must be made meaningful to all patients and their families.

(iv) The official visitors require supervisory powers.

(v) The appointment of the official visitor should be extended to incorporate a range of practising professionals in the field of mental health."

The Australian Psychological Society therefore recommends that the following sections of the Act be reworded as follows:—

"12. Official Visitors. (1) The Governor in Council shall appoint, in relation to any hospital or any part of the State, three or more official visitors, one of whom shall be a medical practitioner, one a barrister-at-law, a solicitor, a stipendiary magistrate, or person qualified for appointment as a stipendiary magistrate, and one a practising professional in the field of mental health care, other than a medical practitioner.

(2) Official visitors shall have such functions, powers, and duties as are or may be prescribed and all or any of such prescribed functions, powers and duties may differ in relation to different official visitors appointed for the same hospital or part of the State. Where a matter brought to the attention of the official visitors requires immediate attention they shall take such action as is deemed necessary. Where such responsibility is exercised, however, a written report shall be forwarded immediately to the Director.

"13. Visits by Official Visitors. (1) Each of the official visitors shall visit every hospital to which he may be appointed and every hospital which by the regulations he is required to so visit once at least in every month and shall make special visits concerning the administration of this Act or particular matters at such times as the Minister or the Director-General or Director may direct. When it is reasonably practicable the visitors shall consult with individual patients to further their inquiry. Visits may be made without previous notice and at such hours of the day or night as the official visitor or visitors making the same thinks or think fit, or as may be required by the person directing the visit.

(2) A report shall be transmitted to the Director immediately after each visit by the official visitor or visitors who made the visit, except where the Minister or the Director-General has directed the visit, when such report shall be furnished direct to the Minister or the Director-General, as the case may be.

(3) In addition to such other inquiries which he or they may make for the purposes of the administration of this Act, an official visitor or official visitors shall make such inquiries as are prescribed.

(4) Patients in any hospital should be informed that the mechanism of Official Visitor exists and of the names of those who have been appointed to serve under the Act. Patients together with their next of kin shall promptly upon the patient's admission receive written notice, in a language they understand, of their rights under the act pertaining to the function of Official Visitors."

The third aspect of the society's concern deals with the admission and treatment of patients. It states—

"Recent court cases in the U.S.A. have upheld the concept of the patient's right to treatment. The right to treatment principle has been facilitated through the development of individual treatment plans for all patients admitted to mental institutions in a number of States in the U.S.A."

"Individualised treatment plans which have been contracted between patients and therapists have been demonstrated to be useful in affecting behaviour change in community settings. Contracts in treatment describe who is to do what for whom under what circumstances. Contracts give the patient an opportunity to fully participate in his own treatment and to develop more responsibility and commitment to the treatment programme. Contracted treatment plans also ensure that the therapist (or in this instance, the institution) provide an adequate range of therapeutic services to meet the needs of any patient admitted."

"We therefore propose that contractual individualised treatment plans be available for every patient admitted (under any circumstances) into a psychiatric institution, or training centre under the Queensland Mental Health Act of 1974. If it is not possible to develop a contractual treatment plan on the basis that no treatment can be offered, then the onus is on the institution to show cause why that particular patient should remain in the institution. We further propose that these treatment plans be developed and supervised by a range of qualified mental health professionals."

There are obvious difficulties in this concept, Mr. Row, but I believe that in the long term, if implemented with care and consideration for the patient, it would be of benefit to patients.

Following this I have a fairly long submission, which I seek leave of the Committee to have incorporated in "Hansard". I could then simply read out the relevant headings where necessary. (Leave granted.)

To develop and incorporate all of the foregoing concepts into the existing Act, it is proposed by the Australian Psychological Society that the Act be redrafted as follows:—

PART III

ADMISSION AND DETENTION OF PERSONS GENERALLY, AND REMOVALS TO PLACES OF SAFETY

"17. Admission sequence. All persons admitted to an institution under the provision of this Act shall be admitted in the first instance under division I of this part, and then if the circumstances require it, he shall be re-admitted under division III of this part."

"DIVISION I—EVALUATION ADMISSIONS

"18. Application for evaluation admission. (1) A person may be admitted to a hospital other than a security patients' hospital for evaluation of his state of mental health and shall receive such care and treatment as his condition requires—

(a) upon the person's own application; or

(b) upon application made with the person's written consent by a relative of the person or by an authorized person, in accordance with the provisions of this division; or

(c) upon application made without the person's written consent by a relative of the person or by an authorized person . . .

(2) An application for admission—

(a) under subsections (1b) and (1c) shall be founded on the written recommendation in the prescribed form of a medical practitioner; and in addition

(b) under subsection (1c) may be made only on the grounds that the person, as a result of mental disorder, is imminently a danger to himself or to others, or is gravely disabled.

(3) For the purposes of this Act, 'gravely disabled' means a condition in which a person, as a result of mental disorder, is unable to provide for his basic personal needs for food, clothing, or shelter. A person of any age may be 'gravely disabled' under this definition.

(4) Unless otherwise indicated in this Act, a hospital administrator may refuse to make arrangements to admit a person to, or otherwise to have or keep a person in, a hospital.

(5) In the case of a person who has attained the age of eighteen years and is capable of expressing his own wishes, any arrangements referred to in subsection (1a) and (1b) may be made, carried out as determined notwithstanding any right of custody or control vested by law in his parent or guardian.

"19. Period of Evaluation residency. A person admitted to a hospital in pursuance of an application for admission—

(1) under section 18 subsections (1a) and (1b) may discharge himself upon reasonable notice to the hospital administrator.

(2) under section 18 subsection (1c) may be detained there for a period not exceeding three days from the day of admission, weekends and public holidays excepted, and shall not be detained thereafter in pursuance of that application unless in conformity with the requirements of Division III of this

part. Such person shall be discharged before three days have elapsed if, in the opinion of the hospital administrator, the person no longer requires evaluation, care or treatment.

"20. Evaluation during residency. (1) A person admitted to a hospital in pursuance of an application for admission under section 18 of this part shall receive initial multidisciplinary evaluations of such of his medical, psychological, familial, social, occupational, financial and legal conditions as would appear to constitute a problem. A written report summarizing these evaluations and detailing recommendations for subsequent action, if any, under division III of this part must be completed within three days from the day of admission, weekends and public holidays excepted. Persons providing evaluation services shall be qualified mental health professionals authorised by the Director for the purpose.

"21. Treatment during evaluation residency. Any treatment administered during the period of evaluation residency—

(1) for a person admitted under section 18 subsections (1a) and (1b) shall be on the written consent to such treatment of the person admitted.

(2) for a person admitted under section 18 subsection (1c) shall be authorized by a psychiatrist or other mental health professional authorised for the purpose by the Director, and apart from such treatment as may be required for his immediate well being shall be consented to by the patient or his parent or his legal guardian.

"22. Admission application generally. A person shall not make an application for the admission of a patient unless—

(a) he is of or above the age of eighteen years; and

(b) he has personally seen the person subject of the application within the period of three days ending with the date of the application.

"23. Medical recommendations generally. (1) Unless otherwise provided by this Act, the medical recommendation required for the purpose of an application for admission of a person shall be signed on or before the date of the application by a medical practitioner who has personally examined the person. The medical practitioner shall have full details of the grounds for the application being made before the examination is conducted.

(2) Unless otherwise provided by this Act, a medical recommendation shall cease to have effect, for the purposes of an application for admission, on the expiration of three days from the day of the examination to which it relates.

(3) A medical recommendation for the purposes of an application for the admission of a person under this Act or for the purposes of subsections (1b) and (1c) of section 18 shall not be given by any of the following persons, that is to say—

(a) the applicant;

(b) a partner of the applicant;

(c) a person employed as an assistant by the applicant;

(d) a person who receives or has an interest in the receipt of any payments made on account of the maintenance of the patient; or

(e) the husband, wife, father, father-in-law, mother, mother-in-law, son, son-in-law, daughter, daughter-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, sister or sister-in-law—

(i) of the patient;

(ii) of any person referred to in paragraphs (a) to (d).

(4) The following rules shall be observed in making and signing medical recommendations for the purposes of this Act:—

(a) the medical recommendation shall be in the prescribed form;

(b) the medical practitioner making and signing the medical recommendation shall state his qualifications in the medical recommendation;

(c) the medical practitioner shall state the facts indicating mental disorder observed by him at the examination to which the recommendation refers and such other information as may be prescribed, including in the case of admissions under section 18 subsection (1c) a declaration that the person is imminently a danger to himself or to others, or is gravely disabled;

(d) the medical recommendation shall state the day or the last day on which the patient was examined;

(e) every medical recommendation shall contain a statement that the medical practitioner making and signing the same is not prohibited by this Act from giving such medical recommendation.

(5) A medical recommendation shall not be sufficient for the purposes of this Act if it purports to be founded only upon facts communicated by others.

"24. Incorrect or defective application. (1) As soon as is reasonably practicable within the period of twenty-four hours after the admission of a person to a hospital as provided in section 18, subsection (1c), the hospital administrator shall satisfy himself that the application for the person's admission is sufficient to justify the detention of the person in hospital in that such application and the medical recommendation on which it is founded comply with this Act in all respects.

(2) If the hospital administrator is not so satisfied he shall return the application and the medical recommendation to the applicant and shall notify the medical practitioner in charge of the treatment of the person.

(3) On receipt of such notification that medical practitioner shall—

(a) if he considers the person should continue to be detained because through mental disorder he is an imminent danger to himself or to others or is gravely disabled, he shall furnish to the hospital administrator a

report in writing to that effect and in any such case the person may be detained in the hospital pursuant to that report for a period not exceeding three days from the day on which the report is so formalised.

(b) if he considers the person should not be liable to be detained because the person is no longer mentally disordered, or not so mentally disordered as to constitute an imminent danger to himself or to others or to be gravely disabled, he shall furnish to the hospital administrator a report in writing to that effect whereupon the person shall be discharged. Such discharge shall not prevent the person being re-admitted under section 18, subsections (1a) or (1b) if the person consents to such an application as required by those subsections.

(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed so as to deprive any person of any rights or protection conferred by this Act or by any other Act or law.

"25. Effect of application for admission. (1) An application for the admission of a person to a hospital under section 18 subsection (1c) and the medical recommendation on which it is founded, duly completed in accordance with the provisions of this Act, shall be sufficient authority for the applicant, or any individual authorized by the applicant, to take the person and convey him to the hospital at any time within a period of three days from the day on which the person was last examined by a medical practitioner before giving a medical recommendation for the purpose of the application.

(2) Where a medical practitioner who completes a medical recommendation in accordance with the provisions of this Act is of the opinion that the assistance of a member of the police force is necessary in taking the person the subject of the medical recommendation, and conveying him to the hospital, he may certify as to his opinion by endorsement on the medical recommendation to that effect.

Any member of the police force to whose notice any such endorsement as aforesaid is brought may as soon as practicable take the person and convey him or assist in taking him and conveying him to the hospital or make or cause to be made arrangements for some other member of the police force to take the person and convey him or assist in taking him and conveying him to the hospital.

(3) It is lawful for any individual acting in accordance with any authority vested in him under or pursuant to this section—

(a) to use such force as may be reasonably necessary in taking the person the subject of the medical recommendation and conveying him to the hospital or in assisting in taking him and conveying him to the hospital;

(b) to enter into or upon and search any premises in or upon which the person is or is reasonably believed to be and to use such force as may be reasonably necessary in so doing.

DIVISION II—REMOVALS TO PLACES OF SAFETY

"26. Warrant to remove to place of safety.

(1) (a) If it appears to a justice, on information by any person on oath, in the prescribed form, that there is clear cause to suspect that a person is mentally disordered and in consequence is an imminent danger to himself or to others, or is gravely disabled, and that in the interests of that person or for the protection of other persons it is necessary to do so, the justice may issue a warrant in the prescribed form and as hereinafter provided.

(b) A justice who issues a warrant as provided in this subsection shall forthwith forward a copy of the warrant and a copy of the sworn information relied on to the clerk of the court or, if more than one, a clerk of the court in the Magistrates Court District in which the person then is.

(2) A warrant issued under this section shall authorise and require the member of the police force to whom it is directed or any other member of the police force to remove or cause to be removed, within the period of three days after the date of the warrant but as soon as practicable, the person in respect of whom the warrant is issued to a place of safety.

(3) (a) In the execution of a warrant issued under this section, the member of the police force by whom it is being executed shall be accompanied by a medical practitioner, save in a case where one is not available, and may be accompanied by an authorized person.

(b) If the medical practitioner accompanying the member of the police force informs that member in writing that in his opinion the person in respect of whom the warrant is issued is not mentally disordered, such member of the police force shall not execute the warrant but he shall as soon as practicable thereafter make a report in respect of the issue of the warrant and of the reasons for its not having been executed and cause the report to be forwarded to the Director, who shall notify the clerk of the court and the justice who issued the warrant.

(c) Where the member of the police force executes a warrant and is not at the time accompanied by a medical practitioner because one is unavailable, he shall as soon as practicable thereafter make a report of the circumstances in respect of the unavailability of a medical practitioner and cause it to be forwarded to the Director.

(4) For the purpose of enabling the member of the police force to whom the warrant is directed or any other member of the police force to act in accordance with the provisions of subsection (2), the warrant shall authorize the member so acting to do or to cause to be done all or any of the following things—

(a) to execute the warrant at any time whether by day or by night;

(b) to call to his assistance such members of the police force, medical practitioners or other persons as he thinks fit;

(c) to apprehend, whether in a place to which the public has access or not, the person in respect of whom the warrant is issued;

(d) to enter, re-enter and search, if need be by force, the premises (if any) specified in the warrant and any other premises in which the member of the police force reasonably believes the person in respect of whom the warrant is issued will be found.

(5) It shall not be necessary in any information or warrant under this section to name the person the subject thereof provided that the person is otherwise sufficiently identified in such document.

“27. Removal without warrant to a place of safety. (1) Subject to subsection (2), a member of the police force may, without a warrant, remove from any place to a place of safety any person who appears to him to be mentally disordered and in consequence is an imminent danger to himself or to others, or is gravely disabled if that member thinks it necessary to do so in the interests of that person or for the protection of other persons.

(2) A member of the police force may remove a person from any place that is not a public place to a place of safety without a warrant in pursuance of subsection (1) only if—

(a) he reasonably believes that the obtaining of a warrant under section 25 would involve unreasonable delay, having regard to the circumstances of the case; and

(b) he obtains the consent of the occupier or person apparently in charge or control of that place or, where the place is the subject of more than one occupancy, the part of the place in question:

Provided that such consent shall not be necessary where such occupier or person apparently in charge or control is the person the subject of the removal or where the occupier or person apparently in charge or control does not appear to the member of the police force to be readily identifiable or available.

(3) For the purposes of this section the term “public place” includes every road and also every place of public resort open to or used by the public as of right: The term also includes—

(a) any vessel, vehicle, train, bus, building, room, licensed premises, field, ground, park, reserve, garden, wharf, pier, jetty, bridge, platform, market, passage, or other place for the time being used for a public purpose or open to access by the public by the express or tacit consent or sufferance of the owner, and whether the same is or is not at all times so open;

(b) any vacant land or any premises at any material time unoccupied; and

(c) any place declared by Order in Council to be a public place for the purposes of this section.

“28. Procedure on and following removal to a place of safety. (1) A person removed to a place of safety under this Division may be detained there for a period not exceeding one day from the day when he is removed to that place and shall be examined, or further examined, as soon as possible within that period by a medical practitioner and interviewed there by an authorized person, with a view to the making of an application in respect of him under Section 18 subsection (1c).

Without derogating from any other provision of this Act, the member of the police force who removes the person to a place of safety pursuant to the provisions of this Division is deemed to be an authorized person for the purposes of the interview and of the application referred to in this subsection.

(2) (a) A person removed to a place of safety pursuant to the provisions of this Division shall be removed to a hospital in preference to any other place of safety unless a hospital is not readily accessible.

(b) Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, a hospital is deemed to be not readily accessible in a case where the hospital administrator of a readily accessible private hospital is not willing to receive the patient and also in a case where the patient is not able to be cared for in any other readily accessible hospital.

(3) (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (1) and (2), a person conveyed to a place of safety pursuant to this Division may, during the period referred to in subsection (1), be conveyed from one place of safety to another, provided that such person shall not be detained in places of safety, if more than one, for a period, in the aggregate, in excess of the period so referred to.

(b) The power conferred by this subsection to convey a person from one place of safety to another may be exercised by—

(i) the member of the police force who, pursuant to this Division, conveyed that person to the place of safety from which he may be conveyed under this subsection;

(ii) any other member of the police force; or

(iii) any other person prescribed.

