

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 1966**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER, 1966

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill

State Housing Acts Amendment Bill

### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS

#### LOANS SINKING FUNDS

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the operations of the various sinking funds of the State for the year 1965-66.

Ordered to be printed.

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS; DATE OF PRESENTATION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that the Auditor-General's report for 1965-66 has been compiled and is in its final stages of completion at the Government Printing Office. It is expected to be ready on Friday, 14 October, for presentation to Parliament next Tuesday, 18 October, 1966.

### QUESTIONS

#### WIDENING OF CHARTERS TOWERS ROAD, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) At what point will the present road-widening job on Charters Towers Road, Townsville, finish?

(2) Is it proposed to continue the widening of the road? If so, to what point and when?

Answers:—

(1) "The present job extends in full width construction from Woolcock Street to Bayswater Road plus tapers from the Woolcock Street end to Causeway Bridge, and from Bayswater Road to Ahern Street."

(2) "The next widening section proposed is from Bayswater Road to Rising Sun, including the intersection at this point. Discussion is being had with the Postmaster-General's Department at present and it is planned to commence construction early in 1967 if the alterations to services can be completed in time."

28

#### WATER STORAGE FOR LOCOMOTIVES, CAPE HORN AND BULLOCK CREEK

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) Is he aware that there is no water available for locomotives at Cape Horn or Bullock Creek watering points?

(2) Will he consider improving the storage at these points and so overcome the necessity to haul water trucks many miles, which reduces the amount of payable freight?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "As from Monday, October 3, all timetable trains on the Chillagoe and Etheridge branch lines were operated by diesel locomotives."

#### AFRICAN STAR GRASS

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

(1) Have any instructions been issued to the effect that African Star grass is unsuitable for grassing waterways in soil conservation schemes? If not, is he aware that the grass has become a serious threat to other cultivation?

(2) Has any survey been made to establish any value of the grass?

Answers:—

(1) "The Department of Primary Industries Soil Conservation Officer at Atherton was instructed in November, 1965, not to recommend any further planting of African Star grass in soil conservation waterways on the Atherton Tableland. The width of a waterway and the rate and amount of runoff determine the type of grass needed. Where runoff is high and land is dear the width of waterways is kept to a minimum. In such cases, a vigorous sod-forming grass is needed to protect the waterway. African Star grass has this vigorous growth habit but does encroach on surrounding areas where conditions are favourable as on the Atherton Tableland. However, this grass is still recommended for some areas such as the Western Darling Downs. Trials conducted by my Department on the Tableland have now established that alternative species are available which present less encroachment problems. These are now recommended for use in that area."

(2) "African Star grass was introduced into Queensland more than thirty years ago. For twenty years it has been a well-established pasture grass on farms ranging from Bell to Malanda. Trials have been conducted concerning its grazing value and possible toxicity. It is a useful pasture grass, palatable to stock and has high nutritive value if adequately fertilised. Although dairy farmers in some areas regard it highly, it has not been recommended generally for pastures because better species are available for most districts."

#### FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS, MURUROA ATOLL

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a statement by an eminent French biologist, Jean Rostand, that the Mururoa Atoll French atom bomb test in the Pacific was a crime against humanity?

(2) Were any protests lodged by his Government that Queensland, only 4,200 miles from the explosion, could have become contaminated with fall-out effect from the blast which took place on July 3, 1966?

(3) Will he seek assurances from the Commonwealth Government or the appropriate authorities that Queenslanders will not become affected through contamination of our soils, waters and living creatures by fall-out from these French tests?

*Answer:—*

"As the Honourable the Premier has been at pains to point out on more than one occasion, questions on matters of external affairs do not come within the jurisdiction of any State Government. However, for the information of the Honourable Member, I might mention that the Honourable the Premier has been informed by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister that, following the announcement by the French Government of its plans to carry out nuclear tests in the Pacific, the Commonwealth Government asked the National Radiation Advisory Committee to undertake an assessment of any biological hazard which might arise in Australia as a result of these tests. By way of information, the National Radiation Advisory Committee is a body appointed by the Commonwealth Government to provide guidance on matters concerning the effects of ionising radiation on the Australian community. This Committee reported that it is satisfied that the proposed French weapon tests are unlikely to lead to significant biological hazard in Australia."

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

##### DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; PREMIER AND MINISTER FOR STATE DEVELOPMENT

**Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.7 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that the Honourable the Premier and Minister for State Development left Queensland for London on 30 September, and it is anticipated that he will be absent until 16 October. On 29 September His Excellency the Governor, in pursuance of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Acts, 1896 to 1965, authorised and empowered the Honourable Gordon William Wesley Chalk, Treasurer, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Premier and Minister for State Development by any Act, rule, practice, or ordinance, on and from 30 September, 1966, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable George Francis Reuben Nicklin.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the "Government Gazette Extraordinary" containing the relevant notification.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the "Government Gazette Extraordinary" upon the table.

##### OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

###### RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an order made by the House on 9 August last, on the motion of Mr. Harris, showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1965-66.

##### PAPERS

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

Reports—

Minister for Education for the year 1965.

Director of Industrial Development for the year 1965-66.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Commissions of Inquiry Acts, 1950 to 1954.

The Industrial Development Acts, 1963 to 1964.

The Barrier Fences Acts, 1954 to 1965.

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.

The Medical Acts, 1939 to 1963.

Report of the Burdekin River Authority for the year 1965-66.

Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account of Queensland Trustees Limited for the year 1965-66.

## INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACTS AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION

**Hon. J. D. HERBERT** (Sherwood—  
Minister for Labour and Tourism): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Inspection of Machinery Acts, 1951 to 1963, and the Inspection of Scaffolding Acts, 1915 to 1963, each in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

### SUPPLY

#### COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper,  
Greenslopes, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 29 September (see p. 791) on Mr. Chalk's motion—

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1966-67, a sum not exceeding \$3,700 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor.”

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—  
Leader of the Opposition) (11.18 a.m.): A perusal of the Treasurer's Financial Statements for the last nine years discloses that either a flood or a drought has been a factor responsible for the budgets being fashioned in the way they have been to meet those exigencies. The Opposition believes that a condemnation of the Government is warranted, that the Government's handling of the general financial affairs of the State is such as to warrant a motion of censure by the Opposition—and the Opposition intends so to do—and that very trenchant criticism should be levelled at the Government on some aspects of its administration. The Opposition feels that if its point of view is ventilated fairly by the Press and other mediums of disseminating propaganda, the public will acknowledge the Opposition's justification in moving a motion of censure.

However, on this occasion a somewhat unprecedented step will be taken inasmuch as the motion of censure will not be moved by me as Leader of the Opposition, but by my Deputy, the hon. member for Bulimba, who will follow me this morning and will be supported by the hon. member for Baroona.

I was elected to this Parliament on 14 December, 1935, and I have had a long and continuous association with Parliament except for a period when I was defeated following the unhappy schism in the ranks of the Australian Labour Party in 1957, and when I was temporarily denied the privilege of serving the constituency that I have represented for so many years.

It is true that during the period following my defeat I accepted an invitation to contest the Gregory seat. Some people, of course, claimed that, because my candidature was rejected on that occasion, my political stocks were perhaps not of a sufficiently high standard to merit my re-election to this Assembly. I think it was abundantly clear at the time to all students of politics that, irrespective of the candidate who carried the A.L.P. colours, we had no prospect of winning that seat. I accepted the invitation to nominate not because I thought that I would emerge victorious but because of the circumstances prevailing at the time. In western constituencies in particular, unhappily the D.L.P. vote was higher than the A.L.P. vote and, following the return of 13 members of the D.L.P. to this Assembly, a further increase in the number of D.L.P. representatives at that critical time could well have influenced many people to transfer their political allegiance from the A.L.P. to the D.L.P.

My nomination on that occasion was made in the hope that we would be able to arrest that trend and show that the A.L.P. was the official political organisation in opposition to the Government and was a party to which the people could entrust their votes. I accepted nomination purely as a party responsibility and not as a means of re-entering Parliament. The result was that we were able to increase our vote considerably compared with the position a few months earlier. From that time till my subsequent re-entry to Parliament following the unfortunate death of the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. L. A. Wood, who was a very close friend of mine for very many years, we were able to accomplish our immediate objective, which was the re-establishing in the mind of the public the fact that the A.L.P. was the only effective alternative party to the Government parties.

The prolongation of the activities of the D.L.P. in Australia for so long is a cause of wonder to many political writers and those who endeavour to assess these situations. However, it is a political fact of life that it has remained in being principally for the purpose of discrediting, wherever possible, the Australian Labour Party. It has negligible representation in the Parliaments of Australia; in this State, its representatives have decreased from 13 to 1. By a set of fortuitous circumstances when the Labour vote was at its highest, that very fact was responsible for distribution of Liberal preferences which enabled one of the chief protagonists of the D.L.P. in this State to be elected to the Senate of the Commonwealth Parliament.

I mentioned at the beginning of my speech that I entered this Parliament following a by-election in December, 1935. I should have liked the opportunity to go through “Hansard” to ascertain the number of speeches I have made in the intervening years. They probably number many hundreds. Those who have been in this Parliament for

either long or short periods of time may concede that some of them were good. Some were of indifferent quality, and some may even have been downright bad. But one can never be at one's peak all the time. The arguments that one has to use are not always as strong as one would like them to be, and the situations in which one finds oneself during political controversy are such that the timing and the nature of the controversy are not invariably of one's own making, particularly if one is in Opposition. It is one of the cardinal rules of government, I suppose, that the Government chooses the issues and the timing of the consideration of those issues that are most likely to benefit itself.

As I said earlier, I have no doubt made many hundreds of speeches during my period as a member of this Assembly. Unhappily, this is perhaps the most difficult speech that I have ever been called upon to make. In my private life, and, indeed, in my political life, I have been confronted with all sorts of problems from quite an early age, and I have invariably been able to cope with them reasonably well. Despite some uncharitable statements by people who have not been able either to authenticate or to prove them, I have never been an intriguer, and I have suffered, perhaps, one of the political disqualifications—this is an allegation that may have some foundation—of being an individualist in some ways. My political fortunes have either advanced or been retarded very largely by the fact that I elected not to become a member of a faction or a group. I still have the quixotic belief, which, as a political realist, I think will not be realised, that we should in politics, civic administration, and, indeed, all aspects of business, endeavour to select the person who we think has the most talents and qualifications for a particular job. Unhappily, all sorts of side issues enter into these considerations—matters of geography, matters of education, matters of association, matters of grouping of people with similar ideas or, sometimes, similar religious feelings. Many factors of this sort result in people other than those who, on merit, should be promoted or elected to positions being elected to them.

Although I did elect early in my political career to operate alone and not to seek counsel and not to be guided or persuaded by others who sought to tell me how my vote or my judgment should be exercised in the filling of vacancies, I am conscious of the co-operation, friendship and encouragement given to me by a wide circle of friends, well-wishers and parliamentary colleagues. I take this opportunity of indicating to them my gratitude for their friendship and their loyalty.

It would be foolish of me to say that in politics, in which there are so many people involved and so many different points of view to be considered, one could ever expect unanimity of expression or opinion, and there are occasions when one must of necessity, by one's utterances or vote, align oneself on the

side of some cause or some individual or make some decision that will provoke counter-action on the part of those who are involved. Those situations have occurred from time to time during my career, particularly during my period in ministerial office and as Leader of the Opposition. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding the misinterpretations and, probably, the ill-advised deductions that are made sometimes of the motives that actuate one's actions, I have generally tried, despite the percentage of mistakes that one makes, being human, to deal with situations as I thought they should be dealt with. Notwithstanding the differences of opinion and conflicts of personality, I want to thank my colleagues for the help and assistance they have given me.

I commenced by saying that this was not an easy speech to make, and at this stage of it I can only express the hope that I shall not allow emotional considerations to take control of my mental faculties and thereby obscure some of the things I wish to say.

Unhappily for me, I am not aware whether the matter of which I am about to speak will become a matter of public interest in the course of the next few days or the next twelve months. I am not sure, because I have not made any official overtures to the authorities concerned to ascertain the position. The facts are that I have been involved in a taxation difficulty of some magnitude and, as hon. members know, if one does become involved in these matters, and they are of some magnitude, the regulations provide for the publication of the names of those who have breached the taxation laws of this country.

I want to make it abundantly clear that I feel that, in a democracy, everybody should accept his taxation responsibilities despite the burden of some of them, despite the unfairness of some of them, and despite the perhaps unwise use of public funds which at times results in the imposition of heavy burdens on individual taxpayers.

I have indicated that this particular matter is one about which I am not certain in regard to the time of its release, but my own course of action was determined some time ago and it will be revealed later on. Perhaps at this stage it would not be inappropriate for me to say that this matter has been hanging over my head for some little time. It covers the period between 1955 and 1962, a period largely when I was not in Government. For the first couple of years the amounts involved are virtually negligible; for the other years—two in particular—resulting from share transactions the amounts are quite considerable, and, as a result, the taxation authorities have determined that I should be treated retrospectively as a trader and not as an investor. And, with the particular amounts superimposed on my parliamentary salary, as everybody knows, the consequential higher rate that applies is considerable.

Perhaps at this stage it might be more appropriate if I read relevant extracts from a letter which I addressed to the then Deputy Commissioner of Taxation on 10 July, 1963. Some of these things are personal, some are perhaps of no interest to anybody, some may be regarded as displaying an undue sense of questionable sentimentality, but I think it might achieve my object if I read relevant extracts from the letter. My reason for not reading the whole of the letter is that obviously it was a submission that involved detailed statements of particular share transactions which are of no consequence—at least of no importance—to anybody except myself and the taxation authorities. I do not think anyone's private affairs in that regard should be the subject of public interest. What I shall read is taken strictly from the letter that I wrote to Mr. Johnston.

This is what I said—

"Dear Mr. Johnston,

"I very much regret the necessity of addressing this appeal to you following an examination of my tax affairs by your Department.

"The allotment by you of Mr. Quain to interview me has been a painful, embarrassing, and in some respects a surprising experience, insofar as the revelation by him of my income tax discrepancies. This officer has been most thorough and insistent, and has taxed my memory fully and sometimes inadequately in furnishing answers to questions put to me. I should like to record the statement that irrespectively and notwithstanding his probing questions, and final decision by you, I shall remember with appreciation Mr. Quain's unflinching courtesy, tact and co-operation in reconciling his requirements with my personal commitments.

"The first declaration I wish to make is that, despite my anticipated heavy financial indebtedness to the Department of Taxation as a result of my own actions, I did not initially or subsequently, engage in financial dealings with the deliberate intention of avoiding my tax obligations.

"Without wishing to appear unduly sentimental it became apparent fairly early in life, following the death of my parents when they left me the eldest at the age of 12 years, my three sisters and a brother, without a penny or any physical assets, that I should endeavour to avoid such a happening as far as my wife and children were concerned.

"Subsequently my parliamentary experiences with its fluctuating political fortunes, artificialities and insecurity, re-inforced my views that I should strive for a measure of financial independence. I therefore aimed at building up my capital. Share transactions seemed to offer a possible avenue to achieve this objective.

"My initial adventures in this field were almost disastrous, but later as a result of sounder advice from friends and one or

two share brokers, together with my own assessments, the position gradually altered for the better, and, in the period covered by your investigations, showed a marked capital appreciation.

"I can say with complete honesty and a clear conscience, that it has only been during the last two years that I became a little worried at my capital increment, and, whether this situation might place me in a position where I might have to declare the means whereby this capital appreciation had been achieved.

"Without justifying my actions, I foolishly, partly because of my extremely busy pre-occupation with my official duties and responsibilities, postponed appropriate and necessary action. Additionally because of the volume and frequency of my share transactions, together with inadequate book-keeping methods, I was not able to effect a reconciliation with my Tax Returns. Finally (and this is a statement which you may find difficult to accept) I held the view that as it was my intention within the next 5 or 6 years to dispose of my shares, and invest the proceeds in debentures or other fixed interest investments, the resultant income would place me in a permanently higher tax bracket, thus compensating for the tax not paid in building up my capital increment.

"Had I been less busy, and certainly wiser, I would have approached you officially before your enquiries were instituted. Indeed I made some oblique reference to your Mr. Smith which I did not pursue to their logical conclusion.

"Before I was aware of the likelihood of any official investigation into my affairs, I discussed, and, indeed secured, from two or three friends, detailed particulars of the setting up of a family investment company. Such action if proceeded with promptly, would have necessitated full disclosures in order to have the share transfers completed. It is unfortunate for me that because of pressure of work I deferred (after examining a particular scheme) my approach to Messrs. Feez, Ruthning & Co., solicitors, to form such a company, but eventually, and again before I realized I was in possible trouble, got them to draw up a scheme and Articles of Association for a company. Mr. Proctor of Messrs. Clarke & Co., Public Accountants, was subsequently consulted. After this I realized that you might be examining the question of whether I was to be treated as a trader rather than as an investor, and it was agreed that I wait until this possibility was resolved before committing the book-keeping arrangements into his hands.