(4) If a medical practitioner on examining a person detained in a place of safety pursuant to this Division is of the opinion that the person is not mentally disordered, or not so mentally disordered as to constitute an imminent danger to himself or to others or to be gravely disabled, he shall certify in writing his opinion to this effect to the hospital administrator, manager or other person in charge or control of the place of safety, whereupon the person shall be discharged forthwith from the place of safety and the hospital administrator, manager or other person as aforesaid shall forward to

the Director a report of the circumstances of the case. Such discharge shall not prevent the person being admitted to a hospital under section 18 subsection (1a) or (1b) if the person consents to such an application as required by those subsections.

"29. Civil action on wrongful information. Any individual who makes application for the admission of another person under section 18, or who provides information to a justice on oath concerning the mental health of another person under section 26, and who knows or has good reason to believe that the person for whom the application is made or against whom information is laid is not, as a result of mental disorder, an imminent danger to himself or to others or is not gravely disabled is guilty of an offence, and may be held liable in civil damages by the person for whom the admission was sought or against whom the information was laid.

"DIVISION III—TREATMENT ADMISSIONS

"30. Application for treatment admissions. (1) In conformity with the evaluations and recommendations provided under section 20, a person who has been admitted to a hospital under Division I of this Act and who has not earlier been discharged—

(a) may be discharged in compliance with section 19, or

(b) may be admitted to the same or a different institution as a voluntary patient subject to the provisions of this division; or

(c) may be admitted to the same or a different institution as a regulated patient subject to the provisions of this division.

(2) For a person to be admitted as a voluntary patient it must be established to the hospital administrator, and consented to by the person or by his parent or legal guardian if he is under the age of 18 years and/or is incapable of expressing his own wishes, that adequate treatment cannot be implemented in an out-patient facility but can be provided in an in-patient facility such as the one to which it is proposed that the person be admitted.

(3) For a person to be admitted as a regulated patient it must be established before a Review Tribunal convened for that purpose—

(a) that the person, because of mental disorder, continues to be a danger to himself or to others or to be gravely disabled; and

(b) that there is no less restrictive alternative to involuntary institutional confinement and treatment, and

(c) that adequate treatment cannot be implemented in an out-patient facility but can be provided in an in-patient facility such as the one to which it is proposed the person be admitted.

"31. Period of voluntary treatment residency. (1) It having been accepted by a hospital administrator that a person be admitted to a hospital as a voluntary patient, that person

shall be so admitted and shall remain resident for no longer than is required by his treatment plan as reviewed in conformity with section 33.

(2) In the case of a person who has attained the age of eighteen years and is capable of expressing his own wishes, that person may discharge himself upon reasonable notice to the hospital administrator.

(3) In the case of a person who has not attained the age of 18 years and/or who is not capable of expressing his own wishes, that person may be discharged on application of his parent or legal guardian, or by order of the Tribunal in accordance with the provisions of section 30 subsection (3).

"32. Period of involuntary treatment residency. It having been accepted by the Tribunal required under section 30 subsection (3) that a person should be admitted to a hospital as a regulated patient, that person shall be so admitted and shall remain an involuntary resident subject to the following review provisions—

(1) the person may be detained in a hospital for a period not exceeding twenty-one days from the day of his admission, and shall not be detained thereafter in respect of the application in question unless authority for his detention is renewed in accordance with this section.

(2) Authority for the detention of a person may, unless the person has previously been discharged, be renewed under this section—

(a) from the expiration of the period referred to in subsection (1), for a further period not exceeding ninety days from the day of his admission;

(b) from the expiration of any period of renewal under paragraph (a), for a further period not exceeding ninety days and so on for periods not exceeding ninety days at a time.

(3) During each period of his detention as authorized under this section a patient shall receive a thorough multidisciplinary evaluation of such of his medical, psychological, familial, social, occupational, financial and legal conditions as remain problems, and shall have his treatment plan reviewed accordingly in compliance with the requirements of section 33. A written report shall be prepared by the mental health professional responsible for treatment summarizing both these evaluations, the revised treatment plan and the recommendations pursuant to the person's discharge under this section.

(4) In the event that discharge of the person from regulated admission is recommended as a consequence of a multidisciplinary evaluation, such discharge shall be arranged forthwith by the hospital administrator. Such discharge shall not be so construed as to prevent the person being re-admitted under section 30 subsection (2) as a voluntary admission if such action is

recommended by the multidisciplinary team and provided also that—

(a) in the case of a person who has attained the age of 18 years and is capable of expressing his own wishes, that person consents in writing to the application for voluntary admission, or

(b) in the case of a person who has not attained the age of 18 years and/or is not capable of expressing his own wishes, the person's parent or legal guardian consents in writing to the application for voluntary admission.

In the event that renewal of regulated detention is recommended as a consequence of a multidisciplinary evaluation, such renewal shall not become effective unless it is authorized by a Tribunal which shall receive information and make deliberations. Such authorization shall only be given if it is agreed by the Tribunal—

(a) that the person, because of mental disorder, continues to be a danger to himself or to others or to be gravely disabled; and

(b) that there is no less restrictive alternative to involuntary institutional confinement and treatment; and

(c) that the treatment plan required under this section is in conformity with the requirements specified in section 33, and in particular that it stipulates clearly both the criteria for release to less restrictive treatment conditions, and the criteria for discharge.

(6) Without derogating from any other provision of this Act, an application to a Tribunal with respect to any matter relating to the detention of a person under this section may be made by the person or a relative of the person or an authorized individual after 30 days have elapsed since the Tribunal's last deliberation on the person's case.

"33. Treatment during voluntary and involuntary residency. (1) Each patient shall have an individualized treatment plan. This plan shall be developed by at least 2 appropriate Mental Health Professionals, approved for the purpose by the Director, and implemented within 21 days of admission. Each individualized treatment plan shall contain:

(a) a statement of the nature of the specific problems and specific needs of the patient;

(b) a statement of the least restrictive treatment conditions necessary to achieve the purposes of commitment;

(c) a description of intermediate and long-range treatment goals, with a projected time-frame for their attainment;

(d) a statement and rationale for the plan of treatment for achieving these intermediate and long-range goals;

(e) a specification of staff responsibility and a description of proposed staff involvement with the patient in order to attain these treatment goals;

(f) criteria for release to less restrictive treatment conditions, and criteria for discharge;

(g) a notation of any therapeutic tasks and labor to be performed by the patient.

(2) The treatment plan must be signed by the mental health professional responsible for treatment, the patient, or by his parent or legal guardian if he is under the age of 18 years and/or incapable of expressing his own wishes. Each patient and parent or legal guardian shall promptly receive a signed copy of the treatment plan.

(3) A mental health professional appointed for the purpose by the director shall be responsible for supervising the implementation of the treatment plan, integrating the various aspects of the treatment programme, and recording the patient's progress. This person shall be responsible for ensuring that the patient is released, where appropriate, into a less restrictive form of treatment.

(4) As part of his treatment plan, each patient shall have an individualised post-hospitalisation plan. This plan shall be developed by at least 2 mental health professionals, one of whom is responsible at the time for the supervision of the within-hospital treatment plan. This post-hospital plan shall be developed as soon as is practicable after the patient's admission to the hospital.

(5) The treatment plan shall be continuously reviewed by the mental health professional responsible for supervising the implementation of the plan and shall be modified if necessary and agreed to by all the parties to the original plan. At least every 90 days, each patient shall receive a review of his treatment plan by at least 2 mental health professionals.

"34. Legal and civil rights of person in voluntary and involuntary residency. (1) Each person resident in an in-patient facility and admitted under this Act shall have the following rights, a list of which shall be prominently displayed and conveyed in writing to him and to his nearest relative or legal guardian:

(a) To wear his own clothes; to keep and use his own personal possessions including his toilet articles; and to keep and be allowed to spend a reasonable sum of his own money for canteen expenses and small purchases.

(b) To have access to individual storage space for his private use.

(c) To see visitors each day.

(d) To have reasonable access to telephones, both to make and receive confidential calls.

(e) To have ready access to letter writing materials, including stamps, and to mail and receive unopened correspondence.

(f) To refuse shock treatment.

(g) To refuse psychosurgery including lobotomy.

(h) Other rights, as specified by regulation.

(2) For the purpose of paragraphs (f) and (g) of subsection (1), if the person has not attained the age of 18 years and/or is unable to express his own wishes the right to refuse may be exercised by his parent or legal guardian.

(3) Any person's rights under subsection (1) may be denied for good cause only by the Mental Health Professional in charge of his case and in any case only if it is part of the agreed treatment plan required under section 33. Information pertaining to a denial of rights contained in the person's treatment record shall be made available on request to the person, his legal representative, and his parent or guardian."

It is further recommended by the Australian Psychological Society that the following Mental Health Regulations be altered as follows:—

"Regulation 18. Delete whole section.

"Regulation 20. A notice in language readily understood shall be displayed in accordance with the provision of Regulation 16 and shall be communicated in writing to the patient and next of kin. That notice shall contain information concerning the following matters—

(i) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the admission and continued detention of a patient;

(ii) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the circumstances under which an application may be made to a Tribunal and the procedures for so doing;

(iii) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the procedures by which a patient may be discharged from detention;

(iv) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the functions of an official visitor in relation to patients, including the right of a patient to access to an official visitor in person or in writing;

(v) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the correspondence of a patient;

(vi) The provisions of the Act pertaining to an application by a patient to a Judge of the Supreme Court;

(vii) The right of a patient to communicate with his legal adviser or with an organization providing free legal advice to eligible persons, and the address and telephone number of at least one such organization;

(viii) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the circumstances under which the Public Curator may manage or cease to manage the estate of a patient;

(ix) The provisions of the Act pertaining to the visiting and examination of a patient by a private medical practitioner;

(x) The provisions of the Act pertaining to a restricted patient."

That completes the expert advice that I asked for in relation to this matter, which is of great importance to the welfare of patients in our community.

It is very easy to be blasé about the treatment of mental illness. We, as a responsible

Government, have a heavy duty to look after those members of the community who are not able to look after themselves. Many mental patients fall into that category. By no means can I or anyone else in the medical and allied professions construe the treatment of mental patients as being simple. It is very difficult and complicated. It is important for honourable members to realise that it calls for expert attention and that when the Act is amended it should incorporate those opinions that will bring forth the very best form of mental health care and treatment. In the past that simply did not occur.

It is important that the 1973-74 fiasco be not repeated and that those people from whom I have quoted tonight have their opinions considered with due respect to their professional expertise, so that those whose mental health needs to be attended to by institutional treatment will be given it with the dignity that such patients deserve and with the necessary tender, loving care that traditionally has been the role of the medical professional in our community.

Mr. HALES (Ipswich West) (8.48 p.m.): At the outset, I congratulate Mr. Tony Bourke, who will be the new Liberal member for Lockyer, and wish him success. I believe that he is young enough and capable enough, and is representing an electorate that is safe enough, to enable him to emulate his eminent predecessor, Sir Gordon Chalk.

At this stage I want to make a few comments on three-cornered elections.

Mr. Lindsay: Tell it the way it is.

Mr. HALES: I certainly will.

It is both futile and peurile to have three-cornered contests involving sitting coalition members. Members in the two coalition parties should get together and be cool-headed. The only party that will gain any advantage from this so-called altercation between the coalition parties is the Labor Party. I certainly will not campaign against a sitting coalition member in any three-cornered contest.

Sir Gordon Chalk had a career of 27 years in Parliament, and I wish him a long and enjoyable retirement. From the coalition's point of view, he was an able politician and Minister. He had, and still has, my utmost admiration. He is a man of outstanding ability.

His reply in the Budget debate last year simply smacked of brilliance. He completely demoralised and demolished the Leader of the Opposition. I am quite certain that the present Treasurer will do equally well this year. I have never seen any person so absolutely embarrassed as the Leader of the Opposition was on that night 12 months ago. Sir Gordon Chalk tore him to shreds. The Leader of the Opposition attempted to hide his embarrassment by turning around and engaging in small talk with the two members from Rockhampton, but his face was as red as his politics.

I should like to make a few comments on the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition in reply to this year's Financial Statement. Firstly, he claimed that there was to be a 29 per cent increase in licence fees in Queensland. That may be so. To take one licence fee, I point out that in Queensland a drivers' licence costs \$5 for five years. In New South Wales, a Labor State, with Neville Wran as Premier, a licence costs \$10 a year or \$50 for five years. In South Australia, which has "Pink pants" Donnie as Premier, it costs \$6 a year or \$30 for five years. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that Queensland is over-taxed compared with Labor States, he is absolutely wrong.

The Leader of the Opposition also stated that he would budget for a deficit. He seems to think quite differently from Mr. Wran, Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Neilson, the Tasmanian Premier. He appears to be the odd man out; I might say very odd indeed. In his Budget speech, Mr. Dunstan said—

"While the recent actions of the Commonwealth Government have not allowed us to go as far as we would have liked (that would go for all States) I am pleased to say that by careful planning and a firm control of expenditures, the Government believes it can offer some relief to the South Australian taxpayer and still achieve a balanced Budget."

That is quite different from what the Leader of the Opposition would like in Queensland.

I believe it would take five years for any real significance to show up in death and succession duties in the Queensland Budget because many of the bigger estates take years to finalise. While Queensland is leading the other States in abolishing this iniquitous tax—and that is only normal; Queensland seems to lead the other States at all times—even the Federal Government is following Queensland's lead. The South Australian Government is abolishing spouse-to-spouse succession duty. New South Wales is doing the same and Tasmania is extending the limit to \$100,000. In New South Wales, Neville Wran says that he will tighten up the trust laws.

I shall now quote from "The Bulletin" of 9 October under the heading "Millions could flow North". I believe that millions will flow north. The relevant passage reads—

"Wran has also made it clear that his State will attempt to close legal loopholes which allow family companies to be set up with the aim of minimising death duties. Increased funds flowing to State coffers from this source could largely offset the \$30 million of forgone revenue from estates passing between married couples, he believes.

"But that threat may rebound and actually encourage the flow of funds out of NSW and over the border to Queensland to take advantage of the duty-free situation which will shortly apply there."

Tasmania, which has a socialist Government in a shaky electoral position, to some degree has followed Queensland. This is what Mr. Neilson said in his State Budget speech, and this is the observation I made to the honourable member for Archerfield this afternoon when he complained that other States will be following suit. They are simply not doing so. Once again the Opposition has not done its homework. Mr. Neilson said—

"We propose to increase the exemption levels for all classes of beneficiary. In the case of estates passing between spouses, the exemption will be increased from \$15,000 to \$100,000. In addition, estates between \$100,000 and \$250,000 will pay less tax than at present.

"Where an estate passes to children under 18, the exemption level will be increased from \$15,000 to \$50,000 with a reduction in duty payable on estates between \$50,000 and \$200,000. For estates passing to children over 18, other descendants and ancestors, the exemption will be raised from \$4,000 to \$15,000 while the exemption for other relatives will be increased from \$1,000 to \$8,000.

That is nothing like what is happening in Queensland. I believe whole-heartedly that money will flow to Queensland from the other States.

I also believe that the influx of companies from southern States will be forthcoming. Company fees paid to the Queensland Government will certainly increase tremendously. It seems to me that this Government may lose a small amount in funds and, indeed, the Treasurer's estimate is \$1,300,000 this financial year that is not in line with the bleating of the Opposition and the member for Mackay, who claimed that we would be losing \$25,000,000 this year. I sincerely believe that the influx of capital from other States to Queensland will be substantial indeed. If that is so, employment opportunities will increase substantially.

As I said before, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Rockhampton, the member for Mackay—who also should be in the Opposition—berated the Government for abolishing death duties. The member for Rockhampton suggested that we could spend the \$25,000,000 on something else, as did the member for Mackay. I repeat: did they really read the Budget? I do not think so. I am certain that they did not do their homework. As I said before, the Estimates clearly state that a reduced amount of only \$1,300,000 will be lost, not the \$25,000,000 referred to by Opposition members.

All responsible Government Budgets follow the guide-lines set down by the O.E.C.D. countries at their May conference; that is, to reduce Government spending in order to control and reduce inflation. I believe that the Federal Government is following that principle, as is every State. While Australia has its present inflation rate, we cannot

expect any upturn in the economy, and the control of inflation is and should be the major objective of any Government in Australia.

Any Budget is a series of debits and credits. No Budget can be wholly good or bad; but, according to most A.L.P. members in this Chamber, nothing at all is good or benevolent in this Budget. Apart from the 15 per cent increase in railway freights, this Budget places no great imposition on the community. However, it is my view that this Government made a serious mistake during the years from 1970 to 1975, when railway freight charges were frozen. I believe the indication from our present Treasurer represents the correct approach; that is, that adjustments in charges will be investigated more regularly.