"I must of course accept responsibility and blame for not revealing my full share transactions. If this had been done, the question of determining whether I was a trader or not would have been determined by your assessing officers much earlier. I genuinely wanted to place myself in the

category of an investor. Because of the wide fluctuations in the value of many shares, and to protect my investments, I sought advice frequently, and was advised, or acted on my own initiative to sell shares in companies whose profitability or prospects were declining, and re-investing in what was thought to be sounder companies. As a result of the increasing volume of these transactions, I was advised to accept special placements or new issues (which is the discretionary privilege of the share broker) and in order to obtain the funds for such purposes, it was often necessary for me to sell a share which I was not anxious to dispose of. As a result of this, the number of transactions progressively grew, and I had hoped that it would sort itself out. Instead, the situation from the point of view of effecting a reconciliation with my Returns, because of unsuitable dissecting records in my books, became more difficult and finally impossible. In retrospect and too late, the proper course would have been a voluntary disclosure, and the matter sorted out as Mr. Quain has now done.

"I was not able to marshal my financial affairs as Mr. Quain has done. After perusing the statements he has shown me, I accept them as being correct from the records available to him. I have checked the bank balances on hand at the various dates, and a physical check of my share certificates, confirms the holdings as compiled by him at the 30th June, 1962. I intimated verbally to Messrs Ferguson and Quain that I would accept the position as detailed by them as being factual, and that whatever decision you reached, however painful and embarrassing it might be to me, I was sure you would exercise your powers fairly and with a proper sense of responsibility.

"Mrs. Duggan is completely ignorant of my share transactions, and apart from signing a Power of Attorney in my favour, wouldn't have the faintest clue of my financial dealings.

"My final appeal to you before determining the measure of my culpability and the amount of penalty to be applied, is that in this unfortunate matter, particularly, and I wish to emphasize the word particularly, in the event of my name being published in any document to which the public have access, or what might be published in a newspaper, that I have been guilty of a violation of the tax laws, such action will have regrettable repercussions because of my parliamentary position, not normally applicable to tax offenders.

"I realise that you have a duty to perform and that I have no right to seek preferential treatment. Like all people who break the tax laws, I must expect to pay the financial penalty involved. Unlike the majority of such people however, because I occupy the position of Parliamentary Leader of the Opposition, I expose myself

to some additional penalty. If I should have the misfortune to have my name published, I will immediately on such publication appearing, voluntarily relinquish the parliamentary office of Leader of the Opposition which I now hold. Apart from the loss of £1,000 per annum, such action will entail, the greatest blow will be the feeling that I may have let the political party to which I have been attached so long, down. Added to this will be the sorrow and humiliation that after engaging in so many long and bitter political battles, that I should bow out under such circumstances. Aside from the voluntary act of resigning the leadership, I may be faced with the involuntary position of losing my endorsement and seat.

"A further worry of domestic and personal concern is that the attendant publicity may adversely affect my wife from whom I have concealed most of my troubles in regard to this particular matter. She is in a far from good state of health. She suffers from a serious kidney and blood pressure complaint. Naturally I do not want to aggravate her condition which could well happen if my troubles become an item of public interest.

"In conclusion I should like to repeat my thanks to your investigator Mr. Quain for his courtesy despite I understand the postponement of an operation, to finish my case.

"To you, too, Mr. Johnston, please accept my thanks for the declaration made by you that the investigation would be carried out in strict accordance with the regulations but that in doing so an endeavour would be made to reduce any inconvenience or embarrassment to the minimum necessary. This most certainly has been done."

That letter was signed by me on 10 July, 1963. I have read it for two or three reasons. First, it sets out in some detail my relationship with the tax authorities. Second, I indicated in it that if this matter did become a matter of public interest—as no doubt it will, either shortly or next year—I intended to relinquish the office of Leader of the Opposition.

I have not counselled or sought the advice of any of my parliamentary colleagues until this morning. I went to Sydney last week primarily to inform my son's employer so that he, at least, would know what was happening. I did not want any problem to brush off on him and I am delighted to know that such will not be the case. While in Sydney, I also took the opportunity of thanking two or three friends who offered me positions when I was temporarily out of Parliament in 1957 and 1958. I suppose that firm friends are few in number, and to those who have been so I felt some obligation to mention this matter.

Unhappily, as I say, I did not at any stage regard myself as being a person deliberately involved in tax evasion. Indeed, I have extracted from the records the financial position covering the years in question. Between 1955 and 1962, on my parliamentary salary, allowing for normal deductions, I would have been obliged to pay £2,759 14s. 11d. in tax. During that period I actually paid £7,809 18s. That indicates that dividends were shown on my returns. My advisers have led me to believe that had I elected to appeal the probabilities were fifty-fifty or better that I could establish a case for being treated as an investor rather than as a trader. Those who know something of this problem know that the line of demarcation is very thin indeed. When I endeavoured to discover beforehand what shares could be sold and what other arrangements I might make to meet my quite heavy financial indebtedness, I found a reluctance even on the part of the authorities to determine just what the measuring stick would be until the transactions had been completed. That of course puts a person in a most difficult situation.

Technically, where I was culpable and censurable was that in some of the dealings special placements were offered for which no funds were available and I was obliged to sell existing shares, and sometimes instead of the market appreciating it went down and a quick re-sale was effected, sometimes at a capital gain, sometimes at a capital loss. My serious technical breach was in those dealings which took place within 12 months as distinct from those which took place over a long period, and dividends which would have accrued were treated as capital gains or capital losses, as the case may be. I am advised, and believe it to be so, that if one is guilty in part one is guilty in whole in this matter.

I have a clear conscience in regard to my general approach to this question. My prime object was to set up an investment fund for my retirement and to provide for my family. When I started it there was no parliamentary superannuation scheme. During that period I paid £5,100 more in tax than if I had had no shares at all. I did not at any stage draw 1s. of that money for personal expenditure; I permitted it to build up over the whole period. Members of Parliament know that it is not easy to save, and sometimes I was obliged to sell shares to meet a tax obligation. But apart from that the money was not used for private spending at all. In retrospect, I would have been wiser had I used some of that money for personal expenditure rather than rely heavily on my parliamentary salary only, and not let this fund accumulate over the years.

Honourable members will appreciate that this has not been an easy occasion for me. As I mentioned, I have not counselled anyone, except one or two personal friends with whom I felt, for one reason or another, I had to discuss this matter in recent times. This

morning I arranged for the parliamentary executive, the party, and the inner executive of the Q.C.E. to meet. Suggestions were made that I might leave it in the hands of the party to decide whether I should continue. I scotched that suggestion as soon as it was made at each of those three levels. I pointed out that back in July, 1963, I indicated my intention to take this course of action, and that it would only be embarrassing and time-wasting for the possibilities to be discussed.

I do not know the reaction of my colleagues in this matter. I have tried to take what I consider to be the right, proper, and appropriate action in the circumstances, and I am grateful not only to those members at the three levels—the executive, the party, and the inner executive of the Q.C.E.—who so expressed themselves, but also to those who no doubt wished to do so and would have done so had I not cut them short by saying, "Whilst I appreciate your gesture, I am quite determined that the course that I have set myself is an irrevocable one."

Because of declining interest in street meetings and the impact of television and, to a lesser extent, radio, during political campaigns these days the leaders of the various political parties are, perhaps even involuntarily, projected before the public to a greater extent than they were previously. For good or ill, political parties today have to endeavour to select leaders whose images are good. I do not think that we of the A.L.P. have had a particularly good spin from the Press, although I personally am conscious of many courtesies shown me by individual journalists. Indeed, I have on occasions approached some of the top men in the newspaper business and they have made certain adjustments, sometimes temporarily. However, I am not squealing about the situation. I do not expect newspapers to be on the side of the Labour Party; indeed, I think it would probably be a bad day for the A.L.P. when all of its actions were extolled by the Press. I do not think that we, as a party representing the great mass of the people, should rely upon the Press, powerful as it is; and it is becoming increasingly powerful.

This means, of course, that the only opportunity the Leader of the Labour Party has to allow the people to assess his ability to interpret his party's policy in the interests of the people is when he appears on television or the public platform, or speaks on a radio programme. Despite the unhappy position in which I find myself, I would be the last to embarrass a party which has been very good to me, and I think there would be some reciprocity in this. I have read myself to sleep for the last 30 years. I read early in the mornings, and I work long hours. I think I have fought fairly hard. I do not particularly thank the Australian Labour Party for that, but I do thank it for allowing me to employ what talents I may have had in the past in serving it. For that, I am grateful.



It may surprise some people to learn (I have never mentioned this before) that some very influential people have suggested to me over the years the desirability of transferring my political affiliations to another party. In most cases those suggestions were made by people who apparently liked me personally. However, I always rejected them because, having been left without parents and knowing some of the difficulties of the ordinary people, a good many of whom I met whilst I was a shop assistant for some years, I felt that on the humanitarian level the Labour Party offered more than did other parties. Irrespective of the side of the Chamber on which one sits, there is a great measure of satisfaction in giving some comfort and help to those who need it. I therefore hope that even my critics might be fair enough to acknowledge that I have endeavoured to fight fairly during my time in this Assembly and in the various offices that I have held in the party. I do not think that the general reputation of the party has declined because of my advocacy.

Most of my remarks this morning are made off the cuff; I have not even thought about putting them in their correct sequence; so perhaps hon. members will be indulgent if occasionally I stray from the straight and narrow path of logic or use figures that are slightly incorrect. I have tried to portray the role of the party in the best possible way.

When I came back into the party, its fortunes were at a disastrously low ebb—something of the order of 23 per cent. of the total vote, which is a shocking position for a major political party to find itself in. However, we have progressively restored the situation, until today the Australian Labour Party is almost within 1 per cent. of the combined vote of the Liberal and Country parties in this State. That has been achieved not by me alone but by me as the instrument of the Labour Party through my friends and colleagues in the party on the administrative level, in the branches, and elsewhere. Again I am subject to correction, but I think that in building up the vote from the catastrophic low in 1957 to the present vote, we have probably done better than our counterparts in other States. It is true that a Labour Government has been returned in South Australia with more than 50 per cent. of the vote; but the Australian Labour Party has always received a very high percentage of the vote in that State in recent years, and I do not think that the progress achieved in this State indicates that I have any cause to be ashamed of my participation in the leadership of the party.

I have been not only a student but also an admirer of some of the great men who have led the Australian Labour Party in Queensland. Some of Australia's leading statesmen were Labour leaders or Labour Premiers in Queensland. Despite an occasional good speech, or even a brilliant speech, however industriously I might apply myself to preparing an indictment against the Government and no matter how effective my contribution

might appear to be to those listening to it, I should not like to think in the unhappy situation in which I find myself today that if I continued as Leader it could be said subsequently that the A.L.P. did not receive all the votes it should have because its Leader had violated the tax laws of this country. That is the sole reason why I have not given my colleagues an opportunity of determining whether or not they would like me to continue as Leader of the Opposition. I think my obligations to the party transcend the obligation that they may feel they owe me as a friend and a colleague.

We are living in difficult times, and unfortunately the Australian Labour Party has some general difficulty in securing support for its policies. I do not believe that we deserve to have withdrawn from us the percentage of support that would place us in Government. In fact, if ever there was a time for the application of sound Labour policies in both Federal and State spheres, it is today. I say that to hon. members without reflecting in an unfair way on those who hold political beliefs different from those held by hon. members on this side of the Chamber. In my opinion, the policies of the Australian Labour Party have a much sounder basis, although I think that, if the aspirations and hopes of many people are to be fulfilled, we still have much to learn. I do not believe that enough members of the Labour Party realise that the electorate is much more sophisticated than it was and that the heart, which ruled the Labour Party in the past, now takes second place to the head. With an increasingly high standard of education and the increasing sophistication of the electorate, perhaps the Labour Party is not exploiting as well as it could the possibility of enrolling white-collar workers in its ranks.

Matters such as these are not so easily brought into the picture on a State scale. If I may say so, I find that the avenue for major change in the State is restricted because of the Financial Agreement. This very often makes it merely a question of how the proceeds are carved up rather than of creating any new bold measures of policy. In the Federal sphere I think there is tremendous opportunity for the application of sound Labour principles. The Labour Party has always been a party of conflict; it must necessarily be so—we should not resist change merely for the sake of resisting it; we should not reject an idea, policy or argument simply because it is old or reject a new one because it is new.

I think there is a tremendous challenge today to political parties in this particularly troubled world. We are very fortunate in Australia that we are free of many of the things that are causing trouble elsewhere; but the world generally is a sick world and parliamentary democracy has its troubles in disciplining sections of the community to play their parts in evolving policies that are beneficial to the citizens and the people. I think that the wheel will revolve once again

in Labour's favour and I hope my colleagues, in electing a successor to me, will choose a man who they think will do the job, according to his talents and to the best of his ability. I know the person so appointed will do his very best, and I ask my colleagues to exercise wisdom and judgment in their choice. I promise my successor that I shall help him as much as I can.

Some cynics or nasty people might say that this is my swan song. It certainly is as leader of a great political party and for that reason it is rather difficult for me to do justice to it. But it will not really be my swan song, although it might be as the leader of this great party.

At this stage I can only express my thoughts. If I am engaged later on, as a member of Parliament, in heavy debates with those on the other side of the Chamber I want to say that I do appreciate the personal goodwill and the friendship of members on both sides. Apart from politics, if they were not politicians of the Liberal or Country Parties I am sure I should have had many of them as personal friends. I can only express the hope that the distressing recital I am obliged to make today will not in any material way alter the position of friendship and association which I have had with them over the years.

As I say, in other circumstances perhaps I would have been engaged in what I hope might have been an effective attack on the Budget. Hon. members will appreciate that I am not in an emotional condition to undertake that task—perhaps I am not in quite a condition to undertake this one—but the facts that I have related are all material facts and I do not intend to elaborate on them. I am not going to make myself an object of curious speculation over a period.

I have been frank in my disclosures—I think more frank than most. I pay the penalty for my transgression. I am not whingeing or wailing about that, although it has meant the neutralisation of much that I set out to build up. I do not intend to be a subject of cross-examination. I hope my friends will accept the story that I have given as revealing the true position. As for those who do not want to accept it as true, I am not very much concerned about them. I know that my action, taken as it is well in advance of the next election, will give my successor ample opportunity to build up his own image. As I pointed out earlier, it will be my very great privilege to help if help is needed. If I can help in an unostentatious, back-room way I shall be very pleased to do that.

As hon. members know, I have engaged in quite heavy political controversy with many on the other side of the Chamber and I hope I may continue to do so for at least a few more years. What my future will be is a matter on which I am not prepared to speculate, nor am I inviting inquiries on it at this stage. It is sufficient for me to say

that those who are entitled to know will know in sufficient time. The situation in which I am placed requires me to make the statement that I am relinquishing the position of leader of the Australian Labour Party in Queensland and Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament.

To you all I say clearly in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition, "Thank you for your personal manifestations of friendship; thank you for the opportunity of knowing you." I am only sorry that these indications of my goodwill towards hon. members on both sides of the Chamber are given under the circumstances which compel me to do so in the 1966 Budget debate.

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Acting Premier) (12.6 p.m.): In this somewhat unprecedented position, I feel that I should ask leave of the Committee to suspend this debate to allow me to make a brief statement as Acting Premier.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the debate be suspended to allow the Acting Premier to make a statement?

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. CHALK:** I regret very much this morning the absence of the Premier from the State. I also regret that it has been necessary for me, as Acting Premier, to listen to the speech that has just been made by the hon. member for Toowoomba West. I am certain that the sincerity with which his remarks have been tendered to this Committee are accepted by us all.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. CHALK:** It is true that this Parliament, or any other Parliament, cannot condone anything which involves a breaking of the law of the land. On the other hand, I am conscious, as I believe is every other hon. member in the Chamber, that there are problems that concern all of us which we seek to overcome by means best decided by ourselves. This morning, as Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Toowoomba West has outlined to the Chamber the problem that confronts him. Might I say on a personal note that I have known the hon. member for Toowoomba West over my 20 years and his 30-odd years in politics. We have brushed on many occasions in the political arena. Possibly there have been no greater opponents coming from one city than the hon. member for Toowoomba West and myself. All I want to say this morning is that we all deeply regret the circumstances that have necessitated his rising in this Chamber and delivering the speech that he has made. Whatever might be the outcome of the problems that confront him, from my personal point of view the hand of friendship and the hand of assistance will still be extended to him. So far as the matter of the law is concerned, that is something between the hon. member and those who administer the law.

**Mr. Duggan:** Fortunately, it has all been resolved now.

**Mr. CHALK:** I am very pleased to know that it has been resolved. I assumed that it had been from what the hon. member said, beyond some possible publication which undoubtedly will place him in a very awkward position and has prompted his taking this course this morning.

I conclude with the thought that, whatever the law might be, it has to be abided by. I hope for the sake of the hon. member's wife and family, who are very well known to me personally, that this shortcoming will have no effect upon their lives, for they are all good, honourable citizens. I hope that, as time goes by, the hon. member for Toowoomba West will be able to clear all his responsibilities and that he and his will have happiness, peace and contentment in this world.

**Mr. Duggan:** Thank you very much.

**Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (12.12 p.m.):** First, on behalf of Mr. Duggan and my other colleagues. I thank the Acting Premier for taking the opportunity of replying immediately to Mr. Duggan's speech. When a person is virtually down for the moment, it is greatly appreciated if those who are opposed to him see fit to speak well of him. I thank the Acting Premier most sincerely for his remarks. For over an hour we heard Mr. Duggan speaking of the problems confronting him privately and announcing his resignation as Leader of the Opposition. I am sure it must have been a great shock to all hon. members to learn of the burden that he has borne, completely alone, for three long years. Those of us who have had a problem in our lives and have had to bear it for a few weeks or months know how trying it can be and how it affects our judgment, but Mr. Duggan has borne his problems for three years knowing full well that eventually something had to break. This has been a great shock to his parliamentary colleagues—men who have worked with him over the years—who had no inkling that he had a personal problem. I venture to say that in my term in Parliament no man has been more eloquent, nor has any man had a better command of the English language, than John Duggan when making speeches in this Chamber. When we reflect on today's episode, on what he said, and on how he went about it, we will realise that he has tremendous courage. He told us point blank of his personal, private affairs; he berated himself in the eyes of the Australian people (and I believe he has done so wisely) but it needs outstanding courage to talk about oneself in that way. That is the man as we know him.

Prior to 1957 we followed Mr. Duggan's actions in this Chamber when he was fighting for the things he believed in. Then we saw the trouble in 1957. I had the honour and privilege of assisting in a small way in the campaign when John Duggan won the

Toowoomba West seat and was once again returned to this Assembly. There we saw his fighting qualities in most adverse circumstances. Therefore some of us were not surprised at his action today. I believe that he showed great courage and a sense of duty. A lesser man would have let things ride longer hoping that something would break, or would have put the responsibility on to his parliamentary colleagues, his executive, or his party to decide whether or not he should resign. But John Duggan did not do that. He made his own decision. His one main thought was loyalty to the party which he said has given him so much. While giving to him, the party has received tremendous service from him. No man in the Labour movement has displayed greater loyalty than John Duggan today.

I ask members of this Committee not to judge him as a man and pass sentence on him. He has judged himself and has personally reproached himself. And his statements today showed the severity of the sentence he has imposed upon himself. Instead, we should reflect on how much he contributed to this State. Remember the tremendous amount of work that had to be done to rehabilitate our railways after the war, when he was Minister for Transport. Remember also his contribution as Deputy Premier and Acting Premier. When the present Acting Premier first held the portfolio of railways, he endorsed the various decisions John Duggan had made as Minister for Transport and also acknowledged his ability in that position. That is borne out by the extension of dieselisation in this State. As long as we have diesel locomotives in Queensland the name of John Duggan will be closely associated with railways.

Most hon. members have seen Mr. Duggan in action for many years. Do they stop to consider for a moment the hours he spent on research before replying to a Bill introduced by a Minister who had a full knowledge of the matter and also had the backing of his departmental officers? A Leader of the Opposition has to get up without any warning and reply not on behalf of himself but on behalf of the Opposition. Every word John Duggan uttered and every opinion he expressed were taken to be the word and the opinion of the Opposition. What a tremendous responsibility for him to carry. Only three present members of this Parliament know how heavy that responsibility is. Firstly there is my colleague Jim Donald, who was Leader of the Opposition for a short period, secondly the present Premier who held that position for a considerable period, and of course our present Leader. I am sure that if the Premier were here he would readily admit that it is a heavy responsibility.

I feel that today will go down in history and, when the details of his statement are long forgotten, John Duggan's name will be recalled for what he is and what he did for this State. That he remains a member of

this Parliament is, I think, in the interests of the State. Certainly members of the A.L.P. want him here. We want his counsel; we want his knowledge; and we certainly need his ability. As time passes and wounds heal, he will come back into the fight and, with a completely free and clear mind, will be more vigorous than ever and able to show this Parliament and the people of Queensland how necessary it is that he should remain a prominent member of this Assembly.

It is with a sense of shock that I now attempt to take his place on this occasion in expressing our thoughts on the Budget. Unfortunately, because of the shortness of the time available, it has not been possible for me to examine the Budget with the eyes of the one leading the debate for the Opposition. I do not apologise for that, because I believe that things have to be taken as they come. I am quite confident that those who follow me will deal with any of my omissions and that between us we will let the Government know exactly what we think of the Budget.

On behalf of the Opposition, I move—

“That the Item ‘Aide-de-Camp, \$3,700’ be reduced by \$2.”

In speaking to the Budget, I must, of course, congratulate the Treasurer on his elevation to his present position. After presenting his first Budget I am sure he realises that there is a great difference between being head of the State's transport system, where his main worry was obtaining money and spending it wisely, and being Treasurer, where his principal concern is securing sufficient money to see that these things can be done. I feel that he can be complimented on the attempt he has made to do that. However, I do not want my saying that to be construed as a compliment to him on the result of his attempt. After going through the Budget speech, seeing the various new taxes that are to be imposed, and realising the shortcomings in some of the items, I believe that the Government should be censured most severely for this Budget and I, and the speakers who follow me on this side of the Chamber, will endeavour to point out why.

In considering the Budget, one looks at last year's results and considers the Estimates for this year. Let us look first at what the Treasurer's predecessor said last year when introducing the Budget. He said—

“The year 1964-65 will go down in history as a year of mixed fortune.”

The Treasurer, Mr. Chalk, indicated from the word “go” that he intended to introduce some new ideas in the presentation of the Budget. On the other hand, his opening words were not new, because he said—

“The year 1965-66 will go down in history as the year of conflicting trends.”

Perhaps there is some difference from a budgeting point of view between “mixed fortune” and “conflicting trends”; but I

believe that this year will go down in history as a year of regret on the part of the public that it returned the Government to the Treasury benches. As the hon. member for Baroona says, it has regretted its actions already. In fact, I know many people, particularly people in the sugar industry, who have openly expressed regret that they fell for the Government's three-card trick on what it said it would do for the sugar industry.

There is already an indication that higher taxation is the order of the day. We know, too, that the industrial field is certainly not very stable, because virtually every day there is industrial trouble somewhere in the State. There should not be, but there is.

**Mr. Hughes:** How much of this is genuine and how much is fomented?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is all genuine. As I proceed, I will show the hon. member why. The ordinary person finds today that his income is not sufficient to enable him to maintain the standard of living that he should be able to maintain in these times.

I believe that the Treasurer, in presenting the Budget, did endeavour to simplify some parts of it, but he over-emphasised others. He became rather confused. On the one hand, he said this—

“As the Committee is aware, last year's budget was based on the assumption of a normal wet season in early 1966. Unfortunately that wet season did not materialise . . .”

In other words, he tried to indicate that, in framing the 1965-66 Budget, the Treasurer of the day believed that there would be a wet season in early 1966 and, as a result, assumed certain income. However, later in his Financial Statement the Treasurer said—

“The Budget for 1965-66 was framed on the anticipation of a loss of \$3,862,000 in revenues because of drought.”

He cannot have it both ways. He cannot say early in his speech that the Budget deficit was due to unpredictable drought and later say that the drought was anticipated.

In the Treasurer's Financial Statement, of course, there is much evidence to show that last year the Government was well aware that Queensland's situation was desperate because of the drought. In considering the Budget, therefore, I do not believe that we should worry at all whether or not the Treasurer thought the drought was as bad as it was. The main thing we have to consider is whether or not the Government of the day, with all the resources at its disposal, should have been able to anticipate with fair accuracy what the conditions would be for a few months ahead. It failed to do that.

Normally when we consider the Budget as set out in the Estimates of Probable Ways and Means we do so to try to find what the Government had in mind and what has been hidden and covered up in various figures. I

believe that in looking at the Budget, we have to analyse each section fairly closely. Of course, as we have a change of Treasurers we have a change of approach; therefore, it is not as easy for the average citizen to analyse it as the Treasurer would have us believe.

I have taken out some figures that I should like to consider. In Consolidated Revenue I find Commonwealth payments to the State of \$7,500,000 more than the State budgeted for. This helped to give an amount of \$4,411,867 over the estimated income. I do not think it matters greatly in the final analysis how money is obtained. It is a fact that at the time he framed his Budget the Treasurer had at his disposal \$4,000,000 more than he anticipated. Having this money, I believe he could have done more than he did.

I am afraid that the Treasurer's figures—I do not doubt their accuracy because I have great faith in our Public Service and in those responsible for them, and also in the integrity of the Treasurer himself—show a down-at-heels result. What would have happened if that \$7,500,000 had not been available? The Treasurer made some reference to it but shrugged it off as if it was of no consequence, but I believe that, knowing what happened on that occasion, we must take a very close look at this Budget to make sure we are not put into the position of having again to go to the Federal Government for a hand-out.

What did the Treasurer say of the Federal Government? He said quite bluntly and point-blank—I think it is worth repeating—

“However, I must repeat my earlier public expression of disappointment that the only aid afforded us towards the factor of loss of revenue by drought is \$2,750,000. As we have already lost in the vicinity of \$8,000,000 from this cause and I estimate that we shall lose a further \$9,000,000 from the same cause in 1966-67, I can only state that the help given in this direction is totally inadequate. In consequence, as Treasurer, I was left with the alternative of cutting back in works and services or of finding means of obtaining extra revenue.”

Is not that an indictment of the present Federal Government? Is not the Treasurer, in so many words, condemning the Federal Government for not making more money available to the State? Of course, we understand why the Federal Government is not making money available to the States. It is because it desires to put forward a bold front in this, an election year; but I am afraid that in Queensland the Federal Government has missed the boat completely because we will not be put off by promises of things to come when in fact nothing eventuates.

Let us look at some of the items of Commonwealth grant. I refer first of all to the amount for the Institutes of Technology.

I am sure that the Minister for Education was very interested when he realised the the position. The Commonwealth grant of \$189,280 amounts to only 14·8 per cent. of the total to be spent on technological education in this State. What a paltry sum! The Commonwealth Government tells the people, “We are the great helpers of education in this country. We are going to help the States overcome their financial problems in providing technical education.”

**Mr. Pizzey:** What figures are you citing?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am talking about the Federal grant from the Consolidated Revenue Account against Consolidated Revenue expenditure. I am not referring to money used for the provision of equipment or buildings, which is an entirely different thing. I am talking about straight-out Consolidated Revenue. That is the position shown by the Treasurer's Financial Statement. Only 14·8 per cent. of the total is coming from the Federal Government; the rest has to come from State taxation.

**Mr. Pizzey:** I do not know where you are getting your figures from.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** From out of the Budget.

**Mr. Pizzey:** You must be misinterpreting them.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Not at all. The Minister is misinterpreting them. It is not that I am condemning the Minister for Education for the total amount to be spent on technical education. However, I will deal with this matter when we are debating the Estimates of the Department of Education, at which time the Minister will have a chance to reply.

The same remarks apply to the grant for the university. The university grant of \$4,144,982 is an increase over last year's figure. Some publicity has already been given to this additional money being made available for the university, but the proposed percentage total expenditure on the university this year is slightly less than that for last year, with 44·5 per cent., as against 45 per cent. of the expenditure coming from Consolidated Revenue.

I have said this before: we must have more assistance from the Commonwealth Government for technical and university education. It is not much good keeping our kiddies at school until they are 15 or 16 years of age if we are not going to give them the opportunity to develop their talents fully. The only way we can provide that opportunity is by having these institutions.

I have a certain amount of sympathy for the Minister for Education because of the great financial needs of his department, but I am sure he will agree that the Commonwealth Government has not been generous to this State in providing special grants for these purposes. I know that

money comes from other sources. If we look at some of the Commonwealth expenditure in other fields of education I am sure the Minister will agree that that Government cannot be proud of its generosity in this direction.

Looking at the income side of the Budget, we find that State transport fees last year were \$287,846 below the estimate, but they are expected to increase by \$577,846 this year. In other words the Treasurer expects a 12 per cent. increase in the money available from State transport fees.

**Mr. Pizzey:** Better seasons.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Not at all. The Minister has not read the Budget.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He can't stand looking at it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Of course he can't. The true position is that the fees per ton-mile have been increased. The Treasurer has set out details of the increases. He tells us that he will get an extra \$500,000 from these increases. Deduct that \$500,000 from the \$577,846 and all that remains to represent the increased prosperity and trade that the Minister talks about is a paltry \$77,846. In other words, the bulk of the money is to come from the increased rates, which will be a further burden on the public. The main users of the State's road transport system are primary producers and people living in country areas. There is no doubt that the increased fees will be passed on to the public, and that is one of the reasons for our moving this virtual vote of censure of the Government.

**Mr. Pizzey:** To give one case in point, at Isis this year there are 60,000 tons of sugar against 12,000 tons last year. Wouldn't that be significant?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I did not publish the figures. If the Government is gaining something from sugar it is losing it on wheat or some other commodity. These are not my figures; they are the figures in the Budget. I do not doubt their accuracy, and from the Government's point of view perhaps they are correctly presented to give the best picture.

All the talk about greater development and prosperity is not supported by the Estimates as the income from State transport fees this year is £210,000 less than the estimate for last year. How can the Government claim that the State is developing greatly? There are three main means of transport in the State, namely air, rail and road. On many occasions Government representatives have said that road transport fees are a barometer to indicate the development that is taking place.

Income from land tax is to increase by \$527,285. I ask the Minister for Education to ascertain from the Treasurer whether this means that there will be another land revaluation in this State. There has been no increase in the rates and there has certainly been no indication they are to be lowered.

If the Government hopes to get an extra \$500,000 from land tax, where will it come from? There is only one way to get it, and that is by increasing valuations. Many areas in the State are due for revaluation. An inquiry was held into land matters and the Government parties are fighting between themselves about what should be done. The Government is trying to drag a herring across the path and is holding an inquiry in Brisbane into various matters. However, I will not pursue that at the moment. Whether the Government likes it or not, the Treasurer has told us that he hopes to get an additional \$500,000 from land tax. For the sake of Queensland as a whole, for those in primary industries particularly, and for the new industries going to various parts of the State, I suggest that the Government should look closely at this matter, otherwise many industries will be scared away.

In the field of stamp duty, the last estimates were up \$396,578 but the Treasurer has told us there will be a further increase of \$2,307,422—not \$200,000. What a large sum to rake in by one taxing method! We are told that \$250,000 will come from stamp duty of 3 per cent. on workers' compensation premiums. Who thought up this brilliant idea of taxing the premiums on workers' compensation policies? Workers' compensation premiums are paid only to the State Government Insurance Office, which pays millions of dollars a year to the State Government in lieu of income tax. In other words, the State Government Insurance Office finances the State heavily. Yet we are putting a further tax on. In addition, what chance have the workers, who have been agitating for better workers' compensation payments, of getting a better deal? None at all, because this hungry Government seizes every opportunity to get money, even if it means taking it partly from itself, and that is what it is doing. These are the Treasurer's words, not mine. I must compliment the Treasurer because he was honest in some of the statements he made, but I do not know whether he meant them the way we have taken them.

Another new tax is stamp duty of 1 per cent. on the registration of new motor vehicles and on the transfer of motor vehicles. This will give the Government \$1,000,000. If the car-owner is not hit one way he is hit another way. Every time a person buys a new car or a second-hand car he must pay this tax. In comparison with transfer fees and registration fees, 1 per cent. may seem only a small amount.

**Mr. Newton:** He is up for another three or four dollars before he gets it on the road.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right.

Where does this new method of tax stop? If there was no other reason for moving a motion of censure, this form of taxation would be sufficient. We can remember

the introduction of sales tax and other sectional taxes which have become the tools of Governments to tax the people. What service will this tax give to the people? None at all. The stamp-duty tax of \$16,750,000 is the largest single item in the Budget. Yet no service is given for it. The public get nothing at all out of this form of taxation.

**Mr. Lee:** The Treasurer said it would be put into roads.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is nonsense. I know he said that, but look at the Budget. He has put this into roads but has taken away the amount spent last year, so over all there is nothing extra.

**Mr. Pizzey:** You had better call your former Leader back; you are making such a mess of it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister for Education need not stay and listen to me if he does not want to. There is another Minister in the Chamber.

Sales tax is paid only by people in business. Last year the duty on cheques was increased so that a person paying an account for 50c is charged 5c, the same amount as is charged a man paying a bill for \$100,000. Stamp duty is also paid on receipts and other documents issued in the normal course of business transactions. Every time a person does something in this State he is taxed. It would not be so bad if some of these amounts covered the services rendered by the public servants who carry out the duties. But this has developed into nothing but a means of fleecing the public. Ability to pay is not considered. As much as we complain about income tax it is based partly on ability to pay. This form of tax can affect the welfare of people who cannot afford to pay.

The totalisator and betting tax was \$52,091 below the estimate. No wonder Government members cried when the Treasurer said that gambling in this State was not as heavy as expected. I am glad to see that the Minister for Justice has entered the Chamber. Next we will find advertisements posted around the place urging people to gamble more so that the Budget can be balanced.

**Mr. Chinchin** interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Look at the Budget. I shall give the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt the figures.

**Mr. Chinchin:** I am referring to the advertisements that you spoke about. That is ridiculous, and you know it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is not to say that the Government will not put them up. Statements appear in the Press to the effect that the T.A.B. pays better dividends than bookmakers do.

**Dr. Delamothe:** You would sooner have the S.P. men?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister cannot prove that they are no longer operating, either. If he thinks that, let him be in Parliament House on Melbourne Cup day. The Government is confident that betting in this State will increase, because it is estimated that this year an additional \$708,091 will be received in totalisator and betting taxes. How is that going to be accomplished unless the rate of taxation is increased, which would fleece the punters even more, or gambling becomes heavier?