This year's Budget provides for increased spending in many areas—health, education, police and works and housing. I am particularly grateful to the Treasurer and the Minister for Health for the increased subsidy to the Blue Nursing Service. The previous subsidy of \$3,630 for each nurse has now been increased to \$4,482. That will attract a further subsidy from the Federal Government, as that Government operates on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the State Government. As one who is involved with the Blue Nursing Service in Ipswich, I am cognisant of the high level of domiciliary care administered by the ladies in blue. While the currently high inflation is with us, I urge the Treasurer to adjust the subsidy to allow the Blue Nursing Service to continue to operate a service of extremely high value.

I could go on and illustrate the benefits of this Budget to small business through measures such as the reduction in pay-roll tax and the adjustment of workers' compensation payments. However, the major concern in my mind about the economy in this nation is to get it moving again. Although I believe that the State and Federal Treasurers are moving in the right direction, I am concerned at the attitudes of some people to the Welfare State. They expect the Government to provide everything for them so that they can continue to be parasites on the community. There seems to be a hard core of unemployables. The work ethic seems to have disappeared from the character of some people. The Opposition continues to quote unemployment figures and figures relating to positions vacant. However, the number of positions vacant relates to positions registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service and does not reflect the true position.

I will give the Committee two instances of people I know, one of whom does not want work and the other willing and desperate to work. One young fellow living on the dole is living off his girlfriend's wages. He just refuses to work. He could go to Gladstone, where there are vacancies, and

get a job as an electrician, but the young devil will not. A young nephew of mine has just left the Army. Within one month he tried three jobs. He went from one to another to pick the best one, and finally he has settled in a job. If he has the capacity to find three jobs in a month, many others have it too.

I should like to refer to two articles which reflect the feelings and statements made to me by many of my constituents time and time again. The first is the editorial in this morning's issue of the local paper. It is headed, "Time for a return", and reads—

"When the concept of the welfare state was introduced in post-World War II Europe, it was with a fine sense of idealism.

"It was welcomed, even by those who were paying for it, because they saw their taxes going to help those in genuine need.

"But the ideal is souring, because the ineradicable feeling has grown that too many of those who benefit are not genuine.

"Younger generations have taken the welfare state for granted, and are making greater demands on it.

"So a vicious circle has been set up.

"It is undeniable that many people have less initiative than they used to have, and expect the government to do more for them.

"And as more seek welfare services, the tax burden becomes greater on those who pay for them.

"When large numbers of income earners seriously begin to question the work ethic because they see their taxes going to support others with whom they have little sympathy, a country has serious problems.

"This is one of the dangers in Australia today. It is one of the dangers in many Western countries, and as a result they are swinging more to the right politically to call into question the operations of the welfare state.

"If it is to be preserved at all in this country, there is a crying need for a return to the ideals of former years, and an inspired leader to give the direction."

A further article appears in "The National Times" today. It is headed, "Why the middle classes are abandoning the Left." It outlines much the same sentiments as those expressed in the other article.

I support that feeling. I support less government and less taxation, which the Federal Government is achieving by the indexation of taxation. But, what is even more important, this nation needs and deserves strong, positive leadership such as that shown by the Premier when taking a firm stand on issues such as the Torres Strait border and socialism. Nobody would doubt the attitude of the Premier or the Government on many issues. That firm positive stand is what this country is seeking.

Mr. MOORE (Windsor) (9.3 p.m.): I have decided to share with the honourable member for Brisbane the remaining 27 minutes for this debate, so I shall make my remarks tonight reasonably brief.

An Opposition Member: Here comes the griddle-car.

Mr. MOORE: I have made my remarks about griddle-cars. The Minister is quite aware of what I think of them. I think they are a crying disgrace and the day that I am Minister for Transport I will fix them up.

The present debate is really on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and the state of the economy. Whilst I think the present Prime Minister is doing a rather good job in Canberra in arresting inflation, I would not be surprised if there is a little merit in some of the things Opposition members are saying such as the statement that he might be going too far too fast—as the A.L.P. did in reverse. I would not be surprised if, in a very short time, the Government takes another look at the state of the economy to see if a little freer spending can be allowed in the public sector to improve the unemployment situation.

I do not see the Federal Government lowering the rate of inflation below 10 per cent while the bond rate is around 10 per cent. As I have said previously, the various service charges bring the bond rate of 10 per cent to about 12 per cent. The inflation rate will not be lower than the borrowing or bond rate. That is something that the Federal Government should start to consider. It should reduce the interest rate, even if it places a restriction on borrowers. This should be done for a short time so that money can be borrowed only for certain purposes, thus preventing it appearing to be cheap money which would produce a further escalation in the rate of inflation. We are suffering from a high rate of unemployment, but it is not unemployment of the type experienced before the Second World War because at that time virtually all wives stayed at home and there was only one bread-winner in the house. The situation is now changed because demands are greater and most wives attempt to find work. We just cannot have an economy in which all adults of working age are in employment because we cannot survive economically by taking in one another's washing.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. MOORE: The only way to achieve full employment is to have an export market for our products, and we will not obtain such a market unless we can sell our produce overseas at competitive rates. The only way to do that is by means of some form of subsidy or by dumping. Perhaps we could use some form of barter by which we sold so much of our produce and bought so much

from someone else. We are in a situation in which we cannot compete with Singapore dollars, Hong Kong dollars or Deutschmarks. We just cannot compete with those countries, because of their lower production cost.

We need a good balance of payments position and we can obtain that only by exporting. It follows that unless we engage in some form of dumping we are not going to be able to compete. The only reason for our satisfactory balance of payments position at present is our good fortune in having a firm iron-ore and coal market. Whilst copper and silver-lead from Mt. Isa were our greatest income earners for a long time, coal is now beginning to surpass them. But the nation cannot rely on minerals for ever, especially with wage rates getting higher and higher. Wage increases therefore are going to have to come to a halt. The former Federal Labor Government tried to overcome the problem by printing money, but that is not a satisfactory solution.

One thing we must ensure is that our various industries are not allowed to run down. We have a shipbuilding industry which appears to be going out of existence. The aircraft industry has suffered an enormous downturn and is now producing virtually only one aircraft, the Nomad. It is not a supersonic aircraft, so we virtually have no aircraft industry at all. Our motor vehicle industry is in the doldrums. We need to manufacture trucks, tractors, electronics components and the like if we are to be a nation of some worth because one day we will have to stand on our own feet. We cannot always rely on other countries to produce goods for us. If we did, not only would we lose vital industries but we would lose also the skills and techniques that go with them.

One of our greatest problems is that tax rates are a very great disincentive to increased production. There was some mention in the Budget of increases in the exemption amounts for the payment of pay-roll tax, thus giving some relief to employers. Last year we received \$168,900,000 in pay-roll tax, and this year receipts are expected to total \$192,300,000. Therefore, relief or no relief, the State will still receive more money than it received last year from the imposition of pay-roll tax.

Someone said how marvellous it was that we were able to abolish succession and probate duties and still bring down a balanced Budget on this occasion. Of course, the State received \$26,800,000 from succession and probate duties last year and this year it is going to receive \$25,500,000; so the Treasurer has budgeted for only \$1,300,000 less. The chickens will come home to roost next year or the year after. The result of the decision to abolish these duties was easy enough for the Treasurer to handle this year, but the State will be in some trouble in subsequent years to find counterpart funds.

Medibank is going to be very costly to the community, and I am very sorry that the Prime Minister, in spite of his assurance

that he would not do away with Medibank, did not go to the people and say, "I said I was not going to do away with Medibank. I have made a sad mistake. In the circumstances, I will produce for you a better scheme. If you choose that it be called Medibank, well and good." He should then have introduced a scheme such as we had previously in Queensland—true enough, it was introduced by a Labor Government—under which there was free health treatment for those who needed it and those who felt they needed something better had the right to private insurance. Although the free health scheme in this State needed improved funding, that is all it needed. If a scheme of that type had been introduced in the other States, they would have been happy, Mr. Row, and we would not now have this great canker—\$1,400 million at present, and it will increase.

When I was a child, it cost 10/6 to go to the doctor—half a guinea a visit—and at that time the basic wage was about £3/17/-. There was no such thing as medical benefits. If a person had his appendix removed, the operation cost him about £20, or about five times the average weekly wage. If a person has an appendix removed today, with a wage of about \$100 a week it might be expected that the operation would cost about \$500. The cost of an appendix operation is nothing like that amount; in fact, it is about \$100 or \$120. Medical expenses have really decreased.

Of course, the problem is the overuse of medical services—the number of people attending doctors. They are being brainwashed; they are being frightened. They will not go to the chemist for a proprietary medicine. They go to the doctor because they think he will give them a potion. Every time they get a cold, they think they are getting pneumonia. Every time they get a sore throat, they think, "God, I am getting diphtheria." They go to the doctor and he prescribes antibiotics, and so it goes on. All they really need is a gargle with salt and water and they are back in business; but along to the doctor they go and up goes the medical bill. They have been brainwashed by television and other sections of the media. I do not suggest this for use by the public, but when I was a kid a little bit of kerosene and sugar was used.

The introduction of the metric system is one of the causes of inflation. A Liberal-Country Party Government brought it in, and I think it is a crying shame that it was introduced. Older people in the community will never get round to using the metric system, and I believe that a dual system should be used. Let us educate our children in the use of the metric system and let the old system fade out. That would be the sensible way to tackle the problem. There would not then be an escalation in prices resulting from a smaller article being sold at the price previously charged for an article in ounces or pounds. There was nothing much

wrong with the old British system, and as I said earlier, the introduction of the metric system is a crying shame.

Although I had much more to say, I shall only reply to something that the Leader of the Opposition said earlier in the debate. He asked why the State would not use deficit budgeting. What a fool he is to believe that the State could have a deficit Budget! Where are we going to obtain the funds, Mr. Row? We have no mint; we have no means of getting funds. Who is going to guarantee them? Where are we going to get the credit? If that is the type of mentality that the Leader of the Opposition has, what sort of a party does he lead?

Mr. LOWES (Brisbane) (9.15 p.m.): If I might continue on this same theme and refer to the fiscal policy of the Leader of the Opposition, I would refer to his recent statement on the reduction of 1 per cent in interest rates. I refer also to the comments of Professor von Hayek, a 1974 Nobel Prize winner and visiting professor to Salzburg University, who said—

"There is very much against a suggestion by the State Labor Opposition that interest rates should be reduced by 1 per cent across the board. So you invite people to borrow more. Great. But it is in no way a solution to the inflation problem in this country."

His view is shared by Professor Milton Friedman, another Nobel Prize winner. When he was here recently, he said that we must stop printing money. He was here at a time when another Government was in power in Canberra, and he urged it to stop printing money. Advice of that type is continually given to the Federal Treasury by people such as Professor von Hayek and Professor Milton Friedman. It is sound advice and advice of the type that put Germany back on the economic map.

Today the honourable member for Archerfield spoke about free enterprise. What did Professor von Hayek have to say about it? He was outspoken on Queensland and Australian Government interference in private enterprise. He was far from impressed with Government intervention in free economy as it existed in Australia and in Queensland. He said it had been shown that free enterprise can do better than any Government operation. That is exactly what members of this coalition Government stand for.

The two leading lights of the Opposition—the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Archerfield—are nailed by people of no less stature in the economic world than Professor von Hayek and Professor Milton Friedman.

At this stage of the debate I do not intend to deal with the intricacies of the Budget; rather will I speak to the broad principles of budgeting. In doing so I can do no more than compliment the Treasurer on his first Budget, one of resourcefulness and humanitarianism.

I care not whether the term Fraser federalism or McMahon federalism, or any other kind of federalism, is used; so long as the Government in Canberra believes that the States are rightfully funded by the Commonwealth Government, that is the worst feature of centralism. Those members of that Government who believe the States are funded by the Commonwealth are either ill-informed or downright deceitful. It is true that the Commonwealth Government is the collecting agency, but that arose from a war-time emergency measure. In the 1940s many people said that whoever holds the purse-strings also wields the whip. Today those same people would say, "Didn't I tell you?" That is the present state of affairs, no matter how that control was gained by the Commonwealth or handed over by the States. Given over it was. The sugar-coated euphemism "uniform taxation" is not a solution to the problem. Taxation was handed over by the States to the Commonwealth on the basis of such a euphemism.

Mr. Marginson interjected.

Mr. LOWES: I hear the honourable member for Wolston interjecting. No doubt he would like to talk about double taxation. That is the cry that was heard in New South Wales. It was the one taken up by Neville Wran when he jumped on the band wagon. If ever there was a person who hopped onto band wagons, it is the Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament. Having heard Neville Wran talk about double taxation and having seen him gain power by a slender majority, the Leader of the Opposition here thought that double taxation was a good thing to lambaste us with.

But let us look at the situation in 1940 before we had uniform taxation and consider how we would fare under it now. I would welcome it and I have said so in our party meetings. I think we would do well to go back now to the system of the '40s and have our own form of taxation, particularly in view of the minerals in Queensland. This State would be far better off and the imposition of taxation would be far more equitable throughout it.

Mr. Marginson: Have you ever asked for your taxation powers to be handed back?

Mr. LOWES: No, we have not, but we might well contemplate taking back our taxation powers.

May we always remind the central Government, whatever its political complexion, that its function, which we gave it in the early '40s, is to collect taxes. It is a tax-collecting agency and nothing more. It holds a position of trust to gather money and hold it as trustee for the States. The Commonwealth Government is not being bountiful in giving back to the States moneys which are rightly theirs. I would welcome the day when we return to collecting our own taxation.

If there is any doubt about who is the true owner of this money, or where it comes from, we have only to look at the mineral export levy imposed by the former Minister in charge of mineral resources, namely, Reginald Xavier Connor—that iniquitous \$6 a tonne levied on coal of a particular type selected by him, which could come only from Queensland in large quantities.

Surely those moneys raised by the central Government belong to this State. When the Commonwealth gives the money back to the Queensland people, is it really giving back to us what we rightfully own? I deny that the Central Government has the right to do any more than collect taxes from the people of the States.

I listened attentively to the Budget speech delivered by the Federal Treasurer; it was plain that it was a stay-put Budget and it was obvious that restraints would be imposed on the Queensland Government when its Budget was introduced. On that basis I was very concerned about our new Treasurer's position. I realised that he was constrained but, despite that constraint imposed by the Federal Government, our Treasurer, to his great credit, introduced a Budget full of humanitarianism and resourcefulness. The constraints imposed on this Government by the Federal Government mean that we may not introduce new taxation or indulge in expenditure in the public sector. Nor may we do anything by way of taxation that would impose increased unemployment or costs.

Our State Treasurer was in a cleft stick. He was told by the Commonwealth Government just how much he could spend, how he could spend it and what he must not do. On the other hand, he tried to do the best he could for Queensland and inject into his Budget resourcefulness and humanitarianism to look after the people, rather than introduce a simple, stay-put Budget. To his great credit, that is what he did and I congratulate him no end for it.

I accept the comment of the honourable member for Archerfield that when listening to the Treasurer deliver his Budget speech, I said, "Hear, hear!" at the appropriate places because I believed that what he was introducing was worthy of congratulation. It was not a matter of being a mere parrot. Having heard him introduce the Budget, I listened with great interest to the Leader of the Opposition. I listened and waited, but what a monochromatic, lugubrious mental palette it was, devoid of all initiative!

Now it is somewhat explained. He came in here with words and notes that had been prepared by somebody else. It was nothing but a dirge of doom. He was here to create fear in the minds of the people of Queensland. That is most unfortunate. Irrespective of politics, we must have regard for the workers of Queensland, particularly the young school-leavers. However, the

Leader of the Opposition was only too keen to engender in the minds of those people a fear—a fear of unemployment. It is such a negative word. If only he could have been induced to talk about work—work that is available. Work is available. The Leader of the Opposition delights in referring constantly to unemployment figures and the lack of job vacancies. Whenever he mentions the lack of job vacancies, he is answered always in the columns of the Press the following morning by the vast number of job vacancies advertised not only here in Brisbane in "The Courier-Mail" but in every other newspaper throughout the State. The answer is there for him, and for every voter in this State, to see. Job vacancies are available.

The Budget of this State has had an influence upon the Commonwealth—in reverse. Usually the Commonwealth's Budget has an effect on us. However, in one instance at least to which I can refer, this State's budgetary planning has had a direct influence upon the Federal Budget. I refer to Federal estate duty. The exemption for an interest passing to a spouse has been increased to \$50,000. Where the whole of the estate of a deceased passes to the spouse, the estate is exempt if its value does not exceed \$90,000. Those figures are quite realistic. By the declared policy we announced in this Chamber over a period of years, we have shown the Federal Government the way to reduce the incidence of taxation upon the individual.

Another aspect of the influence of the Federal Government upon the State is in housing. Here there is a rather pitiful story to tell—pitiful because, particularly here in Brisbane, so many people are dependent on housing provided by Governments. I refer to that part of the Treasurer's Financial Statement in which he said—

"Total funds available for housing purposes in 1976-77 are \$113.4 million".

That is an increase of approximately 15 per cent, which is only commensurate with the inflationary spiral. This has had the most serious effect upon the economy of Queensland. It is not that I want to see the State of Queensland become the greatest landowner since William I, but I would encourage the State Government to consider the land which it owns, particularly in the Brisbane area. I refer to Kangaroo Point. The activities by unionists—and particularly the painters and dockers—have reduced the formerly robust company of Evans Deakin into a state of nothingness. Kangaroo Point, which is perhaps the most salubrious residential suburb in the Greater Brisbane area, has what was formerly a productive dock area but is now non-productive. I encourage the Government to consider the use of the land for the purpose of the development of high-rise dwellings for the workers of Brisbane. It is an excellent dormitory suburb. It is close to the centre of the city. It has all the amenities that are required and bus or ferry transport to

the centre of the city. This is an area which, I submit, is ideally suited to the development of high-rise workers' dwellings.

The other aspect of the Budget to which I refer is the question of health. Health is taking 21 per cent of our Budget and so much of it is being spent upon the erection of large buildings. I encourage the Government to consider not erecting buildings such as the 800-bed hospital in Townsville or the extension of the Rockhampton Hospital except where those things are necessary. It is understood that these things are necessary in the treatment of geriatrics and traumatic injuries. But a far larger amount of money is required to be spent in preventive medicine.

I recommend to the Treasurer that he consider the absorption of the Building Societies Act within his own portfolio. That Act is no longer a matter for house-building; rather it is a matter belonging to the fiscal policy. For that reason I recommend strongly that the Treasurer consider, and recommend to the Premier that he consider, transferring the Building Societies Act from the portfolio of the Minister for Works and Housing.

A great deal of confidence has been expressed in the Budget in Queensland and in Australia. The greatest expression of confidence occurred last Saturday with two happenings. One was in Lockyer, where the people supported this Government by 70-odd per cent and the other was that B.H.P., the largest company in Australia, expressed its confidence in the economy of Australia and the mineral resources of Queensland by paying \$81,000,000 for the purchase of the interest of Peabody Coal Company. These two aspects give great support to our new Treasurer and his first Budget, on which I congratulate him.

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (9.33 p.m.), in reply: It is rather pleasing to learn that the Budget has been well received by the Committee and indeed generally by the public. I thank the many honourable members who have spoken for their contributions, kind remarks, suggestions and various views. It is inevitable in a Budget debate that there would be a variety of views expressed and occasional criticism.

I am not going to attempt in my reply to deal with the speeches of individual members but rather I shall deal with the general principles on which they spoke. I think 36 members have spoken on the Budget and I have deliberately delayed my reply to allow as many members as possible to speak. I will endeavour in my reply to cover the main points that have been raised.

The Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members unleashed a typical tirade of condemnation of practically every policy measure contained in the Budgets of both the State and Commonwealth Governments. They fail to understand that all Governments in this country—and that

includes New South Wales, Tasmania and South Australia—are forced into a position of having to live in the aftermath of the mismanagement of this nation by the Whitlam Labor Government and that to a very large extent current policies of these Governments are directed to restoring the damage that was done to the economy during the Whitlam socialist era.

The two major issues that are at the root of the current economic difficulties—inflation and unemployment—were spawned and nurtured by that socialist Government. They developed to unacceptable levels at an incredible rate and I can say with complete certainty that their arrest and control will not be achieved with anything near the rapidity of their growth, and what is more they cannot be brought under control without some pain. The economy cannot be restored with jobs available for everyone without some cost.

The massive and sudden injection of funds into the public sector by the former socialist Government, which created excessive demands and set the inflationary spiral in train, has had to be phased down in order to allow the economy to settle down and to give businesses in the private sector an ability to look to the future with confidence that their profit margins will not again be attacked by uncontrollable cost rises. Restoration of a sound economy cannot be achieved overnight and I have been somewhat critical of the present Commonwealth Government's approach to the problem in that I feel that it has cut Government and semi-government works too severely before the private sector is ready to take up the slack.

I believe that the medicine prescribed by the Commonwealth to cure the ills of the country is the correct prescription but that the dose has been too strong. Nevertheless the blame for the creation of the disease falls fairly and squarely on the socialist Government led by Mr. Whitlam and we are now at least moving in the right direction—towards stability with encouragement of the private sector to expand and absorb the manpower and other resources which were previously taken for lavish, non-productive and unwanted programmes in the public sector. The Commonwealth Government alone has the responsibility, the power and the resources to regulate the over-all economy, and even though there might be points of fine tuning with which the State Governments disagree, it behoves all of them to stand behind the Commonwealth Government in its genuine efforts to restore some semblance of sanity to the running of the nation's economic affairs.

The Opposition would have the State Government now turn on another tap of its own from some reservoir of money which it doesn't have but which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition advocates could

somehow be provided by deficit budgeting, to counteract the effects of the Commonwealth's withdrawals and restrictions. This is not the first time that we have heard this philosophy expounded from the Opposition benches by people who could be expected to have a better knowledge of the principles and practicalities of State financing.

The simple indisputable fact is that State Governments do not have the ability to carry large deficits unless, of course, they are prepared to live on balances which are held in the Trust and Special Funds for specific purposes. Although in times of difficulty where it has been virtually impossible to exactly balance a budget, and such a course has been followed to a very limited degree, it would be a most unsound policy for a State Government to deliberately set out to spend more money than is expected to be derived from revenues. All I can say in this regard is that it will be a sorry day for the State's financial integrity if the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters ever gain control of the Treasury benches and run the State into deficit in an attempt to take over from the Commonwealth Government its role as the economic manager of the nation. Obviously a State Government can adopt policies which give some encouragement to employment in selected areas, as we have done with our special assistance to primary industries, pay-roll tax concessions and so on, but a State which set out to manoeuvre the economy through fiscal measures without regard to the need to live within its means would soon find itself in grave financial difficulties.

In preparing this year's Budget, I could have defied the prudent policies of this Government in the past, and my better judgment, and adopted the approach suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, which may have had short-term attractions for the electorate. But at what price! It would have meant a shattering of the sound financial principles that have formed the basis of the financial management of the State for close to 20 years and which have brought this State into the best financial position of any in the Commonwealth. In point of fact, this Government has taken what I believe, and I believe time will prove, is the correct course of action. We have provided funds to areas of special need and, in accordance with declared policies, provided for taxation concessions on the same guide-lines. We have not imposed any general taxation imposts over and above the present levels and have increased charges such as rail fares and freights, which have to be related to cost factors, only in accordance with increases in cost since they were last increased, irrespective of the degree to which current charges fall short of covering these costs.

At the same time, we have held departmental expenditures generally at a level which provides for no more than the current levels

of service, including a restriction on expansion of Public Service staff establishments. We have provided an amount to cover costs of basic wage and award increases which assumes that the rate of increases will be similar to last year's. This, I hope, may be regarded as a maximum requirement and, as I indicated in my Budget statement, charges against this reserve, and indeed against all allocations, will be continually monitored with a view to releasing funds which can be made available for much-needed capital works.

In my view, this is prudent, well-considered budgeting and the only type of financial administration under which the State can hope to maintain a firm and viable structure under the present circumstances.

We cannot, however, hope to pick up all the shortfalls in Commonwealth funding, particularly in the capital area. We cannot provide enough money to complete Kinchant and Monduran Dams on schedule or bring progress on the urban transit system up to date. We cannot provide another \$12,000,000 for the sewerage programme so that local authorities can continue their works at last year's level.

We cannot provide the extra \$20,000,000 necessary to bring the State Loan Council allocation to near the amount necessary to provide the same work effort as in 1975-76.

We do not have the capacity to provide perhaps \$20,000,000 for housing to reinstate a programme which would make some substantial inroads into the desperate needs in this area, and we cannot come out of nowhere with another \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 for roads, to improve the capacity of the department to provide the much-needed upgrading of various roads right throughout the State.

All the State can do is what it has done, that is, direct available funds to areas of highest priority and endeavour and as the year progresses divert further funds to areas of greatest need in an attempt to maintain the work-forces and progress at the highest possible levels.

Honourable members of the Opposition are whistling in the dark if they think the Government has some sort of a fairy god-mother who can grant its every wish. They are not facing up to the realities of the situation, and when I hear the policies of the alternative Government of this State—and I would mention at this point that at least for the first time in my recollection Opposition members have told us during the Budget debate what their financial policies are—I shudder at the prospects for this State should some mischance grant them the control of the Treasury benches. Having now heard them, I can fully appreciate the Opposition's reluctance to openly commit themselves to them in the past.

The Leader of the Opposition, who is very seldom here, talks of a "controlled deficit". What sort of a deficit would he

envisage or, in his wisdom as a prospective Premier and perhaps Treasurer of this State, regard as being one which would be appropriate to the circumstances and necessary to do all the things he sees as essential to right all the ills of the present system? \$100,000,000, \$200,000,000? This could be the sort of money needed to carry out the A.L.P. policies. He must be feeling fairly secure and grateful that he will not be likely to be confronted with a day of reckoning on this issue.

Let me now turn to some of the other specific matters raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. He referred to a 20 per cent estimated increase in State taxation this year over last year and drew a comparison with New South Wales, which, he says, only has a comparable figure of 11 per cent. His research has, however, not extended far enough for him to have ascertained that the Queensland figures include the additional amounts resulting from the full year's effect of last year's increases which applied for part only of last year and which still left Queensland rates of taxation below the average of other States. This full-year effect accounts for \$18,400,000 of the increase, and the exclusion of this amount would reduce the 20 per cent to 14 per cent. This increase results purely from anticipated increases in the level of transactions subject to taxes and increases in monetary values in line with projected inflationary trends in the coming year. It does not result from increases in taxation this year, and the fact that it is at variance with the New South Wales estimated increase does not seem to me to be very relevant.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to give further quotations of the percentage increase in various State taxation items since 1972-73. He indicated that he was alarmed at the over-all increase of 130 per cent in State taxation collections in the four years. Included in these figures is pay-roll tax, which has shown a large increase due, firstly, to the progressive lift in rates to 5 per cent in unison with all other States and, secondly, to the abnormal increase in wage and salary rates over the years in question. With pay-roll tax excluded, the increase otherwise is 81 per cent, which is not inordinate when the rate of inflation is taken into account and consideration is given to the fact that certain of the State's taxes were revised in 1975-76 to bring them more into line with the rates applying in other States.

The Leader of the Opposition also speculated on the level of increases in general charges. I have already indicated that these are to be revised in line with cost increases since they were last revised. As almost all of these were increased last year, this means that they will generally go up by about 15 per cent, which amounts to no increase at all in real terms.

The comments by the Leader of the Opposition on Medibank have, I believe, been most competently responded to by my

colleague the Minister for Health. I hope that he is now comforted in the knowledge that the people of Queensland are receiving full benefit for the levies that they pay and that he will in future refrain from suggesting that the deal which the people of this State are receiving under the present Commonwealth Government represents something inferior to what they were previously receiving.

In the final analysis, the question of whether the cost of Medibank is met by a special levy or from general taxation is an academic one. The taxpayer is meeting the cost in either case and there was never a prospect of convincing the Federal Government that Queenslanders, because of their peculiar position, should be exempted from this payment. Any disadvantages that Queenslanders may appear to have suffered can be attributed to the founders of the scheme, Mr. Hayden and his colleagues, yet they are far outweighed by the benefits that accrue from participation in the scheme.

I find it difficult to reply to some of the other observations of the Leader of the Opposition because of their inconsistency. He has welcomed in one breath the taxation concessions that were announced in the Budget, even claiming credit for some of them, and condemned them in another as being inadequate or misleading. The very real pay-roll tax concessions, which I believe will prove to be a great stimulus for the development of small businesses, the elimination of death duties, the reduction in workers' compensation costs—none of these is satisfactory in the eyes of the Leader of the Opposition. I'm sure we would all like to see greater concessions than this Budget provides for, but this is no reason for a State Government to act irresponsibly, reduce taxes and charges willy-nilly, and pour money into every area of demand by the use of the "controlled deficit" which he advocates.

I assure the Committee that as long as I am Treasurer of this State I will not be swayed by propositions such as those put forward—propositions which, if put into effect, would lead the State to financial disaster.

Increases in rail freights and other relatively minor charges were criticised and it was claimed that the Government was not doing enough to relieve unemployment. It was suggested that more funds should have been provided for housing, roads and other projects, but at the same time the Opposition wanted more pay-roll tax concessions. All these grandiose ideas have their attractions, but the only suggested source of finance was the Leader of the Opposition's magical deficit.

To maintain an acceptable degree of stability in the State's finances and services, account must be taken of inflationary effects on both expenditures and revenues. The major service area in which the Government, by deliberate policy decision, has not done this over the years is the railways.

I mentioned in my Financial Statement that I am concerned about the burden that the railways are imposing on State finances. The loss on the operations of the railways, including the profitable mineral lines, will be of the order of \$70,000,000 this year. Had increases in fares and freights not been instituted in the last two years, the loss would have been closer to \$160,000,000. Would the Opposition have left the charges at their 1975 level and found the extra \$90,000,000 or even the whole \$160,000,000 by running into deficit? Or would it have cut down on expenditures on schools, hospitals, services to primary producers and so on?

It was also suggested that the Government should have permitted controlled numerical growth in the Public Service to help the unemployment situation. The Budget measure of restricting staffs to the approved establishment numbers as at 30 June 1976 does, in fact, provide for "controlled growth".

In point of fact, there were some 2,600 vacant positions in the Public Service at that date in a total approved establishment of nearly 31,000. This means that, provided funds can be made available as the year progresses, a further 2,600 clerks, stenographers, technical officers and others can be placed in the Public Service during the financial year. The filling of these vacancies is under close surveillance by the Department of the Public Service Board, the Treasury and the departments themselves with a view to ensuring that as many qualified and suitable people as possible are placed in employment. However, it is not proposed to sacrifice the usual standards of quality in the recruitment of staff. To do so would assist in overcoming a temporary unemployment problem, but would have undesirable effects on the standard of the service in the future and would be unfair to the persons who were taken on but were not equipped to meet the demands of the positions which they filled.

I believe that this is a practical and constructive approach which takes account of the need for restraint but at the same time ensures that the Government plays its part in providing employment opportunities to the extent of its needs. I do not believe it would be correct to allow expansion beyond immediate essential needs, at considerable cost, primarily for the purpose of creating jobs.

Some scepticism was expressed about the stated provision for an increase of 228 in the Police Force. The Leader of the Opposition compared the figures in the Estimates which show a decrease of seven. These figures are the approved establishments of the department, not the actual numbers of the police officers on which the statement in the Budget speech was based. If he looks again and less cursorily at the Estimates of this department, he will find that the reduction of seven occurred in the administrative staff of the department and that the approved limits for officers remain constant at 4,268

for both 1975-76 and 1976-77. The actual numbers employed at 30 June 1976 were 4,040, or 228 below establishment. Thus there is scope for recruitment of a further 228 officers during 1976-77. I hope that this puts the Leader of the Opposition's mind at rest and that he will appreciate that this does not restrict the expansion of the force.

In the education sphere, there is scope for employment of a further 1,056 teachers in all areas and some 200 aides, janitor/grounds-men and cleaners.

Hospitals have authority to engage an extra 2,600 staff in all categories.

Totally, then, there is scope for employment in our Public Service and related Crown employment of a further 6,684 in these sectors of the Government service alone, and I regard this as a very real contribution by the State Government to alleviation of the unemployment position.

In other aspects of Government employment, the Budget provisions have been oriented to employment-intensive activities to the extent that it is practicable. Over \$20,000,000 has been provided to the Works Department for maintenance of public buildings, including schools, court-houses and so on. This is nearly \$6,000,000 more than was originally provided last year and will permit a high level of day-labour and contractual work to be maintained.

The Government could perhaps have secured more funds for use for unemployment relief, but this could be done only by increased taxation measures. The effect would be a reduction of spending power in the private sector, resulting in dismissal of staff in that area with no over-all improvement in total employment.

The Opposition has made much of the increased revenues from pay-roll tax since the States took it over in 1971. Let me make it quite clear that the States gained little from the passing over of this tax to the States by the Commonwealth Government in the first instance because the amount that came directly to the State was almost totally offset by a reduction in General Revenue Assistance from the Commonwealth. The revenues from this source have increased substantially over the years by virtue of the increases in rates but also because of the effects of increases in salaries and wages and the work-force in the period.

The fact that wages escalation has been influential in drawing more and more smaller businesses into the scope of the provisions is recognised, and constructive measures have been introduced to reverse this trend in Queensland under a programmed lifting of exemption levels along the lines indicated in the Budget statement.

I have dealt at some length with matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. As I said earlier, it is regrettable that the efforts

of his research have not been brought to fruitful and worth-while conclusions by a careful study of the problems—problems which, I assure him, are foremost in the minds of the Government—and rational constructive alternatives presented worthy of serious consideration by the Government.