**Mr. Chinchin** interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I say that it is dishonest to say one thing at election time, as hon. members opposite did, and then depend heavily on revenue obtained from gambling. Hon. members opposite were against gambling. They went round saying, "It is wrong to gamble," but now they put out their hands to receive money from it. However, I do not want to enter into a discussion with the "side-issue" group. Circumstances have altered a few things that were to be said, and time does not now permit me to deal fully with that matter. It will be referred to at a later date.

Revenue from mining was \$376,312 above the estimate. I am pleased to see that. Most of it has been obtained from royalties. The Opposition has always been in favour of the development of our mineral wealth, and we are pleased to see the increase in revenue obtained from it. It is also pleasing to see that this year the Treasurer expects to obtain an additional \$1,353,688, bringing the total sum to \$3,060,000. In spite of those increases, however, the revenue obtained from mining is still less than will be received from the increase in stamp duty. The total income from mining is only slightly more than the estimated income from betting taxes and, if bookmakers' turnover tax is included, \$1,500,000 less.

There are in Queensland the natural resources of gold, coal, oil, bauxite, and copper. Over the years men risked their lives and investors risked their capital in attempts to discover them. Now that they have been found, the State receives from them a sum a little less than the amount received from gambling. Surely this shows that there is something wrong with the mining rights and royalties. I know that obligations have to be honoured, and the Opposition would have no part of failing to carry out an undertaking.

I suggest that we should be realists and look into the question. How far can we go on taxing the public in the various fields that the Budget is entering while we allow outside investors to make handsome profits and the State to receive a paltry amount in royalties from things that are part of our heritage? In my opinion, the Government should have considered those questions before it brought the Budget down.

Let me now make a comparison between mineral wealth and wealth produced from the land. It is expected that over \$14,000,000 will be obtained from the primary producers of this State in revenue from land tax. If they are to pay the tax, they first have to earn the money. On the one hand, the State is making available from Consolidated Revenue large sums of money in grants to primary producers to keep them going through difficult times; on the other hand, it is taking from them \$14,000,000 in various taxes. That is their contribution to Consolidated Revenue, and, at the same time, the Government is obtaining the relatively small sum of \$3,000,000 from the State's natural resources, which are there for the taking and are part of our heritage. We can only take the Government's word for it that the over-all return to the State is enormous. How often have hon. members heard Ministers boasting in this Chamber of the State's great natural resources or the amount of coal now being exported to Japan? The Mt. Isa railway line has been reconstructed; millions of dollars are being spent on developing other places in the State. Surely the people are entitled to a far greater return on their investment.

Proceeding through the Budget, I ignored many of the items in which I thought there had not been any fundamental changes in the amounts estimated or received last year and those estimated for this year. However, other hon. members will have an opportunity of making some points on those.

Fines and forfeitures increased from an estimated \$1,300,000 to \$1,771,680—in other words, by \$476,680—and the estimate for this financial year is \$1,800,000. That indicates to me the extent to which crime has risen in the State, and it is indicative, too, of a number of other things. The relationship between crime and the number of police, or the shortage of police, and between crime and education could be debated for hours. I realise, of course, that in some cases the crime is a very minor one in our present way of life, but I think it is worth considering that the amount obtained from the criminal element in the community by way of fines and forfeitures is only 14 per cent. of the cost of maintaining the Police Force. To me, that indicates one of two things. Either the amount that we are fining people, particularly for more serious crimes, should be increased, or we should consider increasing the numbers in the Police Force. I believe that this should be done, and when the Estimates for the Department of Education are being considered and hon. members have an opportunity to speak on police matters, I am sure that many of them will have a great deal to say.

*(Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.)*

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The next item to which I wish to refer is the income from the Tourist Bureau. I notice that it is only slightly up on last year's figure and \$19,286

below the estimate. I mention that because over the past few months we have had many statements from the present Minister relative to the extent of the tourist industry in this State in an effort to make us believe that tourists have been flocking here since this Government attained office. The figures do not indicate such a state of affairs, because the over-all return of just over \$5,000,000 has been almost stationary over the last few years. I am pleased to see that this year the Treasurer has estimated virtually the same figure as that for last year—in fact, it is \$10,000 less than last year—which shows that he has a realisation of the true position.

It is true that if the tourist industry could be developed it would be a wonderful asset and I do not want to decry what has happened; but let us not be silly about the matter. I have recently taken two trips to the North, one by road as far as Collinsville and the other by train. Talking to people there I found that they are definitely worried about pulling caravans over long distances on some of our roads. The result is that they are bad advocates in the South for this State and its tourist industry. It would be far better to tell them that they can go only so far on good roads in a caravan, and that from there on it would be better for them to use their cars and the hotels and other amenities. That would be a realistic approach rather than telling them a fairy tale that might have some value as propaganda but that, in the long run, would result in our losing tourists.

Whilst dealing with the Tourist Bureau, I do not know what charges are made for carrying out the duty for the purveyor but I am concerned at the cost of the Tourist Bureau. Over the years from 1956 until this year the cost of running the bureau, with all contingencies, as against the income received, has increased from \$181,762 to \$442,163. It makes one wonder just how long we can go on using money like this from Government sources without asking the private sector, which stands to gain \$5,000,000, to spend a little more on advertising from its own resources instead of relying on Government expenditure.

I know it is quite good for the Government to boost the tourist areas but I feel that there has been in some cases—fortunately it may be in only a minority of them—a tendency to lean too much on Government propaganda rather than the private sector using its own.

I earlier mentioned the State Government Insurance Office. We have recently heard from the private insurance companies the argument that the State Government Insurance Office works at an advantage over the private insurer because the latter has to pay income tax whereas the State Government Insurance Office does not. What the private insurer does not say is that although the State Government Insurance Office does not pay tax to the Commonwealth Government it pays an equal amount in taxation to the State



Government; so, in actual fact, the State Government Insurance Office is in no different position from any other insurer in the payment of taxation.

Last year the income of the State Government Insurance Office in lieu of income tax was up from \$507,120 to \$840,214, or 65 per cent., which is quite an appreciable amount. In fact, it is the biggest single percentage increase in the Budget. This year it is estimated that we will receive \$1,187,000 from this source. The figure has doubled since 1964-65. We should do everything possible to ensure the success of this unit of governmental activity. It is a social service unit that is working in the interests of the people, and we should foster it as such.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer indicated increased hospital charges. I will leave that matter to my colleagues as time will not permit me to go into it in detail now.

Previously in the office of the Commissioner of Prices we had a commissioner and two investigators. Perhaps the Treasurer will explain why provision is now being made for a commissioner and only one investigator. We could not possibly expect one man to check on all the various matters that will require attention throughout the State. We all know what happened when decimal currency was introduced. On the one hand prices rose, and on the other hand the size of many commodities was reduced. I have ample evidence of this in my own home. When the Weights and Measures Acts Amendment Bill becomes law a great deal of investigation will be necessary to ensure that its provisions are being observed. The Minister might say that this is the responsibility of another department, but I believe that the type and size of packaging, and other factors associated with attempts to fleece the public, should be all part and parcel of one section of government activity. Rather than the number of investigators being reduced I had hoped that it would be increased. The main object of most of this type of government activity is to bring about a stabilised economy, which would bring industries to this State and prosperity to the people. Whatever action we take has to be aimed at attaining a stabilised economy. It is no good introducing various wage structures if they lose their purchasing power immediately they are gazetted. To guarantee purchasing power it is necessary to be able to guarantee that the consumer gets the value for his money that the interim increase is based on. To be able to do that it is necessary to have various matters policed. All the good intentions of the amending legislation now before Parliament will mean nothing unless it is policed effectively.

During the election campaign I remember the Leader of the Opposition saying quite plainly that it was his belief that within a very short time the prices of bacon and pork products would increase substantially. We

were told that he was wrong, but in fact that is what happened. The Government cannot blame the drought for those increases. Indeed, no excuse was given; there was simply a blatant increase.

I realise that there is in existence today no price control similar to that which applied when the Labour Government was in office, but if the Government genuinely desires to bring about a stable economy it must take certain action. The way to do that is to have effective price control. It need not be far-reaching, as we know from experience in the transport field that when an example is made of one offender everyone falls into line. I am greatly disappointed in that the protection afforded has been reduced to a very limited degree.

As my time is up, I again ask the Committee to accept the amendment I have moved on behalf of the Opposition.

**Mr. HANLON** (Baroona) (2.26 p.m.): I rise to second the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in censure of the Government. Before proceeding to support the amendment, however, I endorse the comments of the Deputy Leader and the tribute paid by him on behalf of the members of the A.L.P. to the hon. member for Toowoomba West in the situation he is in and on the courageous action he has taken. As has been pointed out by my Deputy Leader and the Acting Premier, we saw the sterling quality of the man in that he chose to come before his peers in this Chamber, having first given to the Parliamentary Labour Party, his parliamentary executive and the party itself, the information that he wished to disclose in the Chamber. He chose to make his statement in Parliament, although it would have been much easier for a lesser man to have done so during last week's recess when Parliament was not assembled, and so lessen the burden of his announcement. As I say, he chose to do it publicly in this Assembly, and I very sincerely endorse the remarks made by the Acting Premier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—now Acting Leader—in their tribute to the hon. member.

I also endorse the tributes paid to Mr. Duggan for his contribution to the A.L.P. both inside and outside Parliament, and to the Government of the State and Parliament itself during his years of office. I will not make any further reference to this matter because, as the hon. member for Toowoomba West pointed out, his remarks this morning were by no means his swan song, and I do not intend to make this something of a valedictory so far as his parliamentary service is concerned. Like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I look forward with other hon. members to his contributions in future debates.

Turning now to the motion of censure moved by my Deputy Leader, it might be said that this is a matter of politics when the Government introduces a severe Budget—and I do not think that even the Treasurer

would deny that in many ways it is a severe Budget. It may be said that in such circumstances it is customary for the Opposition to move a motion of censure but, as my Deputy Leader pointed out when moving the amendment, it is not just a matter of politics. Generally speaking, when such amendments are moved by the Opposition they are more likely to be forthcoming in the period just prior to an election. The very fact that an election has been held recently, and that three years will elapse before the next election, indicates that the political necessity to censure the Budget is not as extreme as it would be if a State election were closer to hand.

The public is rightly resentful of the Government's attitude and the impositions reflected in the Budget as presented to Parliament by the Treasurer. In a lighter vein, we are traditional in retaining, in decimal currency, the same amount of censure, namely \$2 or £1, rather than moving to reduce the salary of the Aide-de-Camp by \$1. Naturally the suggested reduction has no relationship to the entitlement of the Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency; it is simply the traditional form of censure in decimal terms.

Coming immediately after an election, this Budget could well be termed the "morning-after Budget". In the months before the election the Premier, the Treasurer, State Ministers, and other members of the Government travelled throughout the State toasting themselves and telling the people what good fellows they were, what a grand job they had done for the State, and what an excellent position the State was in as a result of their stewardship. Unfortunately, now that the election is over the Government, after nine years of office, will naturally act in the belief that its stewardship justified its return to office and that the State will benefit from its administration.

That would be all right, and I do not blame Government members for toasting themselves before the election, but unfortunately the taxpayers of Queensland have woken up with the Government's hangover. That is what the electors resent and what the Opposition resents, and that is why we have moved this motion of censure. Many people would like to have a good night out drinking cocktails and have somebody else wake up with the hangover. If any congratulations are to be extended to the Treasurer on this Budget, they should be for doing just that. He has arranged for the electors to wake up with the hangover.

Irrespective of what Government has been in office we have tended, until this time particularly, to become somewhat blase about State taxation. Since uniform taxation was introduced by necessity in the war years, and since the battle over its permanence was fought in the immediate post-war years, we have found that Commonwealth financial assistance in the way of tax reimbursement as it traditionally began dominates the quantum of State revenue so much that State

taxation seems almost supplementary to the Commonwealth payments to the State. I venture to suggest that if the Premier went out dressed without the financial clothing with which his Government is vested by Commonwealth payments in one form or another he would be arrested immediately for indecent exposure because so much of the funds that relate to the activities of State Government come in one form or another from Commonwealth sources.

State taxpayers have developed a tendency, particularly in this State, to become somewhat blase about the effect that State taxation has on them individually or as a group. It is something like a puppy with sharp teeth that nips away at your ankles as you walk through the gate but does not quite get through your socks. You feel that he is a bit of a nuisance and you wish he would go away, but you are not particularly concerned about him because you have your eye on the big bloodhound that really might sink his fangs in.

This somewhat nonchalant attitude to State taxation, particularly in Queensland, arises largely from the consideration shown by Labour Governments in Queensland in the post-war period. It is true that prior to the war, when we were responsible for levying our own income tax, there was quite a heavy rate of taxation in Queensland, particularly on companies and people who lived perhaps in Melbourne or other parts of Australia and had large interests in Queensland, and who Governments of the day considered should make contributions by way of taxation to the welfare of the people of Queensland from within whose boundaries they were deriving considerable dividends.

Hon. members opposite were then very caustic, and occasionally they have a nostalgic look back and more or less give Opposition members another "doing over" on the rate of taxation in Queensland prior to the war. As I pointed out in a previous debate during this session, that was an economic fact of life. Because of the relative lack of wealth within this State, the State Government, exercising its taxing powers, had to tax fairly heavily the more affluent sections of the community.

As soon as the benefits of uniform taxation began to flow to Queensland, the State Government began to ease the burden of State taxation on Queenslanders. I refer to Table C5, which appears on page 18 of the Tables presented by the Treasurer with the Budget, and a comparison of the taxation and revenue per head of population in the years 1947-48 to 1956-57, and 1956-57 to 1965-66. Whilst it is difficult to get any basis of comparison at all because of varying factors and times, this is about the only reasonable way of assessing this matter. I repeat that I am quoting from the Treasurer's Tables, not something that I am producing as propaganda compiled by "Hanlon's Research Bureau", in the way in which some hon. members opposite,

including the Minister for Industrial Development, sometimes do. In 1947-48 \$6.10 per head was the level of State taxation of a total revenue per head at that time of \$48.12. In other words, State taxation was 12.7 per cent. on a per capita basis of all revenue flowing to the Revenue Account of the Queensland Government.

Nine years later, in 1956-57, when the Australian Labour Party left office, State taxation per head was \$14.53 of a total revenue figure per head of \$122.17. The percentage of State taxation of total revenue per head at that time had been reduced by the Labour Government in that period of nine years from 12.7 to 11.9.

Now we come to the year 1965-66, the year before many of the additional imposts announced by the Treasurer are to take effect at a State level. In that year, State taxation per capita was \$26.33 out of an all-revenue total of \$182.31 per capita, or 14.4 per cent.

One of the difficulties in speaking to the Financial Statement is that a person who uses figures has them in front of him and others have not, and it becomes rather tedious if one merely quotes figures that have little meaning to other people. However, I believe that the figures I have given hon. members are self-evident. In 1947-48, when uniform taxation had more or less been confirmed after the war and, as I said earlier, the State was getting the benefit of this, taxes imposed at a State level—liquor taxes, transport fees, racing and betting fees, succession and probate and stamp duties, and other taxes—were 12.7 per cent. per capita of revenue. When Labour left office, it had reduced the call on State taxpayers to 11.9 per cent. Under the Country-Liberal Government, State taxation had increased to 14.4 per cent. of revenue last financial year, and I suggest that this indicates clearly that under the coalition Government State taxation in Queensland has steadily been assuming greater importance in meeting the revenue requirements of the State Budget. Consequently, Queensland taxpayers no longer find the State Treasurer a Chihuahua—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as a dog-lover, can correct me if I am wrong. I mean one of those miniature puppies—snapping at their ankles, but a Great Dane who has upped and taken a massive bite out of the seat of their pants.

**Mr. Pizzey:** He may be providing better services, too.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is open to considerable question. Certainly, the Minister's interjection would be relevant if it were true.

**Mr. Pizzey:** It is true, too.

**Mr. HANLON:** The Minister for Education has bought into this. I do not want to deal with education matters at this stage because, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Estimates for the

Department of Education are listed for discussion. However, I ask the Minister for Education to have a look honestly at some of the concessions to independent schools and to equate the \$15.00 a quarter that has been announced in this Budget with the value of the secondary school allowance existing in 1954. It was known then, of course, as the Scholarship allowance, but in due course it became the secondary school allowance. I suggest to him that it should be at least \$30.00 today to have any real relation to the allowance that was paid to pupils attending independent schools under a Labour Government.

If the Minister suggests that better services are being provided, I should be interested to see him take out a comparison on that basis. I am subject to correction, but I think the allowance has been stationary from 1954 till the present. If one lumps together the \$15.00 and the increase of a paltry few dollars and a textbook allowance of \$4.00 in the initial year at secondary school, that still does not represent as much in actual purchasing power as the allowance paid by a Labour Government in 1954.

**Mr. Pizzey:** They get them for an extra year now.

**Mr. HANLON:** They get them for an extra year because they are going to secondary schools under a new system. As I said, I do not want to deal with education at this stage because the Minister will be giving us his thoughts on that subject when his Estimates are being debated. Members of the Opposition's committee on education, who are taking a specific interest in the subject, no doubt will refer to those matters then.

I was referring to the additional imposition of State taxation under this Government compared with that under the previous Government. If we look again at the Treasurer's Tables, we find in Table C2 on page 11 that since 1956-57 Commonwealth financial assistance—that is the basic amount that we receive each year from the Commonwealth under uniform taxation—has gone up from \$54,500,000 to an estimated \$126,000,000, in round figures, this current financial year, an increase of 131.1 per cent. On the other hand, State taxation—that is, the various State taxes I mentioned, including Land Tax and so on—has risen from \$20,256,000 to an estimated \$47,500,000, or an increase of 134.8 per cent.