Other honourable members of the Opposition did little more than pick up and expound on the many points of concern that I raised in my speech and echoed the sentiments of their leader.

Apart from a few parochial matters which are unquestionably of import but with which I do not propose to become involved and which, if honourable members wish to pursue them, could be taken up with the relevant Ministers, I feel that I have generally covered their points in the earlier part of this reply. I note, however, that in some instances both Opposition and Government members raised queries on certain points which I would like to comment on.

One such point was raised by the honourable member for Rockhampton in connection with teacher numbers. He has asked for a reconciliation of the stated increase of 486 with the projected output of teachers' colleges of 1,616. The 486 referred to in my Budget statement is the difference between the maximum approved strength for February 1976, which is 19,579, and the maximum approved strength sought for February 1977, which is 20,065. In comparing the increase in the approved establishment and the output of teachers' colleges, allowance has to be made for the under-strength position at the outset and the number of resignations, retirements and deaths during the year.

The honourable member for Salisbury expressed concern about the amount allocated for temperance education, indicating that only \$46,500 had been provided for this purpose. She is no doubt referring to last year's grant from Education Department funds. The figure from this source in 1976-77 is \$51,800, incidentally, but the point I wish to make is that a further \$231,400 has been provided for similar purposes in the Health, Education and Road Safety areas from the Liquor Act Trust Fund. This fund receives its moneys in the main from liquor licence fees collections.

The really major area of expenditure on the problem of alcoholism occurs in the community health programme. Although this is oriented predominantly towards treatment and rehabilitation, it does in fact embrace all aspects of the problems of alcoholism and drug abuse, including education. I assure the honourable member that the Government is not unmindful of the needs in this area.

Quite a few speakers in this debate have sought information on the progress of the urban public transport redevelopment programme. Honourable members will be aware that the Urban Transit Authority has

recently been incorporated and will continue with the further advancement of the project to its final completion and operation.

I mentioned in my Budget speech the doubt that presently surrounds the rate of future work on the project. I want to make it clear that it is only the rate of progress that is in doubt and that this doubt has been brought about entirely by the failure of the Commonwealth Government to enter into any commitment beyond what is required of it by existing legislation.

The State Government has promised electrification and cannot continue to wait for the Commonwealth to make up its mind before moving forward with the programme. The rate at which we can move ahead without Commonwealth funds must of necessity be limited. However, tenders have been called for electric rail-cars, overhead wiring and signal works for the Darra to Ferny Grove section, which would be the first to be electrified.

At this stage, because of the doubts regarding finance, it is not possible to give a clear indication of when this line will become operative. My colleague the Minister for Transport will, I am sure, issue a statement on the timing of the future programme when the immediate problems and doubts have been resolved.

Item (Salaries—His Excellency the Governor) agreed to.

Progress reported.

STOCK ACT

DISALLOWANCE OF REGULATIONS

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (10 p.m.): I move—

“That regulations 146 and 150 under the Stock Act 1915–1976, as made on 1 July 1976 and tabled in this House on 31 August 1976, be disallowed.”

At the outset of this debate I should like to correct a statement appearing at page 3196 of “Hansard” in which I am recorded as saying, “Every country from which we imported the meat except New Zealand has foot and mouth disease.” That was an oversight on my part. Instead of “has” it should read, “has had”. Anyone who knows anything about foot and mouth disease realises that all of the countries mentioned in that paragraph have had foot and mouth disease except New Zealand, which has not had it. This mistake was taken up by the Minister in his second-reading speech, in which he adversely criticised my knowledge of viral diseases. I hope that I will have time tonight to take action on that matter.

It is rather interesting tonight to see so many Ministers in the House.

Mr. Houston: That's the full total you have got here tonight.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: Correct. During the debate at the introductory stage of the Bill, the Minister was rarely in the Chamber. There were no other Ministers here and he kept walking out of the Chamber. I could not make out whether it was because of complete indifference to what honourable members were going to say or to their knowledge of the subject or because of an ageing prostate.

Before actually speaking to the motion I should like to give honourable members and the people of Australia my reason for moving it. It is purely and simply to strengthen the battle against viral diseases, especially foot and mouth disease, in animals and birds, and to close a large hiatus in the procedures of disease prevention that has been overlooked by the body politic.

I consider that in Queensland there exists a state or condition that may not apply throughout the rest of Australia but which could be the cause of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease or any other viral infection in animals.

I suggest that regulation 146 be amended to read—

“Licensing and Control of Piggeries

“146. Definition. For the purpose of any Regulation which has application to the licensing and control of piggeries the terms used shall have the meanings respectively assigned to them by section 3 of this Act and unless the contrary appears—

‘Animal matter’ without limiting the meaning of the words ‘animal matter’, includes the carcass or any part of the carcass of any animal blood eggs and any refuse or residue which contains or has been in contact with animal matter from any premises.

‘Approved’ means approved by an inspector.

‘Piggery’ means any yard, premises or place where swine are held or kept.

‘Waste food’ means

(a) any meat bones blood offal or any other part of the carcass of any livestock or of any poultry or product derived therefrom or hatching waste or eggs or eggshells

(b) any broken or waste foodstuffs (including table or kitchen refuse scraps or waste) which contain or have been in contact with any meat bones blood offal or with any other part of the carcass of any livestock or of any poultry

(c) but does not include meal manufactured from protein originating from livestock or poultry.

‘Processed animal matter’ means animal matter or waste food reduced to meat meal or treated by a process of maintaining it at a temperature of 100°C (212°F) for at least 60 minutes or

treated by an alternative process which has been authorised in writing by the Minister."

"Treated animal matter means animal matter consisting only of offal and/or meat scraps from abattoirs slaughter-houses or butcher shops subjected to heat in approved equipment to the satisfaction of an inspector or an inspector under the Meat Industry Act 1965-1973."

I suggest that regulation 150 be amended to read—

"150. Restrictions on the Feeding of Animal Matter to Swine. (1) A person shall not—

(i) feed animal matter to any swine; or

(ii) permit the consumption of animal matter by any swine, except as provided in subregulation (2) of this Regulation.

(2) (a) Processed animal matter and processed waste food may be fed to swine on any Registered premises; and

(b) Treated animal matter may be fed to swine on premises licensed as—

(i) piggeries under these Regulations; and

(ii) slaughter-houses or poultry slaughter-houses under the Meat Industry Act 1965-1973."

I direct the attention of honourable members firstly to legislation enacted in the United Kingdom under the Diseases of Animals Act of 1950—that is, (Waste Food) Order 1973 No. 1936—whereby it is an offence to feed waste food, so-called swill, to animals and birds and, secondly, to legislation enacted in New Zealand under the Animal Diseases Prevention (Port and Airport Facilities) Regulations 1966 made under the Animals Act of 1967. I intend to table these documents for the perusal of honourable members.

Because of the restricted time allowed in this debate I will summarise this legislation. The disposal of waste food from ships, aircraft, hovercraft or vehicles of any sort into the United Kingdom or New Zealand is prohibited and the methods of disposal are rigidly controlled.

The legislation forbids the feeding of unprocessed food waste, that is so-called swill, to livestock, which includes cattle, sheep, pigs, goats and all species of fowls, turkeys, geese, ducks, guinea fowl, pigeons, pheasants, partridges and quail.

In the United Kingdom it is laid down rigidly and clearly that waste food must be processed according to a standard proclaimed by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. All plant and equipment used in the processing must be licensed and be of a standard and specification laid down and approved by the Ministry. Various types of methods and machines are described for

producing the optimum conditions for killing all viruses in the waste food, that is 100°C for one hour. All processing plants are licensed and inspected regularly.

Since the Queensland legislation was passed recently, it has become apparent that there will be large quantities of unprocessed waste food poured into sewers, or, alternatively, where no other facilities exist, this waste will be placed on refuse dumps in close proximity to our cities, especially the provincial cities which often border on, or are surrounded by, primary industries such as cattle-raising. I know of two or more provincial cities which will be affected.

The honourable members for Toowoomba, Mt. Isa and Brisbane have in previous debates expressed their fears of disease spread and I, as the member for Townsville, say that there is a real danger in my electorate, which contains a large rural element. We have two local authority refuse areas—Townsville and Thuringowa. The Thuringowa Shire has a real feral pig problem, which I have brought to the notice of the House previously.

There is also a problem of pigs creating untold havoc throughout the entire State. I refer to an article headed, "Pigs buffet Queensland economy" published in the "Australian" of 7 October 1976. I have not heard the Minister of Primary Industries refute that assertion so I gather that he accepts it as a proven fact that pigs are a problem in this State and are adversely affecting our economy, especially in the grain-growing areas. The article reads—

"On average, farmers and graziers in Queensland are losing \$4,000 a year with some losing as much as \$10,000 worth of grain and lambs to the pigs."

I have visited both the refuse dumps in my electorate regularly and noted that feral pigs and birds of all types, especially sea-gulls, pigeons and ibises, are feeding regularly and merrily on all the scraps. I have been there at night-time and noticed feral pigs and rats by the hundreds.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the findings of the Pirbright Virological Laboratory on foot and mouth disease outbreaks in the United Kingdom. It was found that 16 per cent were caused by migrating birds. The pigeon and the sea-gull travel long distances and, therefore, could contribute to the spread of a viral disease such as foot and mouth disease. 40 per cent were caused by meat products fed to pigs; 9 per cent were due to contact with meat and bones other than swill; and 35 per cent came from obscure and unknown causes.

I consider that the present regulations forbidding the use of unprocessed food products and allowing them to be dumped on city refuse dumps or into unprepared sewage plants does create a health hazard not only to primary industries but also to

the health of our citizens, and I consider that further thought should be given to the disposal of this so-called unprepared food waste before rigid rules are laid down by Parliament.

Mr. MOORE (Windsor) (10.11 p.m.): In seconding the motion moved by the honourable member for Townsville, I should like to state first that I am reluctant to take the stand that I am taking.

Mr. Houston: You don't have to do it.

Mr. MOORE: I have to do it because morally it is the right thing to do. That is why I am doing it. However, I am reluctant to do it because I do not like taking on one of our own Ministers in these circumstances.

I am the most easily convinced member of this Assembly, but in the debate that took place in the House earlier this year, no authentic argument was put up which established that the regulations that have been introduced are the correct regulations and that they will do the job. In effect they are doing absolutely the reverse, and that is why I am seconding the motion. I know that the regulations are wrong and that the three or four or half dozen members who speak against them tonight will be proved right in the long run. The Minister will be proved to be wrong, and all those who are going along with him because the Agricultural Council or somebody else has stood over them, influenced them, inveigled them, or whatever it may be, will be proved to be wrong. They have not done it to the two, three or four in the House who know that the regulations are wrong and who say, "We will make a last-ditch stand." If enough members here will cross the floor to defeat the regulations, I will go with them; but I will not go over to the other side of the Chamber with two or three others and make a puerile attempt to grandstand.

The whole problem comes down to the proper disposal of pigmeats and other types of food that in other countries have been proven to carry this viral disease. Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that foot and mouth disease will not necessarily enter the country in other animals. It is true that if quarantine of animals were not as good as it is, foot and mouth disease would have entered Australia a long time ago. In fact, it did enter New South Wales in 1872, but fortunately, whether because of the conditions or because of the stand that was taken at the time, it did not become widespread. It can come in by ship, by aeroplane, or on plant products. The honourable member for Everton fears that it will come here across Torres Strait.

Many people visit this country, and Australians travel overseas every day. When they return to Australia, the quarantine officers say, "Where have you been? Have you visited any meatworks overseas, or have you been anywhere where there is foot and

mouth disease? How long ago?" They would not know whether the information given to them is true. A person may have in his port a pair of shoes that he has been wearing overseas. Nobody destroys the shoes or takes any other action. If a person has shoes on his feet and says that he has been to certain places, the quarantine officers make him walk through a solution and say, "That will kill the disease." If the virus is killed simply by doing that, there is no need for us to worry about it at all. That is the sort of stupid exercise we are engaging in.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Are you espousing Liberal Party or National Party arguments?

Mr. MOORE: The honourable member wouldn't have a clue. He should get back to Rockhampton or wherever he comes from.

I ask that these food scraps be treated in a proper manner. The best thing that can be done is boil every last ounce of them. They should be boiled at 212°F for an hour, as the honourable member for Townsville said, or for a shorter time in a pressure cooker. I realise that if they are boiled in a vat over a fire they may boil on the outside but not in the centre. A suitable vat could be designed.

I would not mind if the regulations stated that table by-products must be ground in a meat grinder of some description and reduced in size to, say, a 5 cm cube. If they are reduced to a certain size they can be properly boiled and sterilised. But what are we doing with them?

Dr. Crawford: We could eat them.

Mr. MOORE: Of course we could. There's nothing wrong with them. Quite often last night's leftovers are cooked as bubble and squeak for breakfast. But here we are saying, "It's O.K. for you for breakfast, but it's not good enough for pigs." That shows how stupid we are.

Dr. Crawford: Bovine by-products.

Mr. MOORE: I suppose I should accept that interjection to let everyone know the honourable member is in the Chamber.

The regulations state that table scraps and so forth have to be buried at a depth of 8 inches. It is stated in metric, but it is equal to 8 inches, anyway. That does not mean that every council employee will do his job in a responsible manner. He simply will not do it; that's all there is to it.

The smart people say, "Let us fence off the dumps." Fence off the dumps! With 2,000,000 feral pigs running around throughout the length and breadth of Queensland! Little pigs whose parents have been shot are as thin as a razor-blade and they can get in anywhere. The more inbred pigs become the longer their snouts are. If they can't uproot something that is buried at a depth of 8 inches, there is something wrong with them. Yet it has been decided that this product, which is supposed to be so dangerous, is to be buried at that depth.

The only reason why Queensland is not infested with foot and mouth disease is that it has not entered the country. If it does enter the country, however, our stupid methods will not combat it. We are the most stupid people who could be met on a day's march. We are not sterilising food waste; we are not putting it into the sewerage system, which is not wholly effective; we are putting it in dumps, where it can be uprooted by pigs or taken away by birds. Neither the Minister nor his departmental officers, who write his speeches, have come up with a proper way of dealing with these food scraps. That is why I am on my feet tonight.

The regulations will not prevent the disease from entering the country, nor will they lead to its eradication should it enter the country in food products. If it does enter the country the only way it can be combated is by boiling the food scraps. That is done in Great Britain. But we think we are smarter than Great Britain. We haven't even got any means of detecting the disease if it should enter the country. That is how smart we are. We were going to establish a virological laboratory in Queensland, but then it was decided to erect it in Victoria. There's not even enough money to buy the land. That is the type of stupidity we are faced with. We could not recognise the disease if we saw it. If the disease came to our country and showed up in domestic pigs in a sty it would be contained within four walls. We would know where it was. That would be far better than feral pigs contracting the disease on a dump. It is well to remember that the disease can be spread very easily on the wind and in water and that it can remain active on a corn bag for up to 200 days.

We are doing nothing to prevent the disease entering the country. One of our problems is that we have been poisoning dingoes with "1080". Dingoes used to keep down the feral pig population, but they are now a bigger menace than the dingoes were. We will now be feeding them with table scraps that we will not feed to our domestic pigs because it could give them foot and mouth disease. If feral pigs contract the disease no-one will know about it until it is in our beef herds.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (10.21 p.m.):
Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Aikens: Are you going to make up the minds of all the A.L.P. members?

Mr. HOUSTON: Apparently the honourable member for Townsville South has no ladies to visit and nothing else to do, so he has decided to come here. It is refreshing to see him on a Tuesday night. I will soon put his mind at rest. We will not be supporting the renegades in the Liberal and National parties in their fight. Let that be quite clear.

It is obvious that this debate is a carry over of the fight that has been going on for quite some time between the Liberal Party and the National Party. Members of those parties have been calling each other names. In the Lockyer by-election campaign in Laidley Liberal Party members said many disparaging things about National Party members. In fact, they described one another as dishonest, deceitful and so on.

When this legislation was last before us it broke the coalition Government into two camps—the Liberal and National camps. We know how strongly they pressed their cases.

Mr. Alison: That is how much you know.

Mr. HOUSTON: Quite a few Liberals support the Premier. Those who are with him have stuck to him. That is their decision. The other Liberals who are supported by their executive and convention—we will see them standing up here tonight—and a couple of National Party members, including the honourable member for Callide, who are sour on the National Party will be showing their true colours in this matter.

To be quite honest, the A.L.P. adheres to its original position. We do not want this disease in our nation. We will support any reasonable move to make regulations to prevent any possibility of the disease coming here. Unlike some of the Liberals and National Party members who are only mouthing concern, we are genuinely interested in the beef industry. We are 100 per cent behind the beef producers.