So here again—I gave figures earlier on a per capita basis—on a quantum basis we find that the Nicklin Government has been asking State taxpayers to contribute additional State taxation to the extent of 134.8 per cent. more than that levied in Labour's last year in office, whereas Commonwealth financial assistance to the State during that period has increased by only 131.1 per cent. So once again we have the picture, whether on a per capita basis or an over-all quantum basis, of State taxation under this Government steadily

putting more and more demands on the taxpayers of this State than was the case under Labour Governments.

I was rather amused in the light of all of this to read in the Treasurer's Financial Statement—

"It is my personal belief that opportunity should be provided for every Queenslander to become better acquainted with the basis on which the State acquires its revenues . . .".

It is clear to me that the Treasurer need have no worry on that score. Labourers, people who consign goods by road or rail transport, employers who pay workers' compensation premiums, hospital patients, both private and intermediate, and people buying motor vehicles, either new or second-hand, will all acquire—particularly with this new Treasurer in Queensland—a very close acquaintance with the basis upon which the State acquires its revenue, because he is going to take a much bigger bite at their pockets than Treasurers ever did in the past.

Over the years, Labour members have been trying to convey to Queenslanders the actual position of State finances rather than the position as it is put by the Government propaganda machine. Notwithstanding uniform taxation, as I have mentioned, the severity of the State imposition—this was what we were aiming to point out to the electors during the last and previous election campaigns—represents the moment of truth for the State Government and for the electors. Whilst State taxation, even with the additional burden that the Treasurer has put upon Queenslanders, still remains very much supplementary to the quantum of revenue we get from Commonwealth financial assistance under uniform taxation, and in its own way is almost insignificant in relation to the impetus of the loan works programme and particularly to the special Commonwealth allocations for particular projects, State taxation is the final link that is not only taking up the gap between expenditure generally and revenue but is also servicing the debt arising from the works programme, particularly works that are non-returnable by way of amortisation.

Apart from the basic competence of various Governments to administer their operations with maximum efficiency and to get the best use from employment resources available to them, whether financial or by way of manpower and general resources under their works programmes, the impact on the State taxpayer depends on what we can secure from the Commonwealth, either directly by taxation reimbursement as negotiated with the Commonwealth and other State Premiers and further State assistance such as the \$2,750,000 that has been brought into this year's Budget as a special concession from the Commonwealth, or through special project allocations.

In other words, to the extent that the Government has fallen down through its own maladministration, inefficiency, and failure to make representations to the Commonwealth Government successful enough to secure advantageous assistance, either directly by way of additional taxation reimbursement or indirectly by special assistance or more favourable terms for advances of Loan moneys at reduced interest rates, the bill has to be met, in the final analysis, by this segment of the Budget that I referred to by way of State taxation.

I readily acknowledge that there is a bill to be met, not by this Government or Parliament, but by the people of this State as a result of the effects of the drought. Undoubtedly the drought was one of the most severe in the State's history; it wrapped its arms unmercifully around large sections of the State, particularly the pastoral and primary-producing areas, for an unusually long time. It cast something of a blight on the State. We would be foolish to assert that this sort of calamity that Nature hands out from time to time should be placed completely at the feet of the Government. Admittedly, when such adverse blows are dealt the State, Queenslanders have to meet the bill. I do not think the taxpayers of the State mind meeting the bill to the extent that it is one that should be shared by Queenslanders generally, but they do object to meeting the bill for the Government's maladministration, lack of initiative in its representations to the Commonwealth Government and timidity in its approaches to that Government, all of which charges can fairly be levelled at the present Government.

It is for that reason that we have moved this motion of censure, not that we deny that there is a bill to be met by the State, which means everybody in it, because of the effects of drought. However, we are being asked by the Treasurer on page 2 of his Financial Statement by some curious process of reasoning that we should not only meet what he himself anticipated as being the loss in State revenue from drought, which last year was estimated at \$3,862,000, but also another \$3,000,000-odd that he has found himself short of in the year's operations. With his curious sort of financial reasoning he adds on to all of this the better returns for the year.

He tells us that because the Government prematurely imposed increased stamp duty on cheques in December last year, and because the banks had secured early stocks of the new forms at the higher duty rate, and because mining, as the Deputy Leader pointed out, has finally shown some return to the State in excess of the amount that the Treasurer estimated this time last year, estimated revenues were exceeded. He then proceeded to add all the good things that happened during the year to the bad things, and took the total as the loss through the drought. If that is an indication of the representations that are made by this State to the Commonwealth Government I shudder

to think of that Government's reaction. Perhaps it is little wonder that we are not getting better recognition from the Commonwealth Government.

In a quite illogical approach the Treasurer then defeated his own argument. He told us that last year the drought in Queensland cost the Treasury about \$8,000,000 in revenue and that this year he estimated that it would cost \$9,000,000. He told the Commonwealth Government, "We cannot possibly balance our Budget under these conditions; the State has suffered tremendous blows through drought." He asked for assistance to meet the \$9,000,000 loss and rightly complained because the Commonwealth, in its usual niggardly reaction to Queensland, offered only \$2,750,000 to meet the revenue shortfalls due to the drought. But having said that he could not possibly balance the Budget, when the Commonwealth Government told him it would not provide more help, instead of budgeting for at least some deficit to show that he was not telling an untruth to Canberra when he presented his case, he decided that, in one year, he would take the \$9,000,000 from the Queensland taxpayers by additional taxation. It is clearly illogical for the Treasurer to speak in two voices in this way.

We know that the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria have arranged a private meeting—not only arranged it, but insisted on it—with the Prime Minister, Mr. Holt, to put their Budget problems before him. They did not arm themselves with self-defeating evidence that somehow they could, by fair means or foul, pluck sufficient from their own taxpayers to meet their situation this year, and present or anticipate a balanced Budget. They budgeted for a substantial deficit. Even though they had increased their taxes at the State level they budgeted for substantial deficits so that when they went to Canberra to meet the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer on this matter they could follow up their argument with convincing evidence of their continuing difficulty.

This is the point I am making: Not only has the Queensland Treasurer not seen the Prime Minister, so far as we know—and he has not given us any evidence that he is to have another go at him about relieving the State's taxpayers of some of these most unfair taxes that he is imposing this year to balance his Budget—but in addition he has not pointed out to the Commonwealth that he is imposing too heavy a burden on Queenslanders, particularly in relation to the point I made concerning the steep increases in many State taxation fields, to balance his Budget.

I welcome the day when a Queensland Treasurer or Premier of the Country-Liberal Party will be able to swing the big stick through the Liberal Party Federal organisation and make the Prime Minister reverse his decision in 24 hours, as has occurred with Victoria and New South

Wales. We know that recently the Prime Minister said he would not meet Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte. When he returned from his recent visit overseas he made a public statement that he did not consider it proper that he should meet individual Premiers to discuss particular problems and difficulties of the State Governments, and that he thought these meetings should relate only to specific representations such as for the Nogoia Dam project which was mentioned by my colleague, the hon. member for Barcoo. He said that he did not consider he should meet the State Premiers individually so that, in effect, Victoria and New South Wales would get a run on the rails compared with the Premiers of the other States.

However, within a day or two, when the big stick was swung by the Liberal Party organisation, the statement made by the Prime Minister did not carry much weight. Had the Press not reported it we would not have known about it. Almost under cover of darkness Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte were departing from Canberra after a discussion with the Prime Minister. Where, oh! where, were the Queensland Government and the Premier? I do not mean Mr. Nicklin personally; he is overseas on a mission at the moment. But in his stead, where was the Acting Premier when these characters from Victoria and New South Wales were swinging the big stick at the Federal Government in the interests of their States? He was here in Queensland sitting in Parliament smiling over a balanced Budget which imposes additional taxes amounting to some millions of dollars.

**Mr. Hughes:** Do you think that the big stick treatment always gets the best results?

**Mr. HANLON:** I am glad the hon. member for Kurilpa interjected, because the purpose of this amendment is to indicate that the public, and the Opposition on its behalf, is not satisfied that the bill the Treasurer is calling upon the taxpayers to meet arises from the drought as has been suggested by him in his Budget speech. We suggest that to a great extent it arises from the circumstances I have mentioned. I shall go back further than the time of the Treasurer's lethargy in following up his representations to the Commonwealth Government.

Sir Thomas Hiley, when presenting the Budget last year, said it was estimated that the loss of revenue due to the drought in the financial year 1965-66 would be of the order of \$3,862,000. He continued—

"In an endeavour to overcome the problems arising from the drought, this State, in common with New South Wales, appealed to the Commonwealth Government for special financial assistance. The Commonwealth Government has pointed out that the revised level of Financial Assistance grant is based on the needs of an average year and that the States are expected to bear the vicissitudes of fluctuating good and bad years. However,

the Prime Minister has indicated that his Government will be prepared to consider assistance grants where the degree of effect of the drought is beyond the capacity of the State to absorb. This will be considered not on a predictive basis but in the light of actual experience."

This was a kind of "timid Thomas" approach that characterises the Queensland Government in comparison with the Governments of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales in these matters, because the Nicklin Government at that time accepted that brush-off by the Commonwealth Government.

The former Treasurer continued—

"Following this advice, the Government has decided that the State should absorb the loss of revenue estimated at £1,931,000; and that, if the budgeting prediction is broadly supported by actual experience, special assistance will be sought, partly on a repayable basis and partly by grant . . ."

He was not even asking for a grant at that time; he was prepared to accept a half-and-half arrangement, notwithstanding the story that has been unfolded now by the Treasurer about the drought. This time last year there was this readiness by the Nicklin Government, which was not estimating the real impact of the drought. Government and Opposition members representing country electorates told the Government of the effects of the drought in their areas and the Government was obviously unheeding of the warnings given to it in regard to the cumulative effects of the continuing drought at that stage. The Government sat back and said it would wait until the end of the financial year and would then apply for assistance.

The New South Wales Premier, towards the end of last year, said he was not prepared to do this. He said that New South Wales, which also was suffering from the effects of drought, could not afford to hang around waiting for, in the majestic terms of the former Treasurer, "the light of actual experience". He told the Commonwealth Government, as Government members were telling this Government, that New South Wales wanted assistance quickly, even at that stage.

As a result of pressure exerted by the New South Wales Government, and stinging criticism of the Commonwealth Government's rejection of the approach made to it, which was accepted by the Queensland Government, funds were made available by way of grants and interest-free advances to be made available to primary producers who were in difficulties, to be repayable from 1968, over eight years, free of interest. These funds became available because the New South Wales Government stood up to its responsibilities, and Queensland fortunately was able to share in what was forthcoming. In the December quarter of last year the first \$2,000,000 flowed to Queensland as a result of the New South Wales Government's action

in telling the Commonwealth Government that it was not prepared to be brushed aside in such a way. That was quite unlike the attitude of the Queensland Government.

This year the situation is similar. During the debate on the Appropriation Bill the Treasurer made an impassioned plea for special consideration by the Commonwealth Government. He told us that he did not want it to be thought that because Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte were already knocking on the Federal Treasurer's door for additional assistance, Queensland did not need it, too. He made this plea and was wiped off as if he were a little boy in the eyes of the Federal Government, who want to save their largesse to announce a policy that will enhance their prospects at the coming Federal election. Meanwhile, Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte did not put their tails between their legs and go back to their States simply because the Commonwealth Government told them to go home. Somehow, by fair or foul means, using Liberal Party machinery, they obtained a special hearing by the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Houghton:** They raised their State taxation, too, you know.

**Mr. HANLON:** I have already pointed out that they raised it, and they also budgeted for substantial deficits. The Queensland Government proposes to raise a tremendous amount of additional revenue by way of taxation this year to balance the Budget in one year.

**Mr. Pilbeam:** Last year you condemned us for a deficit Budget.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is the very point. We have been warning the Government for some years that the bill has to be paid eventually. When we did this, the then Treasurer told us that we were Jeremiahs and calamity howlers, and said that he was justified in budgeting for deficits. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in his initial comments on the Budget, if there was justification for deficit financing in those years, many of which were virtually boom years, surely there is some excuse for deficit financing now. However, this is the time when the Government has decided that the Budget has to be balanced.

We do not accept the Treasurer's explanation that the drought is the cause of accumulated deficits. There is clear evidence that the representations of the State Government to the Commonwealth Government have been at fault. So far as I am concerned, wherever the cap fits it can be worn. Either the Federal Government has disregarded Queensland or the Country-Liberal Government in Queensland has been inept in its negotiations on behalf of this State with the Federal Government.

I have here a document entitled "Commonwealth Payments to or for the States, 1966-67" issued by the Federal Treasurer when bringing down his Budget. At page

60 one finds the story of the tax reimbursements and financial assistance grants to the various States. As hon. members know, in 1959 the Premier and the Treasurer's predecessor went to Canberra and negotiated a new financial assistance formula for the succeeding six years to 1964-65. At the end of the operation of the formula then negotiated, Queensland's tax reimbursement figure had increased from \$63,789,000 to \$101,111,000, or an increase of 58.5 per cent. South Australia, which had been a claimant State up till that time and had received, in its last year as a claimant State, a total of \$48,469,000 in tax reimbursement grants and special grants from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, had had its share increased to £78,155,000, or by 61.2 per cent. At that time Sir Thomas Playford, representing South Australia, went to the Premiers' Conference to negotiate a new formula; the present Premier of Queensland, Mr. Nicklin, and the Treasurer of the day, Sir Thomas Hiley, representing Queensland, went there to negotiate a new formula. It was agreed upon, and the Premier and the Treasurer returned to this State and disseminated propaganda that Queensland was now being treated properly and would not require any special assistance in the future because of the wonderful deal they had negotiated, particularly in comparison with that received by South Australia.

What are the facts? Queensland's increase is 58.5 per cent.; South Australia's increase is 61.2 per cent. Instead of Queensland catching South Australia, South Australia has galloped away again. It was only last year that the formula negotiated in 1959 was reconsidered and a new formula arrived at. Queensland was recompensed to some extent because the Commonwealth, recognising the position into which Queensland had been negotiated by its Country-Liberal Government, agreed to add \$2,000,000 to the base amount on which Queensland's entitlement would be calculated in 1965-66, and an additional \$2,000,000 each subsequent year. The Treasurer should recall that if the Government had done its job as effectively as the South Australian Government did in its negotiations on the formula in 1959, Queensland would have received in financial reimbursements an extra 3 per cent. of the funds at the end of that six-year period, and that would have more than covered the \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000 that he now requires to balance the Budget. Therefore, let us not be hoodwinked into accepting the Treasurer's suggestion that his budgetary troubles and the deficit of \$7,000,000 are due only to the drought.

Moreover, when one speaks of the accumulated deficit, one should remember that the deficit during this Government's nine years of office is really \$13,854,000, not \$7,000,000. It is true that the accumulated deficit is \$7,098,000, but the over-all deficit in the period is about \$14,000,000. It is

not worse than that only because Labour left the Country-Liberal Government a legacy of reserves. It used those and absorbed them, and it has now a deficit of \$7,000,000.

Whichever way one looks at it, it is apparent that the present Government is responsible for the budgetary difficulties that it faces. Accordingly, we consider that it is unfair to expect the taxpayers of this State to contribute in that regard. Apart from the additional taxes to be imposed directly as State taxes we have the increase in motor vehicle registration fees. This, of course, does not go into Consolidated Revenue funds; it goes into the Main Roads fund and it does not figure one way or the other in the deficits or consolidated revenues. Registration fees are paid into the Main Roads fund, which is utilised today, as it was under previous Governments, for the construction of permanent works as well as for maintenance and other requirements of the Main Roads Department.

Also paid into the Main Roads fund are various payments to the State for road works under the Commonwealth Aid (Roads) Act. Here again is an example of the incompetence of the present Government, because on page 71 of Commonwealth payments to or for the States we find that since the Nicklin Government negotiated the formula in 1958-59—that was the point up to which Labour negotiations gave us an entitlement—Queensland's entitlement has gone down in comparison with those of other States. The last Labour-negotiated entitlement in 1958-59 gave Victoria \$14,042,000. Queensland, as a result of the formula entitlement negotiated by the Labour Government, was at that time receiving \$14,825,000. In other words, Queensland was receiving in excess of Victoria, and quite rightly so, because Victoria is a much smaller State with a much more tightly-knit community. It does not have any communication problems or the distribution of population that we have as a result of decentralisation in Queensland.

Labour had negotiated a formula by which we were receiving under the Commonwealth Aid (Roads) Act and Associated Acts in excess of what was received by Victoria. But what is the position in 1966-67? The estimate of the Federal Treasurer for the current year is that Victoria will receive \$29,407,000 and Queensland will receive \$27,442,000. In other words, whereas we were receiving \$800,000 in excess of Victoria in 1958-59 under a Labour-negotiated formula, we are now receiving some \$2,000,000 less than Victoria. Expressed as a percentage, Victoria's entitlement has gone up 109.4 per cent. whilst Queensland's entitlement, notwithstanding its vast area and the services necessitated by decentralisation with which we have been successful, has gone up only 85.1 per cent. Is there any equity in that? I say there is not.