If the regulations do not cover the situation, we will oppose them. The honourable member for Townsville should at least have had the courtesy to tell us what his amendments were. Instead, he merely read them out and, to be quite honest, he read so fast that it was very hard for us to take down his words exactly. If he takes similar action on another occasion, let him print his amendments and distribute them to honourable members so that they may study them and know what they entail. If he had done that, we could have made a closer examination of them. The point is that he did not do that and that is one point in which he failed.

Secondly, we are not coming into a fight between the coalition parties. The real problem is that there is some waste material—

Dr. Crawford: Stop making excuses.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member can make his speech later. He will have a couple of minutes, too.

The real problem is that food and other scraps have to be disposed of. Previously the pig was used as a very handy garbage bin. Whilst I am not saying that that has not saved pig producers some money, the point is that the House decided that the risks involved in this practice were too great. So the Bill was introduced. The regulation, as

I read it, provides that animal by-products may be fed to pigs, provided they are processed by passing through a pressure cooker or similar appliance, as may also treated animal matter such as offal, meat fats coming from abattoirs and all the other things that have been mentioned. However, the honourable member for Townsville wants to add that ordinary food may also be given to pigs. That type of feeding was the very reason why the Bill was introduced. The Government was worried about it and, if I understood the Minister correctly, that is why the Bill was brought down. We are not prepared to agree to the amendment of the regulations at this stage just on the honourable member's assertion that food of that type is quite all right to be fed to pigs.

I will agree with the honourable member on many aspects of the problem of disposing of food. It is a problem, but it should not be a problem under the Stock Act. It should not strip beef producers of their protection. Where the Government is falling down is in not providing enough money to local authorities for the proper disposal of the extra waste that has resulted. If the honourable member had argued in the Budget debate that has just finished, "We want another \$1,000,000 to set up round the State methods of helping local authorities to dispose of scraps of this type", I would have been 100 per cent with him. But he has not done that. As a Government member, he has been a party to constantly imposing extra expenses on local authorities, without any reimbursement.

From recollection, the speeches I made at the introductory and second-reading stages of the Bill were to this effect, "How the devil will local authorities be able to get rid of all this waste matter?" Apparently the honourable member is saying that he, too, is frightened they will not get rid of it. However, his alternative is the wrong one; it is to give it to the pigs and let them get rid of it. To me, that completely defeats the Labor Party's interpretation of the Minister's introduction. If I am wrong, the Minister can put me right. I am just making it very clear where the Labor party stood at that time and why we are not supporting this move.

I regret that some local authorities may not be doing the right thing in their garbage disposal. They may not be putting enough soil on top of the refuse when it goes on the tip. They may be allowing wild animals to take the rubbish away. But surely the supervision of garbage disposal is the responsibility of health inspectors and council health departments. I would expect that of them. If they are not doing it, the honourable member should get up and say so; he should challenge them to get on with the job. But a regulation should not be broken down at this stage. If the honourable member wants our support—

Mr. Moore: We don't want your support.

Mr. HOUSTON: If we had said that we supported it and the honourable member for Windsor had had to come over here to vote with the socialists, as he calls us, he wouldn't have slept for a week.

Mr. Moore: That's dead right.

Mr. HOUSTON: The little bit of hair he has on his head would go, too. I don't want him to lose what hair he has. Let him keep his hair on and stay where he is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: We are not giving Government members a vehicle by means of which they can carry on this long-standing dual between the coalition parties.

As to the councils, I say to the Minister that he should, through his Cabinet, make more money available to them. I spoke to representatives of councils when the Bill was originally brought before the Parliament. Many of them are worried about doing the job correctly and they are concerned about getting rid of the extra garbage. All who conduct hotels or restaurants will say that this measure has added to their costs and their garbage disposal worries.

I can understand the feeling of the honourable member for Townsville with regard to diseases being carried round in those other ways. But, as I have said, the answer to the problem is not the feeding of waste to pigs; in other words, letting the pigs get the disease. The real solution is to give local authorities the necessary money and know-how so that they can do the job in the interests of the general health of our nation.

Mr. LOWES (Brisbane) (10.30 p.m.): I support the motion. I make no apology for doing so. In fact I have no reservations whatsoever about supporting it. On behalf of the people of the Brisbane electorate, which is the central part of the metropolitan area, I say that in this matter we have a great problem.

The objects of the 1976 amendment of the Act and the regulations were twofold: firstly, to prevent the introduction of foot and mouth disease into Queensland and, secondly, to prevent the spread of foot and mouth disease in Queensland. The proposed regulations do neither.

It was unfortunate that the honourable member for Bulimba had to speak for the Leader of the Opposition and play politics. This is a matter which is way beyond politics. It affects the general health of the community as well as the economy of the whole State, particularly the rural sector, which is already in dire straits. What could possibly be the result if we were stricken at this time with foot and mouth disease? Our beef industry is already in a very parlous state. That can be said of virtually all of our rural industries. All that is needed is an outbreak of foot and mouth

disease and we could say goodnight to rural industries not only in Queensland but throughout Australia. These are real prospects.

Unfortunately there is nothing in the proposed legislation by regulation which will do one thing to stop it. If there were, I would support it whole-heartedly, as I think every other honourable member would. But I am not going to play politics, as the honourable member for Bulimba did. He wanted to have two bob each way. He wanted to be for it this way and against it the other way. For goodness' sake let him make up his mind whether he believes this sort of legislation will achieve what is intended. I believe that the proposed legislation does not accomplish either of the objects and, because I believe it is futile, I am opposed to it. I said this earlier this year when the Bill was before us and I will keep saying it.

Mr. Marginson: You didn't vote against it then.

Mr. LOWES: I did.

I shall instance a few of the possible means of introduction. Migratory birds. What can we do about them? How can we prohibit their coming to Queensland? Obviously we cannot. Illegal fishermen. What can we do about them? We arrest them. Anybody going to Torres Strait, Thursday Island, Townsville, Cairns and most of the other ports along the coast can see ships that have been arrested and brought into port. From my inquiries I have found that nothing is being done to those ships or to the people on them to prevent the introduction of any exotic disease. I have made inquiries about this matter and I have found that nothing is being done.

We have illegal fishermen coming from Indonesia, which is a country that has foot and mouth disease. We have Taiwanese fishermen and, coming closer to home, fishermen from Papua New Guinea, which is another country that is host to and has foot and mouth disease. But nothing is being done about this.

We have travellers coming into the country. What is being done in the decontamination of travellers? Very little. They fill in a form. As the honourable member for Windsor has already instanced, the inquiry which goes on has only a nominal effect. It is not fully effective.

We have illegal foodstuffs being brought in and this is considered to be one of the most likely sources of foot and mouth disease in Australia. We talk about the Southern European who comes back from a holiday overseas and brings a salami in his bag. Is this going to be the way that foot and mouth is introduced into Australia?

I understand that the most likely method of introduction is through importation of bull semen. I should have thought that officers of the Department of Primary Industries

would be most concerned about the introduction of foot and mouth through bull semen, but I have heard nothing to suggest that any prohibition is to be imposed on the importation of bull semen into Australia.

Mr. Ahern: There is, of course.

Mr. LOWES: Well, not very long ago we had an incident somewhere near Somerset Dam—the honourable member for Somerset might know it well—when some person arrived in Australia with a bagful of bull semen which was infected with blue tongue.

An Honourable Member: It was smuggled in.

Mr. LOWES: It was smuggled in but it was not discovered by the customs people; it was discovered as a result of some chance remark passed at a bull or pig sale at one of the small towns in the Brisbane Valley. It was not discovered at the airport or at the port, so how capable are the customs people of preventing this?

I am concerned about the possible spread of the disease. I understand it is spread from animal to animal through food waste in an untreated form, and this seems to be the most likely way it will be transmitted. Therefore the recommendation made by the honourable member for Townsville is the solution to the problem. There is nothing in these regulations which will prevent the introduction of foot and mouth disease into Queensland. What we have to do whenever there is an outbreak in Queensland is identify the source, and we can do that by providing for the registration of places which can use food waste. Once those places are identified then eradication measures can be put into effect; stock can be slaughtered and people can be compensated.

But there is no way in the world that we can stop the spread of the disease by feral pigs, wild birds and other means, or even by humans who are scavenging on rubbish dumps, because the dumps around the metropolitan area and provincial cities and towns are not being properly cared for and are not being properly policed. If foot and mouth disease ever gets into such places, it will be disseminated so widely that there will be no way to stop its spread throughout the State.

I support the motion. I am afraid that what will happen if this motion is defeated is that we will go on with some form of pretence that we are doing something, and that is all it is. I am genuinely concerned. We are talking about the fact that foot and mouth disease might come to Australia, but other diseases such as salmonella and typhoid are already here and they can be spread by vermin. One only has to walk up the streets of Brisbane on a Sunday afternoon to see food scraps which have been left out since the Friday night because the pig-men, who used to pick up the scraps on the Friday night, have gone and now people are relying on the council to pick up the scraps on the

Monday. We have lost the first line of defence, and the second line of defence is very unlikely to succeed and is something upon which we cannot completely rely.

On behalf of the people of Brisbane, I support this motion whole-heartedly because I believe that a disease which might begin here could well spread to the rural areas and it will be our friends the National Party members and their supporters who will suffer most of all.

Mr. GYGAR (Stafford) (10.40 p.m.): In rising to speak to the motion, I emphasise that this is not an attempt to defeat what is known as the "pig-swill" Bill. I pay a tribute to the Minister's tenacity, perseverance and patience in getting the Bill through. But in case he is being misled by the honourable member for Bulimba, who, quite frankly, has not a clue about what is going on in the Chamber tonight and who obviously was speaking off the cuff, because what he said bore no relation to the motion moved by the honourable member for Townsville, I should like to reiterate what it is intended to achieve by moving the motion.

It is intended to amend the regulations to allow the feeding of processed waste matter to pigs in controlled circumstances. It does not seek even to define what those controlled circumstances shall be. We are willing to recognise that the Minister's officers and his advisers will want to go into the matter at some length to make sure that every loop-hole is closed. It is sought to provide some avenue through which these food scraps can be disposed of other than by tossing them out on a dump and making a smorgasbord for every passing animal. What we seek is that the Minister will permit the amendment of the regulations to include a new clause defining "processed animal matter" and "waste food". That is in section 146. Again, in section 150, it seeks to add "processed waste food" to "processed animal matter" and to say that it may be fed to swine on any registered premises—registered premises; total control.

Let us look at what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, and, indeed, at what is happening now. The pig-men have just about faded out. In many areas scraps are now being thrown onto dumps and are not being properly treated and properly covered up. The matter which is there—and I remind the Minister that this is the premise on which the whole Act rests—may or may not have foot and mouth disease in it. It is now being thrown onto dumps, and the figures given by the honourable member for Townsville show that pigs, birds and other agents can carry the disease away from the dump. Birds and animals are able to get into the dumps quite freely and carry away the disease.

The pig-swill Bill is in, but let us not compound the problem. Let us use the swill that is there, Mr. Speaker. Let us take the probably infected material, treat it

by sterilising it under controlled conditions that the Minister and his advisers can specify and get rid of any disease, then feed it at registered piggeries that the Minister and his officers can register and control. To me, that seems to be an eminently reasonable proposition. It does not detract in any way from the fight against foot and mouth disease; indeed, it contributes a great deal towards it. It closes up the loop-hole allowing infected material to be put on dumps, from which disease can be spread by feral pigs or birds and then be let loose in the community.

I do not pretend to tell the Minister that if this motion is passed, no food and waste will be thrown on dumps. I do suggest to him that a considerable proportion of it will not go to dumps but will be sterilised. Surely that is what we want. We want to destroy the disease; we want to wipe it out. We want to make sure that it cannot get into our animals. If that is what we are seeking to do, then surely the best solution is to encourage a situation in which as much of this material as possible is not thrown away and possibly buried but is treated and sterilised and the disease destroyed.

How can the motion possibly defeat the aim of the pig-swill Bill and the intention of it? How can it possibly detract from the tight measures that are needed to prevent the entry of foot and mouth disease? I suggest to the Minister that the motion does not fight against the Bill that he introduced earlier this year; it complements it and strengthens it, and I think it is worthy of his support.

For those who are ecologically minded, there is the additional factor of the waste of protein. Much good food that hours before was on the plate of some human being is being tossed onto the ground and, we hope, buried. Why cannot all that protein matter go to pigs? Let us build on it. Let us use it. Let us see something for it. Let us see fat and healthy pigs instead of burgeoning garbage dumps filled with tens of thousands of gallons of swill.

The motion allows the Minister maximum flexibility. He can pick the conditions and he can pick the registration. Nothing is specified. All we are asking him to do is allow the material to be sterilised so that the disease, if it is there, will be killed. He will not be detracting from the Bill; rather will he be strengthening it. By so doing he will assist in keeping foot and mouth disease out of the Queensland cattle and livestock industries.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (10.46 p.m.): I would have thought that this subject-matter had been adequately aired. Tonight I have listened to a number of comments from persons, for many of whom I have a lot of respect. But, quite frankly, I wonder whether there is much merit in their submissions.

It has been stated that foot and mouth disease can be transmitted by a number of means. Reference has been made to birds and feral pigs. It is possible that they can spread the disease; but the fact is that they haven't. That is the point at issue.

Perhaps we could obtain some guide-lines from other countries. We in Queensland are fortunate enough to be living in a happy state of ignorance; we know very little about the disease.

It has been suggested that foot and mouth disease can be spread through garbage disposed of by ships. Perhaps it can, but there is no evidence to suggest that it has been. Great Britain has from time to time had outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, and, although it would probably have a larger volume of shipping entering and leaving its waters than any other country in the world, the outbreaks of the disease in that country have been attributed not to the disposal of garbage by ships but to the swill feeding of pigs. That is the problem that we are attempting to contain.

Although I support the regulations, I would be the last person to suggest that the legislation is perfect. It is, however, a step in the right direction towards containing the disease, which may at some time in the future enter this country. I think all of us would agree that if it were to enter this country it would have a devastating effect.

I was inclined to think that some members of our Government parties felt that some type of preventive measure was not necessary. I find that some of the thoughts I had prior to entering the Chamber and listening to the debate were a little off beam. I believe now that those members are trying to strengthen the legislation.

If we attempt to dry render or otherwise dispose of all garbage, we will have a tremendous problem on our hands. Local authorities have been doing this for quite a number of years. Figures indicate that only a comparatively small proportion of food waste is fed to pigs. It is the smaller quantities that concern us. In this instance it is the meat product. It has been suggested that dry rendering is the solution. I know there are problems associated with that. I also know that if a volume of refuse is placed on a dump and not buried completely there is a possibility of problems through feral pigs. On the other hand, local authorities have not complained about this. In my electorate there are three local authorities but so far I have not received a solitary complaint from them.

In other areas feral pigs are in much greater number than in my locality. But local authority people are very responsible. They realise the importance of our livestock industry. In country areas where feral pigs are likely to be prevalent, once local authorities really get the message and become conscious of the requirements they will without doubt make adequate efforts to see that the

waste product is properly buried or otherwise disposed of satisfactorily. If this becomes difficult at times, I venture to suggest that it is not beyond the means of the local authorities to place a pig-proof fence around the dumps and thus keep out the pigs.

I cannot see any real necessity at this time to further amend the regulations. I see no great need to take the precautions that have been recommended. If at any time there is evidence to suggest that there is a possibility of an outbreak, I am sure that the regulations can be strengthened. At the moment we have to move very cautiously in this field. We must take reasonably adequate precautions. The regulations provide that the meat content of waste shall be dry rendered after which it may be fed to pigs. The vegetable matter and other food wastes that do contain any animal matter can be buried. In the circumstances that is reasonable despite what has been said. I do not intend to support any Minister if I believe he is wrong, but in this instance I feel under an obligation to support the regulations as they stand.

Mr. BYRNE (Belmont) (10.53 p.m.): I point out that I was probably the only member in this Parliament to vote for the previous speaker at the last State election. My family have a property in the area. On many occasions I have seen as many as 20 feral pigs on that property, which is only four short miles from the centre of Ipswich. That means that they were even closer to the waste disposal centres of Ipswich.

The very purpose of the legislation is to prohibit by all possible means an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. I also point out that we are looking at a distinction between controlled and uncontrolled feeding of pigs. The amendment suggests a controlled feeding of pigs. If it is not carried, we will have uncontrolled feeding of feral pigs. It is said that foot and mouth disease spreads best through herds of pigs. If the premise is that we are trying to avoid the possibility of pigs being the means of spreading foot and mouth disease, surely we cannot turn our backs on the existence of the feral pig problem in Queensland.

I recall the debate on the introduction of the Bill. When the feral pig problem was raised we were told how important it was that domestic pigs be prohibited from feeding on this matter because of the possibility of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. Yet when I and others suggested that the feral pig population in Queensland was a significant factor in the possible spread of foot and mouth disease, we were informed that local authorities would stop pigs taking this matter from dumps by putting fences around them, so I would be very interested to know just how many local authorities have so far constructed these pig-proof fences.