That is the result of negotiations carried out by the Nicklin Government on behalf of the people of this State. As I say, when

Labour was in office our entitlement was in excess of Victoria's under a formula negotiated by a Labour Government on behalf of the people of this State. Today, under amended formulas negotiated by the present Government, instead of getting more than Victoria, that State's entitlement has gone up 109.4 per cent. while ours has gone up only 85.1 per cent. And Victoria is no Robinson Crusoe in this regard. During the time that our entitlement has gone up 85.1 per cent., South Australia's entitlement has increased 96 per cent.

So that in all these matters the basic fault in the State's finances today can be attributed to poor, inefficient representation on the part of the present Government. I am not necessarily going to lay the blame one way or the other for this, although I have pointed out that consistency of representation is sadly lacking from this State. At the present moment, Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte are negotiating with the Prime Minister without any participation by Queensland. Our consistency in putting a case for our State is very poor compared with theirs.

Members of the Federal Labour Party have pointed out that the Federal Liberal Government is prepared to give Queensland little bits of assistance only when elections are pending, and that such assistance does not maintain its impetus once the electoral pressures are past. That is why Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin are hammering at Mr. Holt now. They know that if ever they are to get anything this is the time. Every hon. member knows that there is always an increase in the number of people who approach him for assistance just before an election. People put up hopeless cases which have previously been rejected; they seem to think that somehow or other the member might be able to work some miracle for them because he is about to come up for re-election. Whether or not that sort of thing is justified on an individual basis, certainly there is some logic in it for the Commonwealth Government. That is why Victoria and New South Wales are in there, still hammering away, even though they have been previously rejected. They are throwing punches and asking for more, and will probably get it, while our Government is back here sucking at the pockets of the Queensland taxpayers.

It is true that motor vehicle registration fees have not previously been increased during the period of this Government, but the number of vehicle registrations has grown considerably. I have not the latest report of the Main Roads Department, but at the end of 1964-65 the number of vehicles on register had increased from 300,000-odd to 541,000. This increased registration automatically increased the amount of revenue available to the Government. The return to the Commonwealth Aid, Local Authority Roads, Fund has increased, although not as much as in the other States.

The Queensland Government is calling on taxpayers in this State, who are not as well off in personal income as taxpayers in other States, to meet this unfair burden of State taxation. The 1965 Commonwealth Grants Commission Report examined the question of the relative severity of State taxation in the respective States in relation to personal incomes and income tax paid thereon in 1962-63. By the measure of capacity there adopted it appears that the comparative burden of State taxation in Queensland was higher in 1962-63 than in the other States. Since then there have been increases in State taxation in Queensland.

I join with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in sounding a note of warning about the new stamp duty to be imposed on the consideration on the registration of all motor vehicle transfers and on the registration of all new motor vehicles. This new tax is starting off at the comparatively high level of 1 per cent. Not only are motor vehicle registration fees to be increased but a completely new tax is to be introduced. At 1 per cent. this will mean \$23 or \$24 on the average new medium-powered vehicle.

We have been told that there is even to be a stamp duty charge of 1 per cent. on the sale of second-hand cars. We are not told how this measure is to be policed. Will people be required to declare the consideration paid in the transfer of the registration of second-hand vehicles? What effect will this measure have on the motor-car trade, which is very competitive in Queensland? Will we have the same type of war-time controls as those which led to false returns being made for land sales and so on? How can the measure be policed effectively to ensure that the Government is not penalising one section of the community? No doubt the Minister who introduces the measure will explain it in due course, but it will have to be policed if it is to be administered effectively. As the hon. member for Bulimba pointed out, such persons as those in retirement buying cheaper cars will have to pay a tax of 1 per cent. On a vehicle purchased for \$800 there will be an immediate payment of \$8.00 in stamp duty.

The Government's approach to the Budget indicates that the Treasurer has been illogical in that he destroyed his own argument in budgeting for a surplus when he is already \$9,000,000 short and, in this way, he is being unfair to the taxpayers.

(Time expired.)

Mr. RAE (Gregory) (3.27 p.m.): I should like to preface my remarks on the Budget with some comments on the message conveyed to us this morning by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan. Mr. Duggan and I had a political tussle for my electorate and we have had many good arguments since that time. However, it would be quite wrong for me not to say that I have always assessed him as a very able and wonderful person, a man who went about his parliamentary duties in a way which indicated he had the



qualities of leadership, for which I commend him. For those reasons I sympathise with him in the trouble that is his today. I trust, as the Treasurer said, that he will be spared to enjoy contentment in the latter years of his life and that things will not be as black as the picture portrayed to us this morning. I well recall the early days when we fought for the seat of Gregory. I confess that at the time I did not think I was going to win, but that is now history. This matter has not lessened in any way his standing in my eyes, and I wish him well.

I turn now to the Budget introduced by the Treasurer. I congratulate him on his elevation to that office. It is not easy for him to try to maintain the development that is taking place at present without looking around to find ways and means of swelling the funds of the State. I believe he has done a particularly good job in that way.

The only sad feature is that once again western people are being penalised. I know a large amount of money is needed to progressively develop a State, and that it cannot be done merely by hoping that the Canberra hand-out will be sufficient to carry out all the undertakings of the various departments. The Treasurer has to do something to get money. But it is rather a blow to find that the section of the people who are most viciously taxed are those who live in the Outback. I had hoped that the Treasurer would ease the burden on transport operators by reducing their fees, but we find they have a much heavier obligation than previously. Sir Fred Schonell was reported in "The Courier-Mail" as saying that the primary producers of Queensland were carrying the southern States on their backs. There is a lot of truth in that statement. This Government has not fully appreciated the enormous contribution made by western people not only to Queensland, but to the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Graham:** Your Government does not appreciate anything.

**Mr. RAE:** The hon. member for Mackay can have his say a little later. He is quite vocal at odd times and I will concede him that privilege when he speaks on the Budget. Apparently some problems associated with the way of life of western people today are not being really and truly appraised by the Treasurer and the Cabinet because they have seen fit to add to the costs of those people. Increased charges are inevitable, and somebody has to meet them, and I suppose those who live in the remote areas, the contributing areas of the State, appear to be the people the Treasurer has hit the hardest.

I read with great interest something said by Mr. Ed. Clark, the American Ambassador to Australia. While driving back to my electorate, traversing the roads I am obliged to travel on, I recalled that he said that something like \$250,000,000 would be made available to this State by the Export Import Bank of America.

**Mr. Graham:** Hot air.

**Mr. RAE:** I do not know whether it is or not. When a man in such a position makes a statement like that I feel that there must be a lot of gold in the quartz.

**Mr. Graham:** You don't believe him, do you?

**Mr. RAE:** I do. When such a man says that that amount of money will be made available for the development of this country, I go along with it.

The whole of Queensland has a road problem, and I know that the Minister for Main Roads has not enough money to carry out all the road construction work that he would like to. All hon. members know that. The important thing is that a new voice has now been heard in this matter. I believe that a deputation from this Parliament should be appointed to interview this man, ascertain the full import of his words, and see whether what he has in mind could be accepted by the Government. I do not believe that any man in his position would make such a significant statement without having some authority to back it up. I think that this matter should be pursued closely in case funds may become available for road construction.

Everyone knows that the way to develop any State or country is to provide good roads, and these will do more to speed development than any other thing that I can think of at the moment. The Minister for Main Roads and the officers of his department are constantly harrassed by members because work that they hoped would be completed has not been done. I feel that it is now time for the Government to consider calling tenders world-wide for the provision of toll roads from, for instance, Sydney to Mt. Isa, Mt. Isa to Townsville, and Rockhampton to Mt. Isa. These would have the effect of generally opening up the State. Toll roads have worked extremely well in other countries such as America, Canada, and the Continent. Nobody can tell me that it would not be a good thing if one could pay a fee and then travel on a fine road without fear of wind-screen or tyre damage, with reasonable petrol economy, and a host of blessings that motorists do not enjoy now. I think that the Government could well appoint a panel of members, somewhat similar to the one that I understand the Federal authorities now have, to well and truly consider toll roads. Those who constructed the roads would have a right to be reimbursed over a long period, and I feel sure that such roads would do much for the State.

Where good roads have been provided, such as between Brisbane and Cairns, tourist traffic has increased eight- or ten-fold. Bitumen roads to Longreach, Winton, and various other centres, have already increased traffic to the stage at which further motels and hotels are to be built to provide accommodation for tourists.

I have made a fairly close study of the subject, and I do not know of anything that can match good roads in promoting development. Queensland cannot do it all by itself, of course, because it has not sufficient finance available, but I do not think the Minister for Main Roads, Mr. Camm, the Commissioner, Mr. Barton, or his officers, should worry about the introduction of a toll road system throughout the State. They have been obliged to make too little go too far, and I think it would be wise to encourage road-building authorities with a world-wide reputation to come here and assist the State's development by providing in this regard.

Mr. Clark did say that he envisaged a road from the South to Darwin, with feeder roads from cities such as Sydney, Newcastle, Brisbane, Rockhampton and Townsville. I think that is an excellent scheme. It would do more than anything I can think of to open up Eastern Australia.

Some years ago Sir Thomas Hiley gave his blessing to the Mt. Isa rail project; today Queensland needs more than that. In a few years Mt. Isa will rank as one of the great cities of the State, but by today's standards it is virtually cut off after a week's wet weather. One can get there only by rail or by air. It is pretty grim to think that a city such as that has roads leading to it but, after a few days rain, is isolated. I make a very earnest plea to the Queensland Cabinet to give very careful consideration to the possibility of encouraging the building of toll roads by companies who are prepared to be repaid over a great number of years.

**Mr. Graham:** At what distances would you place the tolls?

**Mr. RAE:** That would all have to be worked out. I just do not know how that would be arrived at, but I do know that toll roads work. In America, Canada and many European countries the best roads are toll roads.

**Mr. P. Wood:** They have a lot more traffic.

**Mr. RAE:** Yes. It is up to the people concerned to do the research.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** There is much closer settlement in Europe.

**Mr. RAE:** That may be so, but I am sure that someone would be prepared to come here and do something along the lines I have suggested.

I now want to deal with the very serious problems of western transport operators, a section of the community that is providing a wonderful service in my electorate. They have been taxed almost to the limit of their financial ability, but in the Budget now brought down by the Treasurer, they are further handicapped—I should say in a very ruthless manner.

I wish to make it quite clear to the Committee, as I will be doing when I go back to my electorate, that I am going to call upon western hauliers to give full consideration to the possibility of devising ways and means of making full use of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution so that we who forever seem to be the target of State administrators might receive some compensation for our spiralling costs. I am going to openly encourage them to do so. Up to date I have been against this course, but today I am all for it. I think the impost on these people is very unjust and wrong. It angers me to think that it is always the man on the land in the Far West who "cops the crow" in every extra levy.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. RAE:** That is another story.

I am going to enlist the services of the United Graziers' Association and every other responsible organisation out there and I am going to advise all transport operators in my electorate to devise means by which they can go straight through to Sydney, Newcastle or some other place and so get a fair return on their outlay.

**Mr. P. Wood:** The Budget is going to increase their costs.

**Mr. RAE:** That is what I am saying. It is most unsatisfactory. Why does the hon. member think I am on my feet now? It is purely to register my disturbance at this imposition.

I have a high regard for the Treasurer, but many of the men who are determining these levies are apparently thinking of the days when wool was £1 a pound and in addition their thoughts are clouded by the rather pleasing price now prevailing in the beef industry generally. The course adopted is quite wrong and unjust to the West. There surely must be other ways of getting money from people who are enjoying every available amenity in their everyday life. The people from Cairns to Southport accept as a right the glorious roads to the South Coast beaches, TV and every modern facility for their happiness, yet we in the West get nothing but a kick in the pants. It is just not good enough. Anybody who has lived in the West as long as I have—I know certain hon. members have—will appreciate the problems of western people. It is not a very easy life; it is a very hard life. They have school problems, problems of hospitalisation, road problems, electricity problems, drought and dust, and a hundred and one other problems, not to mention loneliness and the fact that half the time they cannot even hear the local radio station on their radios, as is the case in Quilpie. Only the bond of friendship and the understanding that one person has for another make life tolerable for them. It is pretty tough when my own Government sees fit to levy increased charges on already severely handicapped people.

**Mr. Graham:** A very unsympathetic Government.

**Mr. RAE:** I would not say that, but in this regard it is unsympathetic towards the people in the West.

Throughout the State at the present time there is a tremendous amount of destruction of kangaroos and other wild life by irresponsible people. In most instances this destruction is being carried out by newcomers to this land who would not know a wild turkey from a white leghorn rooster. It is very evident in areas where development is taking place; parties of people are inclined to spend their week-ends shooting. There has been a terrific slaughter of kangaroos. I have had kangaroo shooters on my place for months now and, although they are taking 30 or 40 a night, I can still see no difference in the number of kangaroos.

**Mr. Muller:** You are glad to have the shooters there, too.

**Mr. RAE:** Yes, they are doing a good job. Undoubtedly the kangaroos are a curse in many ways. In some areas they are as numerous as ever, but there is a possibility that in the future kangaroos, emus, plain turkeys, native buffaloes and many other animals will be wiped out. For that reason I am inclined to ask the Government to give consideration to zoning certain areas of the State under the control of responsible officers, managers or owners. They should be big areas, something like the Kruger National Park in South Africa. With this ridiculous obsession of some people to exterminate everything that pops up, it will not be very long before we find ourselves in a serious position with our native wild life. I was very impressed by the number of geese and native animals I saw when I flew over the electorate of the hon. member for Tablelands. I think it must be one of the few remaining places with such large colonies of wild life. It was very pleasing to see. The Government should give very serious consideration to areas of protection.

**Mr. Muller:** You can't keep a kangaroo in any zone.

**Mr. RAE:** He is not one I am keen to give protection to. Kangaroos will eat you out overnight.

**Mr. Muller:** In many cases you have to shoot them or they will clean you out.

**Mr. RAE:** You have to. What I am suggesting is that we have a controlled form of shooting, with someone responsible for the numbers that can be shot.

**Mr. Row:** You want to create more national parks?

**Mr. RAE:** Areas, any way, to permit retention and breeding. I favour a national park idea, perhaps with one in the Peninsula, one in the Far West, and another one elsewhere. At the present rate of indiscriminate shooting, or the indiscriminate desire to kill, it

will be only a matter of 50 years before we are very regretful that we did not do something about it many years ago.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** It will be very difficult to preserve species.

**Mr. RAE:** My word! It will be very hard! Anybody caught destroying these rare animals should have to pay a high penalty.

I turn now to the matter of overseas investment. I carried out a little research and discovered that the Commonwealth ranks as the fifth country in the world in riches and that from a natural wealth point of view we are rated as No. 11. Many hon. members may ask why I desire to attract overseas investors to Australia. I feel, as does Rohan Rivett, a travelled man with some knowledge, that capital investment by overseas interests in Australia so far has brought us ahead 10 years. That is why I urge that we should give full parliamentary support to ways and means of encouraging overseas investment in developmental works in Queensland. I do not suggest for one moment that we should sell our land to overseas investors, but no-one can deny that a great deal of money is required to really get the place on the "up-and-go", as it were. If we can find in our American friends capable people who desire to help to develop the State properly, who want to come here and stay with us, that will be all to the good. I have always believed that anyone who is a "knocker" of overseas investment is little more than a wart on the posterior of progress. The simple fact is that we require big money to develop our land and the only way we can get it is for the whole of our Government thinking to be channelled to encourage overseas people to give us the essential help we need.

**Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo)** (3.59 p.m.): I wish to support the motion of censure moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the hon. member for Barcoona. I also wish to express appreciation to the Treasurer for his kind remarks this morning concerning the retirement of Mr. John Duggan from his position as Leader of the Opposition. I also thank the hon. member for Gregory for his remarks. I feel somewhat depressed by what has happened today. as do many other hon. members.

Now, I have an important task to perform. I am glad the hon. member for Gregory has remained in the Chamber, as during the Address-in-Reply debate he made certain statements that I feel obliged to refute. I refer to page 196 of Proof "Hansard" No. 2, in which he said, referring to me—

"The hon. member was put there by the A.W.U."

On page 197 he passed other remarks about the Australian Workers' Union and me. I want to clear this up. I do not know who advised the hon. member for Gregory in this respect, but he must have had some local knowledge himself which indicated that he could be quite incorrect.

I won a plebiscite in 1961 when the A.W.U. was not affiliated with the Australian Labour Party. That is an important fact. Unless a member of the A.W.U. held an A.L.P. ticket he was not entitled to vote in the plebiscite. In addition, a member of the A.W.U. who was a "rep.", as we call him in the West, was a candidate in that plebiscite. The hon. member for Gregory would know that. When those two facts are added together, the most the A.W.U. could do would be to take an academic interest in the plebiscite.

To further illustrate my point. I produce some figures from that plebiscite. Nobody could deny that A.W.U. members would dominate the vote in Aramac, Blackall, and Barcardine in particular. In Aramac, I obtained five out of 47 votes cast; in Blackall I obtained five out of 75 votes cast; in Barcardine I obtained three out of 104 votes cast, and in Alpha I received two out of 111 votes cast, and they were the votes of railwaymen who came from Emerald. That will disabuse anybody's mind of the idea that I was put here, as the hon. member said, by the A.W.U.