I presume that none have. If none have and if we take into account the fact that many dumps can receive the matter we are

speaking of, then we are quite clearly and honestly stating that domestic pigs in controlled circumstances in pig sties are a much greater danger in the outbreak and spread of foot and mouth disease than the totally uncontrolled feral pig population.

I ask honourable members to reflect on that simple premise and to admit to themselves the most simple circumstances: surely feeding waste to pigs in a controlled situation constitutes a better method of disposal than dumping it in the open where it is available to the totally uncontrolled feral pig population. That is something that needs to be reflected upon. If the Minister feels that that is not a sufficient argument on the matter, I ask him to explain why it is not necessary to consider that set of circumstances in Queensland. Although it is not as significant in the other States, it is particularly important in Queensland.

Why is this matter not considered to be of grave importance? Is it because we do not normally see the pigs during the day? Is it because the local authorities do not normally see the pigs coming to the dump during the day? Is it because they come at night and, therefore, because they come out in the shadow of darkness we do not need to worry about them? If they are the reasons, then I submit that they are neither rational nor sufficient for the protection of our cattle industry from the possible outbreak of foot and mouth disease.

I have a personal concern in seeing that the beef industry of Queensland remains as viable and as healthy as it possibly can. I am sure that many other members of this House share my concern. I am sure, too, that many people in my electorate who have dairy farms or who run cattle are concerned. Despite the fact that some honourable members may question that I have electors engaged in those pursuits, that is the case. They are concerned because they do not want to see foot and mouth disease coming into this country. The situation is clear. If meats and other similar foods are taken from controlled situations in pig sties and placed in uncontrolled situations in dumps, then we are doing nothing more than increasing the possibility of foot and mouth disease spreading should there be an outbreak. That argument is based on the fact that pigs are the perfect means of spreading the disease. That is a very clear premise, and I would very much like a refutation of it, if that is possible. So far I have received none. At no point of debate—neither in the Government party room nor in this Parliament—has it been stated that it is better for the meat to be available to the feral pig population than it is to domestic pigs in controlled circumstances.

What is being suggested in this amendment is that there be registered premises. That is on one side of the argument and indiscriminate dumping is the other or, for that matter, discriminate dumping. What is better? To have a registered piggery where meat can

be disposed of or to have a discriminate dumping? We are told that it can be covered over—I remember speaking on a previous occasion and saying, “What happens in Queensland when there are floods or heavy rain and all the dirt and soil in the dumps gets washed away?” Dumps are normally in low-lying places. What happens? The dirt gets washed into the stream and the waste becomes exposed once again and available for the feral pig population as well as birds and other animals and vermin that feed on it.

I point out, too, that at the time I raised this argument in a previous debate I was told that it was most important for us to control piggeries because foot and mouth disease could spread very easily through the air; it was something that would be very hard to control and it disseminated itself very quickly and could be the cause of a very great disaster. Yet, in contradiction of that, when I raised the possibility of it going into the waterways of Queensland and from there into the waterways of New South Wales and Victoria, I was told that, whilst it spread through the air very easily, it does not spread very easily and breaks down very quickly once it gets into waterways. So once again there was very clearly a contradiction.

The question which presents itself in this Parliament tonight is whether we are honestly concerned about trying to ensure that there is never an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in this State. The honourable member for Fassifern told us, as other honourable members have done on previous occasions, that it is in the pig populations that it is most likely to break out and that it is spread fastest by pigs. Yet there seems to be a desire on the part of some to put a bag over their head and pretend that feral pigs come out only at night so that we do not have to worry about them, or say that we can put a fence around the dumps and forget about them.

It is totally absurd for this Parliament or for any individual member to take the point of view that foot and mouth disease can occur in domestic pig situations in controlled circumstances—in circumstances controlled along departmental lines—and that it will not occur or there is no need for us to worry about it occurring in the feral pig population, which is totally uncontrolled.

That is a very basic premise and unless that premise can be refuted—and it has not been refuted at any point in the whole debate, which has gone over several months, and people in the community are now aware that that is the question before them—then indeed we are doing nothing but stamping our approval on something which is absurd. We are saying that it is the pig population that we have to fear in domestic and controlled situations but that for some reason the bag goes over the head and the darkness of night seems to protect us from the feral pig population, which is increasing. It is

increasing in areas even closer to the cities, and to the towns in the local authority areas and is becoming of much greater significance in the possible spread of foot and mouth disease.

I thoroughly support the motion. If honourable members have at heart the concern of the beef industry in Queensland and have at heart the earnest wish that foot and mouth disease does not break out in Queensland, they too, will most heartily and most rationally support the motion.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (11.3 p.m.): I rise to place on record the fear I hold for the future of the great beef industry and the other primary industries in this State. I say that as a primary producer. I say it also because I cover my electorate and neighbouring electorates and I know the position our primary producers are being placed in today. It is simply a matter of increased policing and heavy fines for those not complying with the regulations.

I want to make it quite clear that despite what the honourable member for Bulimba said—he wanted two bob each way—I will not support any legislation introduced by Ken Wreidt and Dr. Everingham. The A.L.P. in New South Wales fought this legislation tooth and nail. It was brought in by a socialist Government to put small private enterprise piggeries out of business—families that supported this Government to the hilt.

Mr. Jensen: Rubbish!

Mr. HARTWIG: It is not rubbish to them. I will stand up for the little man.

There was no way foot and mouth disease could enter Great Britain except in imported meat. If we were genuine in our concern about the entry of foot and mouth disease into this country we would put pressure on the Federal Government to stop the import of canned meat into Australia. There is nothing we import that we cannot manufacture in this country.

I shall read an extract from a report by two British veterinarians who were appointed to investigate why and how foot and mouth disease entered Great Britain. It reads—

“So long as we have to import meat from South America, and so long as foot-and-mouth disease is endemic on that Continent, there must always be a risk that meat coming from there may occasionally be contaminated. . . . We must now turn to the measures taken in this country against the danger of outbreaks caused by the presence of the virus in waste food.”

Now honourable members should listen to this—

“As we have said, this danger arises in two ways. One is that contaminated food may be fed to pigs in swill”. (that is as sure as night follows day) “The other is that it may be left in a place where susceptible animals may have accidental

access to it, or where birds, dogs or vermin may get at it and drop pieces within reach of susceptible animals, as happened in Scotland in 1952 with disastrous results. It was to meet these dangers that the Boiling of Animal Foodstuffs Order was made in 1927.”

This was in England where foot and mouth exists. The value of scraps in England was placed at \$13,000,000 per annum at that time. The report continues—

“This Order (as amended in 1947) is still in force. It requires that swill shall be boiled for an hour before being fed to animals or poultry, and that before boiling it shall be so kept that no animal or poultry shall have access to it.”

One honourable member talked about fencing in rubbish dumps, but he does not know what he is talking about. We fenced in a rubbish dump, and people would not even close the gate. I put it to the honourable member that they would not even take it into the dump; they would dump it outside. How many honourable members have done any research into this subject? At the present time people from motels in Rockhampton are dumping scraps in the bush.

The responsibility for the enforcement of these regulations has now passed to the health departments of local authorities because the Department of Primary Industries basically has no say in the matter. The responsibility has fallen into the hands of the health departments of local authorities, and the local authorities were caught with their pants down. They were not in a position to accept and implement the ban on swill feeding. The introduction of the regulations was carried out in a haphazard manner and there was no co-ordination between the health departments of the local authorities and the Department of Primary Industries. In fact, the Department of Primary Industries had the cheek to complain to the health inspector at Rockhampton about the smell coming from the dump and the health inspector said, “Don’t blame me; you fellows put it there.” That is what we have to put up with. Let us see what these regulations are costing the State.

It is strange that since the Bill was introduced the emotional issue has died. It was nothing more than an emotional issue stirred up by two industries which put pressure on the Minister, and I for one will not follow the socialist dictation of this country.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: The A.L.P. hotly opposed a similar Bill in the New South Wales Parliament.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member’s counterparts in New South Wales opposed it to the hilt. I have done my homework on this subject. It has cost the base hospital in Rockhampton \$300 a month to get its scraps

picked up; St. John's Hospital, \$56 a month or \$672 per annum; St. Andrew's Hospital, \$1,200 per annum; the Mater Hospital, \$2,400 per annum; the benevolent home, \$768 per annum; the "Eventide" home—the poor old pensioners—\$1,440 per annum; the migrant centre, \$240 per annum; the children's centre, \$432 per annum; the Range Convent, \$480 and the Girls' Grammar School, \$1,200 per annum. The Leichhardt Hotel, the Criterion Hotel and similar hotels are all paying between \$800 and \$1,000 per annum.

Was any compensation paid to the 300 families which were put out of business? One farm at Aspley was turning off 5,000 pigs per annum, and not one pig was condemned. Their pigs were eagerly sought after by buyers at Cannon Hill. Honourable members should have a look at the number of pigs sold at Cannon Hill today. The numbers have fallen away dramatically and we have lost the value of food scraps; do not call it swill.

I have just been to Brampton Island. The Minister should talk to Tom McLean from Brampton Island. He will tell the Minister how many pigs he raised and fattened on that island for his own use. They lost all that because the Government of Queensland, which stands for free enterprise, did not have the guts to resist the socialists when they introduced this proposal at a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council. The Government of this State fell in the soup over Medibank, and something similar has happened in this instance. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, will not be dictated to by any socialist or by a socialist regime. This legislation was introduced by Wriedt and Everingham—it was their brain-child—and I will not support it.

I have enough brains to know that the unscrupulous operator of a piggery that should be licensed does not boil his swill under supervision. Haven't we enough inspectors of the Department of Primary Industries going round the country, Mr. Speaker? It would give them something to do if they had to make inspections and ensure that swill is boiled and fed to the pigs. They would be performing a useful service.

What is happening now? Piggeries are closing. I place it on record that if foot and mouth disease comes to this country, this Government will have been a party to its entry. The swill is not being boiled; it is being thrown into the bush. Health inspectors cannot trace the offenders, because they are dumping the swill in the bush. If foot and mouth disease gets to the feral pig population, Australia is finished. Swill should be boiled and fed in the piggsties. In England, people are forced to boil swill. That is all we are asking now, Mr. Speaker; that is all I have ever asked.

I was reared in a family that experienced hard times. We did not waste anything, and pigs were used to assist in getting rid of

waste. Disposal of waste is one of the biggest problems in the world today. I do not want any honourable member to tell me that I am not accepting my responsibility. I want it known that I have opposed to the hilt the dumping of swill in the bush and on rubbish dumps where it is accessible to feral pigs. I can see what is happening, and local authorities are not in a position to do anything about it.

(Time expired.)

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I issue a last warning to the honourable member for Bundaberg.

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (11.13 p.m.): I have not had an opportunity previously to take part in the great "pig-swill" debate, so I enter at chapter three. I wish to place on record a couple of comments on the over-all question, and I do so in support of the Minister's proposal.

Firstly, the regulations that have been promulgated under the amendment to the Stock Act are simply a part of the package of measures that exists in Australia to prevent the entry of foot and mouth disease and also to deal with it in the event of its entering this country.

It is not suggested that this is a panacea in the field of foot and mouth disease. Indeed, there are some other areas in which I would certainly support the taking of stronger action. For example, I believe that quarantine procedures ought to be strengthened and that at some time in the future consideration should be given to banning completely the importation of meats, in view of the possibility of the entry of exotic animal diseases generally. But, even if that is done, I believe that it is still prudent to ban the swill feeding of pigs on the basis of intra-State quarantine.

As I see it, there is a basis for the banning of swill feeding. At present, if infected material comes into the country and goes into a household, it then goes onto a rubbish dump or through the sewerage system. Of course, a great deal of refuse now goes into sewerage systems and onto rubbish dumps. For a long time, huge mountains of wet refuse have been going onto rubbish dumps around the country.

If some infected material goes into an institution and it is later fed to an infective animal, we can be quite certain that an outbreak will occur. We can be absolutely certain that if infected material goes down the throat of a pig, there will be an outbreak of foot and mouth disease.

The simple logical premise of the Minister's proposal is that if it is not placed directly down the mouth of a susceptible animal the chances of infection are greatly

reduced. If it goes into a sewerage system, what are the chances of its finding its way into the mouth of an infective animal?

Mr. Sullivan: Virtually nil.

Mr. AHERN: Virtually nil. The chance still exists, but the odds are multiplied by millions. If the material goes onto a rubbish dump the chance is much more remote than if it is placed directly into the mouth of a susceptible animal, which is what swill feeding does.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member has been bleating about feral pigs since I started my speech. He must have known I was getting around to them. He is suggesting that every rubbish dump in the country is a seething mass of feral pigs, waiting like piranhas to grab every piece of infected material that comes in and gobble it up instantly. Is that happening? Tell me how much animal material that is deposited on rubbish dumps finds its way into the mouths of animals. Is it 1 per cent? Is it 10 per cent? Or is it 100 per cent? From the way some members have been speaking to this debate I gather that they are suggesting that 100 per cent goes down the mouths of feral pigs. But it would be much less than 1 per cent. If it is 1 per cent we have increased our chances of avoiding an outbreak of foot and mouth disease a hundredfold; if we put it down sewerage systems we increase our chances a millionfold. That is the simple proposition that has the strong support of every grazing association in Australia, and it is so logical that it is to have the uniform support of all States of Australia.

This recommendation has come to us from officers who have experience of outbreaks of the disease. Their experience has been drawn upon. They have seen outbreaks and have been able to trace their source. They have also been able to trace the reasons for the extensions of the outbreaks. The advice that they have given us is sound. It is reasonably based and is completely logical.

No-one has claimed that local authorities and institutions will not be faced with extra expense. It may be that we should have given greater consideration to assisting local authorities and institutions in the disposal of waste. But this legislation has the support of all livestock industries and all States. World-wide experience has clearly shown that outbreaks of the disease can be traced to swill feeding of pigs. If that is so, surely we should ban swill feeding.

The scientific evidence is very, very clear. We should ban swill feeding as soon as possible. It is, after all, a thing of the past. It is an inefficient practice in pig raising. It is not highly profitable. It is something that we can manage without.

The Minister's proposition is basically logical and should be supported by all honourable members. I am astonished at the emotion that has been generated by it. Suddenly the great swill debate has become the conscience issue of this session.

Mr. LINDSAY (Everton) (11.20 p.m.): In speaking on behalf of the silent majority of the electors of Everton, I point out that they have been tremendously silent on this subject. In fact, only one of the 14,000 electors has mentioned this matter to me, and then only by way of passing reference. In the circumstances I think I should tell them what I think about the great pig-swill debate. I certainly do not have a monopoly of the truth about this matter but I have listened as closely as possible to the numerous speeches on the subject.

Perhaps we should look at history to see what it tells us about foot and mouth disease in Australia. To do so, I shall quote from the Australian Encyclopaedia's reference to the cattle industry—

"History. The earliest importations of cattle into the Colony went to form the government herd. This herd was preserved and killings were rare. David Collins, first Judge-Advocate of New South Wales, reported that two animals were killed in January 1793 and collectively weighed 372 pounds. This was only the third time that fresh beef had been tasted by the colonists since their arrival."

I emphasise that in five years they had tasted fresh beef only three times. They must have had a large quantity of preserved meat, which presumably was salted. Certainly there was no refrigeration. If bad meat was brought into the colony, it was probably during that period.

The quotation continues—

"Collins also stated that in the same year an English cow in calf was sold by one officer to another for £80, a considerable sum in those days.

"By 1803 the government herds, including the wild cattle in the Cowpastures numbered 1530 and those owned by settlers amounted to 650. In 1804 Governor King reported a disease among the cattle, a 'spongy substance on the tongue . . . bad feet . . . all those of Government's have recovered, but, I am sorry to say, several belonging to individuals have died'. This was probably foot-and-mouth disease which later was entirely eliminated from Australia."

We might well ask why the cattle were able to recover and how the disease was eliminated. The Parliamentary Library has been unable to give me any further information but the question is worth considering. I believe that the reason there has never been foot and mouth disease in Queensland is in some way associated with the fact that the

State is in a tropical area which has a high percentage of sunny days with high temperatures.

It is of interest to note that the most easterly point that foot and mouth disease has reached in the tropics is the island of Bali, where the last outbreak of major significance was in 1973. On that island the Hindu religion is practised and a major belief in that religion concerns the sacredness of the cow, which represents the total inarticulate animal life. Because the cow represents all animals, it is protected and shall on no account be destroyed by Hindus. When the outbreak occurred on Bali, rather than kill and burn, as is done in the British Isles, they immunised. It is considered that immunisation is never as successful as a total burning programme. We have a problem in that Bali is visited regularly by Queensland tourists and I understand that there are still animals on Bali which have foot and mouth disease.