I won the plebiscite by gaining 248 votes in the east end of my electorate. The people who voted for me were coal-miners, railway workers, members of the A.W.U. who were shop assistants or council employees, provided they held A.L.P. tickets, likewise pastoral industry employees, people who worked in butchers' shops and were members of the A.M.I.E.U., and so on. That disposes of the hon. member's attack on me. In no way can it be said that anything but an academic interest was shown by the A.W.U. Furthermore, after my entry into Parliament I met Mr. Edgar Williams for the first time. Before that I knew only two A.W.U. officials, namely the district secretary at Longreach, whom I had met twice, and the A.W.U. organiser who lived in the east end of my electorate. I met him and came to know him well because of his association with the A.L.P.

It is rather strange that the hon. member for Gregory, whom I regarded as a personal friend and a person having the qualities of a gentleman, should attack me on those grounds. I have been a member of the A.W.U. since 1961. In my pocket I have the ticket for the next year. I got it a few weeks ago. Nobody queried my intentions. I say categorically that I have never let the A.W.U. down, nor have I let the A.L.P. down. I have certainly never let my electors down.

That will answer completely the criticism of the hon. member for Gregory. When I made a personal protest at what he said he made the rather asinine remark, "You take your job too seriously". I happen to do that, and I also take these accusations very seriously. After all, there was no point in what the hon. member said.

To the credit of "The Longreach Leader", when the hon. member for Gregory made his attack on members of the Q.C.E. that newspaper did not even publish the names of those who were attacked. As a consequence, I felt that some sense of responsibility had been shown there. I would say of the hon. member and the Press that there is too much failure to research a question before expressing an opinion. Rather is it hoped to obtain some information on the spot by word of mouth from some person who has an axe to grind. I feel keenly about this, because if anyone had looked through the files of the Press, or my history, he would have ascertained the full facts of the case.

Today the hon. member for Gregory has brought forward some ideas; he spoke of toll roads, and so on. At times he has made good speeches, and when I have interjected it has been in a good-humoured way, with no feeling of personal malice. However, I was not too happy with his attack during the Address-in-Reply debate on the so-called "tall poppies" of the Public Service when he claimed that representations made on any person's behalf by a member of Parliament would result in that person's being placed at the end of the queue. The newspaper article that I have in my hand refers to his "devastating address". He challenged the attitude of Ministers and top public servants in Queensland, and among the occupations and activities he listed was the promotion of school teachers. It is well known that no member of Parliament can, by personal intercession, influence a promotion at any time. In the Department of Education, in particular, promotion depends solely on efficiency.

I should like to tell a story on this subject. Years ago a Minister for Education came to my house, and during afternoon tea he said to me, "How long have you been here?" I said, "Six years." He said, "It is time you had a shift." I said, "I don't want to shift." He said, "You should go. I will see about it." I said, "No, thank you. If you want to make some representations that might help in providing more equipment for my school I shall be quite happy about that, but I am not prepared to have you act in my personal interests, as opposed to the interests of other teachers in Queensland, to obtain a transfer." He called me a fool, and so I may have been. But that same Minister did the same thing with another teacher. (I might mention that it was not the present Minister.) This teacher packed up at the August vacation, believing what the Minister had told him. He unpacked after the vacation. He packed up again at Christmas, and again unpacked after Christmas. He had believed the word of the Minister. The man who finally got him a transfer was not a politician but a sympathetic district inspector of schools. The hon. member for Gregory could have been

referring only to the Department of Education or the Police Department when he made those accusations.

**Mr. Rae:** You are assuming a lot.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am assuming the right thing. In the Department of Education it has always been the practice for top administration officers and inspectors to give sympathetic treatment to teachers, at least since the war years. Perhaps times were a little tougher before the war, but since then there has been a new spirit abroad amongst top officers of the administration in the Department of Education. Furthermore, who would be better qualified to assess hardship than the district inspector or the local regional director? It is difficult to believe that any person to whom hardship had been caused would not receive sympathetic treatment. I know that whenever I have made representations to a departmental officer on behalf of anybody with a just cause for complaint, his case has received sympathetic consideration.

**Mr. Rae:** They have to come to see me to get anything done.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I could tell the Committee a couple of stories against the hon. member for Gregory relative to police officers in his electorate.

I resent the hon. member's statement because people in the Department of Education, in which I was privileged to serve for so long, are absolutely maligned by it. No person can hope to obtain promotion in the Department of Education through political representation; promotion is based solely on efficiency. Anyone who has had anything to do with the department knows that. The hon. member for Gregory thinks a mile off is a bull's eye and, no matter on what subject he speaks in this Chamber, he always uses the same approach. I am disappointed in him because of the personal attack that he made. He may be smiling, but I assure him that there are a few people in my electorate who are not smiling about it, and a few people in the Gregory electorate are not smiling about it, either. Whatever happens, the hon. member has certainly not increased his prestige as a member of this Assembly.

I turn now to a matter that concerns the eastern end of my electorate in particular. I do not intend to go into the question of the dispute between Marrickville Holdings Ltd. and the dairying industry, but in my electorate, which comprises a fair percentage of what is known as the Central District, there is an upsurge in safflower production. Up till August this year at least 60,000 acres were under crop, and since then further areas have been sown. I know that one can go to every primary industry in Queensland and find a problem associated with orderly production, but this

is the time to consider carefully the production of safflower. Both the Department of Primary Industries and the Queensland Grain-growers' Association should work out what is the future of this important crop. The present season is a very good one and I have been assured that the crop will be absorbed. However, if good seasons are maintained into next year and the year after, I can see more land being put under safflower. What will be the destiny of the crop then? It is highly profitable at present.

By way of interjection during the Address-in-Reply debate, I mentioned to the hon. member for Burnett that safflower is worth \$70 net a ton to producers. Farmers are under contract to Pacific Oil Seeds; Robertson and Co. Pty. are setting up an oil-crushing plant at Emerald. Now is the time to assure the farmers of the future or to warn them what excessive production will mean. I know very well that the crop is important to Central Queensland. It gives a second winter crop in the area, if one can call a fluke crop of wheat a crop, and it provides two avenues of wealth to producers—wheat and safflower—depending on the season.

I make this plea especially because the people who are undertaking settlement in that area are virtually all new settlers. Whether they are property owners or share farmers, they have felt the stresses of drought over the last two seasons and they need every penny they can get to recoup the losses they have sustained. That is why I am asking the Minister for Primary Industries, whom I am glad to see in the Chamber, to endeavour to arrange consultations with the growers' association on the future of this industry, which is so important to my area.

Some people have been so carried away that even in the Springsure district they are talking about a production this year of 10,000 tons. I do not think they will get it, but that shows how optimistic some people are. Already Pacific Oil Seeds are setting up a depot there and I want the Railway Department to meet their end of the bargain by giving us the necessary railway facilities. I can imagine what will happen if we have a good wheat result and a good safflower result almost side by side, with such a small railway yard as there is at Springsure. That is why I make the plea today, without taking part in the controversial subject of safflower, in putting forward on behalf of these comparatively new settlers a case to guard them against the financial tragedy that could occur to them by over-production of this very important crop.

I must also refer again to the Nogo Gap. I am exceedingly disappointed with the Government's approach to this project. I was delighted when we gained the Government's election promise that it would go ahead with it. I thought then that there would have been at least some sort of promise from the Commonwealth Government in this regard, but I know that the Premier and the Treasurer

have been to Canberra twice since the election and I can find no evidence that they put forward any argument at all on this important project.

The people of the Emerald district will be bitterly disappointed if this project does not go ahead—I know that there is a great deal of research work to be done, but surely some decision could be made as to when things will start to move. That is the disappointing feature of the matter. We have development at Blackwater, Emerald is a growing centre, and we hope to have irrigation in the Nogoa Valley. A tremendous amount of water will be needed.

I know very well that ideas have changed from the original 130 farms down to 80 farms, which I do not think is a bad idea because 80 good properties will then certainly be obtained. Soil tests may permit an expansion of this number from 80, perhaps to the 130, but we do not want the same thing to happen to that area as happened at Gibber Gonyah, and it could happen if the soil test is not available when this area is broken up after the dam is built.

I must again stress the need for the Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Primary Industries and the Minister for Local Government and Conservation to go to Canberra and press the need for this important project. When the Rockhampton and District Promotion and Research Bureau met the Federal Treasurer in deputation the Federal Treasurer was unbriefed on the project and, in fact, did not even know where Emerald was. To my dismay the person who was responsible for advising the bureau to visit that centre was none other than the Minister for Local Government and Conservation. Had he gone with the deputation I would have said, "Good; this is progress," but he did not choose to do that. Naturally the whole deputation ended up as a catastrophe. We have heard no more. The Nogoa Dam is important to us.

I urge the Government to keep going. If it is rejected on the first occasion it must keep on making further and stronger representations. The strongest representations are made by the Government of the State; it is the most responsible body in the State. If the State Government wants to maintain its status in the eyes of the Federal Government it should make these representations and not leave them to what is certainly a well-meaning, active group but which still is only a parochial group when all is said and done. That group went to Canberra at its own expense. The Treasurer indicated that he was prepared to visit the proposed dam site if the Bureau arranged the tour—again at its own expense.

Although it is possibly a Federal matter, there is a problem in Central Queensland which concerns the Minister for Transport. I refer to the revised route to be taken by Queensland Airlines. Of recent times Q.A.L. have operated services on Tuesdays and Thursdays from Brisbane to Rockhampton,

out through the Central West to Longreach, and back along the same route to Brisbane. The new route is from Brisbane to Barcaldine and Longreach, back through the Central West to Rockhampton, and south to Brisbane. That means that Rockhampton will be completely cut off from the Central Highlands as far as an air service is concerned. I know that the hon. member for Rockhampton South will agree with me on this. I have had a consultation with Mr. Cameron, the General Manager of Q.A.L., and Mr. Bates, the Commercial Manager.

Here is the report of the Department of Civil Aviation, which makes very interesting reading. The airline operates this run at a tremendous loss. I have the figures showing the profit and loss for flights 615 and 616. In 12 weeks the Q.A.L. losses amounted to \$8,607. On only one of those flights was a profit made—an amount of \$275. But a subsidy must also be taken into consideration, as the total loss includes the subsidy paid for the 12-week period amounting to \$2,280. Hon. members can well understand the position of Queensland Airlines, with a total average loss of \$907 per week.

Other complications have also arisen. At present a conference is taking place between the airline operators and the Federation of Airline Pilots. It appears that in future no air flight can have more than eight stops. A route of six stops is sought by the federation but it will allow another two stops, bringing the total to eight. Hon. members can well understand the problem so far as we are concerned.

**Mr. Pilbeam:** It is true that the old route involved 11 stops.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That is right.

It will be seen that the Central West will be cut off from its main coastal city, Rockhampton, because of this unfortunate financial loss. I have discussed this matter with the management, and I have even asked if it is possible to make one flight scheduled to Rockhampton on Tuesday and bring the other one on the projected flight through the West and back to Rockhampton on Thursday, but they cannot give me any assurance on that point. The door is still open; it has not been closed completely because they are awaiting the result of the conference between the operators and the federation.

The Civil Aviation report that I have here is for 1965-66. At page 4 reference is made to subsidised services. The developmental services receive a very large subsidy and the essential rural services share what is left after the developmental services receive their allocations. For the year 1965-66 the Federal Government provided \$1,318,000 in financial assistance. The report then outlines how the money was allocated, and this is what worries me.

In 1963-64 Queensland Airlines received \$63,400; in 1964-65 the amount dropped to \$40,800 and, in 1965-66, to \$29,599. With

the effluxion of time the subsidy is dropping, and this airline is only breaking even on all its services. Because the area has a railway line it is condemned, and it is a poor show to state that it is not a development area so far as the Central West is concerned. What could be more of a development area than the Central Highlands, where today we have the brigalow project in operation and land going under the plough in increasing acreages every year? We also have the proposed Nogoia Gap project, and Area III of the brigalow lands scheme will soon add to the development taking place. As well, Black-water coal deposits will shortly be exploited.

We can see other aspects of development to come. The only answer to the problem of obtaining an air service to the West from Rockhampton is for the Minister for Transport to see if the classification of "development area" can be widened to include such areas as the Central Highlands.

I feel concerned about this. I know that many people in Central Queensland are concerned and I think that some people in Rockhampton are. Before I took this matter up with Q.A.L. I rang Mr. Frank Rudd in Rockhampton to see what his attitude was, because the Bureau has its finger on the pulse of what is happening in Rockhampton and district. After this consultation yesterday I was extremely disappointed that my idea of reversing the run one day a week was not the solution. We must do something about setting up some representations. We understand the position now and it is important that we obtain that service. There was a Press statement in Rockhampton to the effect that the Chamber of Commerce was concerned. I do not agree that the establishment of a new airline in that city is the answer because I do not know whether it would work out. We must remember that there is competition in Rockhampton from charter services. We are developing bitumen roads and charter services, and a big service goes phut because of that progress. Progress usually has some boomerang effect that we do not count on. I feel that the Minister for Transport may be able to achieve something in discussions with the Department of Civil Aviation.

**Mr. Pilbeam:** There is another factor, local patronage.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am afraid we have no control over that.

**Mr. Pilbeam:** It is something that should be submitted to the people in the area.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That is so. It could be done by publicity. If we could get some financial assistance—

**Mr. Pilbeam:** I am on-side with you in this.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Good.

For once I am on-side with the hon. member for Gregory. I am perturbed about the increases in passenger fares and railway

freights and the upgrading of transport fees. To me this is rather a silly way of raising finance. Last year we protested emphatically to the Government and asked for a reduction in road-tax fees. I did that in August when the railways could not compete. The request was granted in December at a time when the railways could compete. With the change-over to decimal currency every penny became one cent, twopence became two cents, and threepence became three cents, an increase of 20 per cent. in each instance. Again we protested and succeeded in having the fees reduced to cent fractions. So were restored the original charges. The Government spoke loudly of how much it had given in drought remissions to railway and road transport. What a gigantic figure it came to! By February it was \$1,700,000. Now the Government is hitting straight back at those drought-stricken people; they are still drought-stricken and their stock numbers are down. In this short space of time they have not had a chance to increase their herds and flocks, and they are being hit for the concessions that were given to them last year. It is nothing short of ridiculous. Approximately \$500,000 is to be taken back from these people in 1966-67. If they could not afford to pay last year, how can they afford to pay this year? They are no better off yet.

The hon. member for Gregory spoke about the price of wool and the cost of production. In our type of country, those things are important. Every charge goes back to the primary producer. In the West the entire production comes from the country, and it is the man on the land who will have to pay every additional cent set down in the Budget. When so much sympathy was expressed for those stricken by the drought, I cannot understand how three or four months later the Government can turn round and ask for the return of the money that was given to them in the form of freight remissions.

We know very well the plight of some of these people. Let hon. members opposite go to the brigalow country and see the parlous position of some of these people who have done such good work. Because the drought has forced prices up, they have not enough money to purchase stock. Let hon. members go to the West, where they will find the same situation. The people there are established on their properties, but their stock numbers have been reduced. The same situation will be found throughout the entire Central West. Purchases in the shops are decreasing and railway business is slack.

Some people say, "You talk about graziers and other primary producers." I always do, because my electorate depends entirely on them. There is not a person in my electorate, whether he be employed in the Railway Department, a shop, or a business firm, who does not depend on primary production.

**Mr. Muller:** That applies in every country electorate.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That is true.

Increased charges mean reduced incomes, which in turn mean reduced spending which is felt right through the community. The added 20 per cent., 60 per cent., and 87½ per cent. are tremendous increases. Let hon. members opposite talk with road hauliers. I do not agree with the practice of carrying freight over the border to escape State transport fees. The fee on motor trucks from 2 to 3 tons tare will increase from 60c to 95c per unit, an upgrading of 58½ per cent., and that on motor trucks exceeding 3 tons tare will increase from 60c to \$1.30 per unit. That is an increase of 116½ per cent. Road hauliers are conducting businesses, and they have to pass those charges on to someone. Of course, we have the aspect that perishables bought direct from farmers bring additional cost on to consumers, but in my electorate that does not apply from the angle of primary production. Freights on goods brought into the electorate either by road or rail are passed on to the consumers irrespective of whether they are rural or town dwellers. In most instances, freight increases find their way to the primary producers in an area such as the one that I have the honour to represent, and so increase the costs of production. When rail freights are increased road transport fees must be increased, too. After all, some measure of protection has to be given to the State enterprise. I agree that if increases are to be imposed they should apply to both types of fees. However, the proposed increases in both categories are savage, and they will fall finally on those who have already suffered through the drought.

I agree with the hon. member for Baroona that the Treasurer should have budgeted for a deficit. That is only common sense. When the Treasurer goes to Canberra next year he probably will be told, "You have balanced your Budget." Of course he will have—at the expense of the people, particularly those who live in rural communities—and he will weaken his case because he has adopted this attitude. The Commonwealth authorities probably will tell him to go back and do the same again. I have not much faith in the Commonwealth Government in its treatment of Queensland, and I have not much faith in the experts who advise it. I think the experts in Queensland are equally good, and I do not see why the Commonwealth Government should be able to put aside Queensland's ideas, plans and projects on the very doubtful basis that the professional knowledge of its advisers is greater than that of the experts in this State. Queensland should always be on the attack to obtain as much as it possibly can, and I cannot see much being achieved by the Treasurer's adopting the attitude that he has expressed in the Budget.