West Irian is not far from Bali, and the Indonesians control both countries. It is reasonable to suppose that there is an interchange of animals between those places. It is therefore easy to presume that animals with foot and mouth disease get to West Irian and, in turn, to Papua New Guinea. Immediately north of our island of Saibai are two water courses, the Morehead and the Bensbach Rivers. In the dry season they are the only places where animals and birds can get fresh water. Animals therefore congregate in the area, and some swim to Saibai. The Torres Strait Islanders trade pigs and deer. It is interesting to note that the drums of the Torres Strait Islanders have skins of goannas that come from New Guinea. There is therefore the problem of the transfer of foot and mouth disease, animal to animal, through the North.

Looking back through history, it can be established that a type of foot and mouth disease has been in Australia. If it has been here before it can come again, although the chances of an outbreak in Queensland would seem to be small. However, if it occurs anywhere in Australia—but particularly in Queensland—we as a State will need financial and physical support from the Commonwealth to do something about that outbreak. I put it to the House that we would have great difficulty in persuading the Commonwealth and the other States to come to our aid in the event of such a catastrophe if we ourselves are not prepared to support the legislation of the Minister in the same way as the other States are doing.

I come now to my last point. I am in an electorate in which the issue is not strong. It has certainly not been presented to me in such a way. I would have firmer support for, and a greater belief in, the arguments advanced by other honourable members if their determination was strong enough to move them to vote against the regulations. If they are not so determined, perhaps the issue is not as vital as they are postulating.

I thought I should make those general remarks. In summary, the likelihood of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease caused by bad meat being brought into Queensland is somewhat remote. It is more likely to come from a migration of animals in our North. Because there have been outbreaks in Australia before, it is possible—and perhaps most likely—that there will be in the future. It would appear to be better to tackle the problem federally, with all States operating under basically the same legislation.

Dr. LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (11.28 p.m.): When the legislation was brought down we were informed that we had been directed to pass it by the Commonwealth Government, which at that time was a Labor administration. It was a gimmick to qualify Queensland cattle and sheep producers, pig-men and even goat-men for Commonwealth compensation in the event of the introduction of foot and mouth or other exotic diseases to Queensland. It would enable beasts within an ever-increasing radius to be shot in a matter of a day or two. We are talking about a radius of 50 or 60 miles.

It was never intended that these measures were to be a control on foot and mouth disease. The honourable member for Townsville and I have shown—and nobody has denied it—that the foot and mouth disease virus can live for 120 days in very strong salt concentrates, for 200 days on dried pelts, skins or bags, and for 103 days in the type of sewage that every town in Queensland puts into some waterway. So nobody has shown the Parliament of this State that disposal through what I call garbage dispersal units—others call them garbage disposal units—will have any effect on the foot and mouth disease virus.

Other honourable members have said that burying it or throwing it on dumps to await burial will also not solve the problem. So we arrive at the situation where because of birds, because of contact by pigs with other cloven-hoofed animals, because of other animals that can carry the disease and because the disease can be spread by air and water, no inland river that has a town with a sewage treatment works can be safe. No salt water coastal river with a treatment works on it will be safe. We all know that seagulls hang around these rivers. Anyone who takes a trip down the Brisbane River will see the seagulls hanging around the effluent at Luggage Point, and seagulls visit farms. Honourable members might be surprised to learn that. These birds can carry the disease anywhere.

Garbage dumps are not patrolled as they should be. They will then become the prime source of a quarantine suspect. Unless we are prepared to put quarantine patrols on garbage dumps, I do not see that dumping the garbage or burying it is the answer. As I have pointed out before, it is much better to locate, as our customs officials try to do

at airports and ports, all of the incoming meat and cheese that could possibly contain this virus and then kill it as quickly as possible by using heat. The dispersal systems are putting this State at risk.

We have heard the honourable member for Fassifern ask us to change the regulations only after foot and mouth disease comes into Queensland. I would not like his chances of surviving the angry mob if he faced the people of Queensland or even Australia and said that he was not in favour of doing it now but would be when foot and mouth disease comes into Australia.

The honourable member for Landsborough is putting all of his money on the theory of infinite dilution. I will tell honourable members the story in language that they can understand by referring to cholera, which is a human disease. Honourable members have no doubt seen the terror in the hearts of travellers at the mention of cholera. The theory of infinite dilution does not work on the Ganges River where cholera is prevalent. It does not work with smallpox. I say that it will not work with the foot and mouth disease virus. The trap is loaded and we are waiting for some pig, cow, sheep or goat to drink the water in an inland stream where virus has been dispersed according to existing practice and regulation. We will sit back blind, feeling that we have done a marvellous job, until it happens.

The better system is to capture this potentially offensive stuff and cook it. I do not believe that boiling, which is advocated by some people, is good enough. I believe that it has to be dry rendered and then sent to piggeries that are registered to handle it. Such piggeries have tremendous advantages over dumps. They can be inspected from 9 to 5, Monday to Friday.

The pigs would then go to an abattoir, which has another tremendous advantage. Every beast can be inspected there by a man who really knows what he is looking at. He can do that in his ordinary hours of work between 6 a.m. and 3 or 4 p.m. when the run is finished.

Along our western rivers and coastal rivers where this virus could turn up unsuspected, there are no men with the expertise to diagnose this disease, which could get out and become prevalent. I should like the Minister to tell me how far a western river flows in 103 days and how far out into Moreton Bay the streams flow in 103 days. They go a heck of a long way.

I believe that the motion will strengthen the legislation. It will make Queensland a much safer place. Our various industries on the land will be protected by this motion. It will allow the positive killing of the virus. Foot and mouth disease could then not appear in the western rivers.

It will remove a tremendous load from our sewers which are presently having a great deal dumped through them from the so-called garbage disposal units which are actually dispersing viruses of Lord only knows what type completely untested and unsurveyed—not between 9 and 5 but never. Can the Minister tell me of any studies done on sewage effluent for live viruses? I do not think he can, and one of these days it will pop up, and it will pop up in the western electorates. It will establish itself in flocks and herds and it will be days or weeks before anyone knows. With the movement of cattle and sheep across this State the Minister will have his shoot-out gangs out shooting. The legislation has already been passed so the Minister will get his Commonwealth compensation, and they will be shooting up whole Federal electorates, not State electorates, and every cloven-hoofed beast in them. And I say more power to the Minister, a better approach to the disposal of those viruses and a better protection for the industries of Queensland. I support the proposal of the honourable member for Townsville.

Dr. CRAWFORD (Wavell) (11.37 p.m.): Anything to do with disease control is difficult, and viral control is even more difficult than other forms of infection—bacterial, rickettsial and so on. The best example of epidemiological control is that of rabies, where we have traditionally in Australia prevented the entry of rabies by very strict control of the entry of animals into this country. It has been traditionally a process of keeping in quarantine in Britain or the United States for six months any animal which people wish to bring into the country from there. This has recently been extended to keeping the particular animal, be it a dog, cat or other domestic pet, in quarantine for 12 months, and even then it is probable that this is not a sufficient time to be absolutely certain that that control is complete and that there is no possibility of introducing rabies into Australia.

Rabies is a disease which is of the greatest possible significance to the community, and foot and mouth disease is not unrelated to it, because I believe that if we are going to control foot and mouth disease to the degree that we should, then we should prevent the entry of the disease into this country completely. I think it is important that we realise the type of situation which eventuates when we attempt to prevent disease from entering the country.

There has been a rather parochial type of relaxation of smallpox control in recent years in Australia and throughout the world. It has been rather euphemistically stated that smallpox is now under control throughout the civilised parts of the world and therefore we do not really need to be immunised against smallpox any more and

we can come back into this country without a current vaccination certificate for smallpox. This, I hasten to add, is another viral disease.

It is only within the past 18 months that some gentlemen from a South East Asian area with supposedly current smallpox vaccination certificates entered the United Kingdom and were in fact incubating the disease at the time. They had not been vaccinated, and within a month there was a whole series of deaths of doctors and nurses in the United Kingdom because of the introduction of that disease by these people who had supposedly been vaccinated by their own health authorities.

So I believe the only way we can control viral diseases of this sort is to make the most stringent regulations and exercise the most detailed control against the introduction of the disease into this country at every possible source of entry. When one returns to Australia from an overseas journey at any time one finds oneself subjected to sitting in the aircraft at the airport with "two-gun Pete" coming along with his cans of detergent and aerosol sprays.

Mr. Moore: Useless.

Dr. CRAWFORD: Completely useless. Perhaps it has some effect on flies, mites, ticks or lice which one might have picked up in some peculiar part of the world, but in effect there is very little control of meat or foodstuffs of any other sort which a person might be attempting to bring back into the country.

I noted on my return from a recent trip to New Zealand that quarantine officers were quite happy to allow one to bring in cheese and similar products from New Zealand. That is very reasonable, because there are in that country no viral diseases from which Australia needs to protect itself. However, I think it is important that people realise the significance of introducing meat products into the country rather than trying to prevent spread of disease once it actually arrives in Australia.

In Argentina, foot and mouth disease causes a loss of £stg.76,000,000 annually. These costs include provision for inspection and special slaughtering facilities for cattle whose carcasses are to be exported. British veterinarians are sent to these abattoirs as a further safeguard against the introduction of infected beef into their country. Even these costly precautions often fail.

Most of the outbreaks in Britain have been attributed to beef from Argentina, a minority possibly being due to birds migrating from Europe. I trust that they are not two-legged birds. The resultant intermittent outbreaks are eradicated by slaughtering diseased and in-contact animals, and by quarantining the areas concerned. Average annual compensation costs amount to hundreds of thousands of pounds.

These great costs are considerably less than those of any practicable plan for vaccination, which might cost Britain \$8,000,000 to \$15,000,000 a year. On the continent of Europe the estimated cost of severe and widespread outbreaks in 1951-52 was about \$200,000,000. The Food and Agriculture Organisation is now encouraging a plan for control by vaccination and for possible ultimate eradication. However, as I said earlier, I do not think that will work.

When foot and mouth disease broke out in Mexico soon after World War II, the United States spent \$133,000,000 in eradicating the disease to remove the threat to its own livestock.

Canada's first outbreak, in 1952, was probably introduced via infected material brought in by a migrant who came by air from Europe and found work on a dairy farm almost immediately. Fortunately the country was in the grip of mid-winter, and snow and ice brought traffic to stock markets and between farms to a virtual standstill. Only 15 small properties were involved, but it cost \$1,000,000 to eradicate the disease from the area, and this resulted in trading losses of about \$200,000,000.

The Canadian example emphasises that vigilance on the part of veterinarians is useless unless informed public opinion backs up the officers who control the entry of food products and those who supervise the disposal of food on aeroplanes and ships.

In my opinion, a simple measure that does not allow the feeding of swill to pigs is of minor importance compared with the prevention of the importation of foods into the country, and I remind the House that many millions of dollars worth of food are imported legitimately. I believe that that is the way in which the problem should be tackled, and I think that the amendment suggested by the honourable member for Townsville is relevant to that issue.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.44 p.m.), in reply: The motion under discussion, which was moved by the honourable member for Townsville (Dr. Scott-Young), reads—

"That regulations 146 and 150 under the Stock Act 1915-1976, as made on 1 July 1976 and tabled in this House on 31 August 1976, be disallowed."

In opening the debate, the honourable member for Townsville read out what he considered the regulations should be, and it would seem that some honourable members are under the misapprehension that amendments to the regulations have been moved. They have not been, and they cannot be. I just want to clear up that point for the benefit of those who think that the motion provides for amendment of regulations.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: I rise to a point of order. I said, "I suggest the following amendment"; I did not say, "I move".

Mr. SULLIVAN: I take the honourable member's point; but some honourable members who followed him in the debate seemed to think that an amendment had been moved.

You have been very tolerant, Mr. Speaker, and to avoid the risk of being called to order by you tonight for engaging in tedious repetition, I shall not go over the ground that I covered a number of times before, during the passage of the Bill.

I want to make the point that all we are talking about is the banning of boiling and feeding swill to pigs. I am not quite sure where the honourable member for Toowoomba North stands on this. At one stage he was a little bit confused, because he said he agreed that feeding should be done by dry rendering. That is allowed by the regulations; we have no argument there.

It is rather strange—I say this with no disrespect—that some men in the medical profession apparently do not place any reliance on people in another profession, that is, the veterinarians. These regulations were drawn up by the animal health people, the veterinary people, and have been agreed upon by the States and the Agricultural Council. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have agreed to what we have agreed to here and legislation is presently going through the Western Australian House. Tasmania and the Northern Territory have not yet reached agreement, but I understand that legislation is ready to come in up in the Territory.

As I said before, the grave risk is in boiling and feeding to pigs, and that is why it is not allowed under our regulations.

I do not want to talk about quarantine measures, as they have been dealt with before. I am all for tighter quarantine controls, and they have been considerably tightened. Nor do I want to talk about banning meat imports, as that subject, too, has been talked about before. I do, however, want to make some reference to the role of swill in other countries.

Mr. Moore: In Britain.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I listened very attentively to the honourable member, so I hope that he will listen to what I am saying.

In his contribution to the debate on the Bill the honourable member for Townsville referred to a report by the Pirbright Laboratory on the 1967-68 outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Great Britain. The official report of the committee of inquiry into foot and mouth disease in 1968, presented to Parliament by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, clearly indicated that the outbreak, recorded as the worst in this century in Great Britain, originated in pigs on a farm near Oswestry, Shropshire. It was considered that the source of infection was frozen

Argentine lamb supplied to the farm during October 1967. The report indicated that, of 179 primary outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in the United Kingdom during the period from 1954 to September 1967, 97 were attributed to imported meat and meat wrappings, 42 to bird and other origins and 40 to obscure origins. The situation in that country is markedly different from that in Australia, where fresh meat may be imported only from New Zealand.

Contrary to the honourable member's information, it has been accepted that wind-borne virus may spread for distances of up to 60 miles under favourable conditions.

The honourable member for Townsville also considered that Australian veterinarians knew nothing about the disease. In point of fact, during his speech he quoted from a lecture given at a well-attended refresher course for Australian veterinarians.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: I rise to a point of order. I think the Minister said I claimed Australian veterinarians knew nothing about the disease. I didn't say that at all.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Well, that was the inference that I drew.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: The inference drawn by the Minister is different from what I said.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I accept the honourable member's explanation.

Australian veterinarians, including officers of my department, were recruited to assist during the 1967-68 foot and mouth disease outbreak in Great Britain, and also during the outbreak in Bali in 1974. Furthermore, other departmental veterinary officers have attended courses on exotic disease at the Grosse Isle Centre in Canada and departmental staff have taken part in exercises based on plans for the eradication of exotic diseases. These plans had been prepared by the Australian Animal Health Committee and approved by the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The point is that what is proposed in the regulations has been adopted by the Animal Health Committee and by the other States. Every livestock industry in Queensland is adamant that it wants these regulations as proposed. Quite a number of honourable members have been subjected to considerable criticism. I visited 26 centres in our western areas where chaos would be caused if we had an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. People would be ruined.

Mr. Moore: What can stop the feral pigs from eating this stuff?

Mr. SULLIVAN: I dealt with the feral pig during the last debate.

Mr. Moore: If they do so, what will happen?

Mr. SULLIVAN: I dealt with that issue then. What has been said by honourable members tonight about the feral pig shows that they lack confidence in our local authorities. I have confidence in them.

With reference to the fact that we are not permitting swill to be fed to pigs, I point out that certain things have been proven in Great Britain where the honourable member for Callide (who has vacated the scene) said that it can be fed to pigs. It is allowed to be fed to pigs but Great Britain has the worst history of any country in the world for swine fever and viral diseases. I do not think we should necessarily follow what Britain does.

Mr. Moore: We have a lot of sea around us.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Britain has a lot of sea around it.

When I moved the amendment of the Stock Act to allow these regulations to be introduced I outlined why I wanted to amend the Act, and the regulations were given to honourable members to study. I am somewhat amazed that after reaching agreement and after their introduction a move has been made to disallow certain regulations.

The honourable member for Toowoomba North referred to compensation. If we do not go ahead with these regulations and there should be an outbreak of foot and mouth disease—and please God there never will be—compensation to the affected people in Queensland would be in jeopardy because we did not have these regulations that virtually every State is agreeing to. I certainly would not want to live with that.

I ask honourable members to think seriously if a division is called on this matter. It is one of the most serious matters I have had to face. I do not think there is anything personal in it but, with respect to the honourable members who are moving for the disallowance of the regulations, I do not believe that they are aware of what the situation would be if the disease should come our way.

Motion (Dr. Scott-Young) negatived.

RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR PRINTING OF REPORT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries) (11.55 p.m.): In tabling the report of the Queensland Fish Board this morning, I moved for the printing of it by the Government Printer. That was unnecessary as the report had been printed by a private firm, and members had already been supplied with a copy. I now seek leave to have the order for the printing rescinded.

(Leave granted.)

The House adjourned at 11.56 p.m.