Recently I was speaking to a teacher—it does not matter where he was—who raised a simple point relating to Cuisenaire seminars. He has to go to Cuisenaire seminars and take some of his staff with him in his car;

no other transport is available. He certainly gets the day off, but if the windscreen of his vehicle is broken on the way he does not receive compensation for it; he receives nothing. Niggling, pinch-penny little things such as that occur because the Government has not sufficient money, and the Government will not get sufficient money until it insists on a better deal from the Commonwealth Government. One hears of lack of school stores. The reason is the same—no money. That sort of thing used to happen when I was a teacher. One would send down a requisition for stores and receive only half the order. The department would say, "The other items are out of stock. They will come later." If one relied on the balance arriving later one would be disappointed. A letter applying for the balance was necessary.

**Mr. Dufficy:** It is worse today.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** It is worse today, as the hon. member for Warrego says, at a time when society is supposed to be more affluent than ever before. I believe that many of these minor irritations are affecting the thinking of teachers, particularly when they know they can go to Canada and receive fantastically high salaries compared with those paid here.

As far as finance is concerned, Queensland must, as I said about the Nogoia Gap project, keep hammering at the door all the time to get a better deal.

**Mr. Davies:** A change of Government in the Federal sphere.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Results will be obtained only if our leaders go to Canberra personally. They will not get anywhere if they attempt to do it by remote control.

If the State is to reap the benefit of good seasons that possibly may lie ahead—I say that because I remember that when the drought broke in 1950 there was a run of five good years—the Government will have to change its attitude to rural industries a great deal.

I am very worried about several of the industries. I mentioned safflower production. I am also concerned about an attitude that seems to be growing in a part of my electorate that perhaps some of the properties that were subdivided from 1955 onwards are on the large side and could have been cut into smaller properties. A great visual deception has occurred in the development of my area. Since the subdivision we have had an intrusion of share-farmers. In many cases they are excellent workers—some are highly expert in plant husbandry—but it is not good country for share-farmers because of the doubtful seasons. However, if one looks at the district and sees one or two share-farmers on a property one might get erroneous ideas, and if one meets a successful share-farmer one might also wrongly assess the potential of the area.



People are apt to forget that a share-farmer works an area of land; he provides virtually nothing. He has not to provide fences, houses, water, and so on. That is all there, and if he receives the benefits of his own good husbandry plus the benefit of good seasons he can make a success of it. But we have to guard against the idea that has been creeping in that perhaps we are subdividing too large. I do not think we have done that over the years.

A line of thought has also grown up lately in a certain section of the community that preference should be given to share-farmers in land ballots. I do not agree with that. I like to see them get their break just like anyone else, but in fairness to many people who want to go on the land I cannot see how such a suggestion could work out. These mistaken ideas must be curbed by the A.L.P. in Opposition and members representing rural areas in the Government. The hon. member for Warrego will support me in this. We criticised the Government about brigalow Areas I and II. We feared that the initial blocks to be developed on virgin country were too small and that the settlers had a tremendous job in front of them. We also warned, on the amendment of the brigalow lands development scheme that was before us not so long ago, that in Area III we should apply lessons learned from Areas I and II and see that the areas were much better than one beast to 10 acres, which seemed to be the basis in Areas I and II.

I feel that if we do not somehow give these people a break to enable them to get on their feet it takes them far too long to do so. It is discouraging and demoralising. It can also be heart-breaking and, more important still, health-breaking. I hope—and I want to say this today—that there is pre-development in Area III. Any member of this Chamber with rural interests at heart should agitate to see that there is pre-development. Areas I and II of the brigalow scheme ran into the drought, another matter on which we warned the Government. Hon. members know the price of stock today and how many head can be obtained for £3,000 or \$6,000. As I mentioned before, the Minister for Lands has been sympathetic. We know now we can obtain more than this amount. Consider how many stock one can get for \$6,000—very few indeed. Even if \$20,000 is available, that is insufficient to obtain breeders and store cattle.

I do not know what is going to happen to the beef cattle industry. I am afraid that its success will depend on one thing alone: whether we can keep beef on the plates of the people of Australia and on the plates of the people with whom we trade overseas. The beef industry has been the only industry in respect of which the Commonwealth Government would lend us money for development. That willingness was because of the industry's secure future, but with mounting prices we are going to have trouble.

I am very keen on the Nogoia Gap project because I think we can develop a fat-lamb industry in that area. I know there are difficulties. The hon. member for Condamine has been associated with these discussions. I am concerned at the fact that we import so many fat lambs from New South Wales when we could be producing them in Queensland. It is a very important matter to us because the less money we spend over the border in New South Wales the greater the prosperity of this State. Most hon. members will agree with me on this.

**Mr. Muller:** There is a fair bit of worm in your country.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Yes. There are all these factors. It seems strange that although we have now up to 400,000 fewer sheep in the Clermont district, nothing is being done about the speargrass or dingoes. It worries me that we have such great avenues for production yet we are not attaining sufficient production to keep prices down to a level that would enable the product to be on everybody's plate.

**Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (4.53 p.m.):** I compliment the Treasurer on his clear, concise presentation of the Budget.

**Mr. Davies:** Do you agree with all the extra taxes on the country people?

**Mr. WHARTON:** Certainly not. I will come to that. The hon. member for Maryborough is always worrying about somebody else's speech. He should get all his interjections on one file and see how they look.

The Treasurer presented his Budget not so much from the point of view of those who have to bear its burdens but from a Treasurer's point of view and we have to compliment him on a good Treasurer's Budget.

Before dealing further with the Financial Statement I should like to express my regret about the statement made this morning by the Leader of the Opposition. It seems very hard indeed that a person in his position has to pay twice. I join with the Acting Premier, whose remarks were in keeping with my sentiments. The Leader of the Opposition is going to be taxed and taxed again; he will pay his way anyway; he will pay all his just dues. It seems ironical that having paid the price he still loses everything he has to lose. It seems unreal that this should be so in a country in which we believe we have justice.

I suppose the Budget is as good as possible in difficult times; it could be referred to as a good Treasurer's Budget in a drought year, and it seems to me that it is the best type of Budget that could be presented. If we do not try to make headway now that we are recovering somewhat from our accumulated losses, and try to plan for the future, we will slip back. As a State we can go backward or forward, and I hope that we will always go forward. Although

we do not like the Budget it is better to have it and move forward than to stagnate, with less development, less employment and less progress. In our few years in government we have tried to encourage development and avoid stagnation that may lead to a recession with lack of progress and lower employment opportunity.

While this is a good Treasurer's Budget, I do not like all the remedies in it, and later I will have something to say about some of them. In the circumstances we have to accept it as the best Budget for this year. There is no doubt that the drought has created the major problem. We appreciate what the Commonwealth Government has done in providing \$7,500,000 for drought relief. That help is appreciated but it is not enough and we have had to raise additional revenue to maintain a proper level of prosperity. We must remember that we are still feeling the effects of a prolonged dry period and, while the season may seem good—and we hope it will be—we do not know definitely that the drought has been broken.

I was interested in the remarks by the hon. member for Barcoo, and for once I agree with many of his sentiments about primary industry. Although it is the most important sector in the economy, we must not forget the part played by many business people and business houses. They are all interdependent and we must remember it when considering the Budget. We have suffered extensive sheep and cattle losses—a drop of 6·8 per cent. in cattle numbers and 23 per cent. in sheep numbers. These factors have a large bearing on the State's income generally, and the individual's return. People who are trying to re-stock are faced with values 25 per cent. to 50 per cent. higher than in normal times. They face the problems of re-stocking at high cost and lower returns because of losses. All these matters affect primary industries and other sections that provide the revenue of the State.

If we study the Budget and appreciate it fully, we realise that as a State we have made great progress over the years, particularly in the fields of education and improved roads. We might call this Budget an education budget, as it provides for considerably increased expenditure on education. This is an important matter. In my electorate progress has been made, particularly in the high school section. We have a new high school at Gayndah, a new secondary department at Rosedale, a new secondary department at Miriam Vale, as well as extensions to the secondary departments at Gin Gin and Biggenden. Those are the main centres, apart from Bundaberg, which serve many of my electors. I am proud of the Government's work in providing better facilities for education, particularly in my electorate, and therefore better opportunities for the future progress of the citizens of the State. We have many better roads than formerly.

This Government has nothing to be ashamed of; in fact it should be proud of the progress that has been made since it has been in power.

**Mr. Davies:** We built good roads and schools. You are not the only Government to do that.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Yes, but Labour did not build enough of them. We have made great progress and want to keep on with the good work. I regret that in some instances the Budget imposes higher penalties on the rural sector than on other sectors.

**Mr. Davies:** That indicates Queen Street Government.

**Mr. WHARTON:** The Labour Government was the greatest Queen Street Government ever known. While we have extended education in the country centres, the Budget imposes penalties in the way of increased freights and transport fees. These affect country people. There is no doubt that our primary industries, with the exception of beef, are experiencing difficult times. Forget about the drought; those industries have difficulty in surviving because of the high costs forced on them, with returns which are not increasing. Costs are rising every day.

**Mr. Davies:** If you do not blame the Government, whom do you blame?

**Mr. WHARTON:** The party of the hon. member for Maryborough which has continually agitated for increased wages and this has forced costs up.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Wages are always behind the cost of living.

**Mr. WHARTON:** The cost of living has continually risen as a result of the agitation of members of the Labour Government. If they had lived and let live we would have got along better as a community. Many of our primary industries are sailing close to the wind. The Treasurer should have considered these matters when preparing the Budget. He should not have imposed further taxes on this section of the community. They do not like them and I doubt whether they can stand them.

**Mr. Wallis-Smith:** The hon. member for Gregory said you could avoid them by section 92.

**Mr. WHARTON:** That is his opinion, and I leave it at that. I am voicing my opinion and would like it left undisturbed. I consider we should have taxed some of the less essential things in the community such as liquor and betting. We could manage without them. Would it not be better to tax the less important things than those that have a great bearing on the rural and business sectors and the work force?

**Mr. Hanlon:** Do you think he is saving those up for next year?

**Mr. WHARTON:** I do not think so. I think that it is necessary to set the sights on a Budget that will be balanced over a period. If I was Treasurer, I would approach the matter on a planned basis, not on something tangible today and a hope for tomorrow. I think the hon. member for Baroona will realise that it is necessary to plan State-wise, and that it is not possible to have a Budget for today and another for tomorrow. It is necessary to plan according to a system and have it operate over a period of years. I feel that this is necessary in my own affairs as well as in those of the State.

The Treasurer goes before Cabinet with his Budget, and when it comes before us it is signed, sealed, and delivered. We do not get much opportunity to say whether it is good or bad, except in the Chamber, and then nothing much happens, anyway. My opinion is that it would be much better to seek revenue from some of the less important things that we can manage without, rather than from essentials. I do not like the Stamp Duties Act. I think it would be a good idea to put a tax of about 10c a lb. on margarine. That would not help margarine manufacturers, but it would help the dairying industry and would be one way of producing revenue. There is an element of planned thinking in increasing the price of margarine so that the butter producer can get a decent return for his product. If it is fair to put an additional tax on the motor industry, which is struggling at the moment, I say it is fair to put on some other things a tax that would have the effect of assisting primary producers.

I was rather interested in what was said by the hon. member for Barcoo, and I agree with many of his points. I agree that steps should be taken to see that safflower growers are not coerced into excessive production. That aspect causes me great concern. Safflower oil is one of the major ingredients of margarine, but in America it is hardly used at all. This is one of the things that worry me when I see the advertisements of Marrickville Holdings Ltd. in their campaign for the abolition of margarine quotas. They say that removal of quota restrictions would assist safflower growers, and that they would purchase the safflower oil and pay well for it. If they obtained control, however, I am quite sure that they would cease to be interested in safflower oil. There are about 10 oils other than safflower oil that can be used in the production of margarine, and they would be able to import any type of oil.

It worries me when I see a large organisation such as Marrickville Holdings Ltd. encouraging farmers to grow safflower, because I know how they would be placed if ever this company succeeded in their campaign. I can assure the Committee that they are not interested in what farmers grow. All they want is the commodity at a price; they are a bit like Woolworths.

**Mr. Bennett:** What do you think of Dixie-bell? That is not bad.

**Mr. WHARTON:** The dairying industry needs protection. The price of its product has been pegged over the years. Certainly the price of butter is subsidised so that the consumers can have cheaper and better food.

**Mr. Bennett:** It is a consumer subsidy.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Yes, it is a consumer subsidy. I would not be so foolish as to say that it does not help the farmer; anything that increases sales helps the farmer. However, it should be kept in its proper perspective. The position would be somewhat different if the price of butter could be increased in accordance with wage increases—I mention that particularly because it has such a big effect on primary producers—and increases in costs generally.

**Mr. Bennett:** Why don't you do something about making it spread more easily?

**Mr. WHARTON:** That is a very good point. I am glad that the hon. member has raised it. I do not know whether he is referring to margarine or to butter. I assure him that he is not the only one to think of that; it certainly has not been forgotten. The spreadability of a particular product is important, and I suggest that butter is equal to any other spread in that respect.

**Mr. Sullivan** interjected.

**Mr. WHARTON:** What the hon. member said is very true. Butter can be stored for three to six months and still be exported. Its condition is as good as it was when it was made. But put margarine in the refrigerator for a week and see what condition it is in and whether the flavour comes out of the oil.

**Mr. Davies:** You just think there should be some restriction on the operations of private enterprise.

**Mr. WHARTON:** That is the type of irrelevant interjection one expects from the hon. member for Maryborough.

**Mr. Bennett:** Why is the Country Party sticking the heel into Marrickville Holdings Ltd.?

**Mr. WHARTON:** I do not think I need reply to that interjection. It is not connected with the debate on the Financial Statement. The hon. member for South Brisbane is worrying about a subject in which he is particularly interested.

We now live in a community of businessmen. The worker, the farmer, and the businessman, are businessmen, or they should be. The farmer has had to become a businessman. In support of my argument, I should like to quote from an article in the journal of the Institute of Public Affairs that deals with the striking change that has taken place in business attitudes. It says—

"In thinking and attitudes businessmen today differ markedly from those of the previous generation. This is not surprising,

because in the thirty years between the 1930's and the 1960's, the environment in which business operates has undergone a transformation. The pace of scientific and technological change has vastly speeded up. The under-employed, nearly stagnant economy of the Australia of thirty years ago has been replaced by an economic climate of full employment and rapid national growth."

Quite different, may I say, from the early 1930's. It continues—

"And—by no means least—the community expects much more of business today. People demand a much greater measure of financial security and personal independence and look to business to contribute to a progressive improvement in their living standards year by year."

That is important because, when all is said and done, we need industrial development in Queensland. The more industrial development that takes place, the greater will be the employment opportunities. Markets will be provided for primary industries and work will be available for the work force. This should be the criterion of development, not Government undertakings. Free enterprise should provide real expansion for the State, employment for its people, and markets for its products.

The article continues—

"Today's society is one of 'great expectations' and the businessman himself has come to expect much more of the economy than his predecessor of 30 years ago. The latter lived in a comparatively hazardous environment. The trade cycle, like the weather cycle, was regarded almost as an unavoidable natural phenomenon, and, as such, as part of the risks of doing business. By today's standards, the world of the 1930's was a tough place and, not surprisingly, it produced a relatively tough attitude in many businessmen. It also produced a somewhat pessimistic attitude. There was no solid reason for thinking that next year would be a better year than this. Indeed, for all anybody knew, it might very well be worse. Just when everything was running along smoothly, economic difficulties and even calamities had a habit of cropping up, and they came to be accepted by the businessman of the Western World with a kind of resigned fatalism."

**Mr. Davies:** There have been some horrible failures during the term of your Government.

**Mr. WHARTON:** If they happened in the time the hon. member was in government he probably would not have heard about them.

**Mr. Hanson:** Many dairy-farmers have gone out since this Government took office.

**Mr. WHARTON:** That is true, but it was the hon. member's Government that sent them out. The hon. member for Port Curtis knows that quite well.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Campbell): Order! There is far too much cross-firing in the Chamber. I ask hon. members to pay attention to the hon. member for Burnett.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Thank you, Mr. Campbell. Further down, the article continues—

"Andrew Shonfield, the British economist, has expressed this very well in his book, 'Modern Capitalism'—

"Once businessmen became convinced that they could safely ignore the risk of a serious recession during the productive life of some piece of capital in which they were thinking of investing, the whole tempo of the economy is likely to change. It moved forward then in the spirit of a driver, who arriving at a stretch of straight, broad highway where he can see ahead, slams his lever into top gear, and lets out the throttle."

The point I want to make is that that is the kind of Budget we have to produce to create those conditions. In the circumstances, we have to accept the Budget as one framed in a tight corner but the kind of Budget we want to bring down is one that will bring with it a little encouragement. I am emphasising the point that the businessman—I do not mean just the fellow who has a grocery shop, but everyone connected with business—needs a bit of encouragement. To continue, the article says—

"It is perhaps not generally appreciated how much the element of risk in business has been reduced by the success of economic policies aimed at full employment and rapid economic expansion."

They are the kind of things I like to see. It goes on—

"This reduction of risks has, as one would expect, been reflected in a change in the businessman's attitude to profits. When the future was clouded with uncertainty, the businessman was understandably disposed toward 'making hay while the sun shone'. Today he is less concerned with quick profits in the short term and more inclined to look to a reasonable and steady rate of return on capital over the long term. Moreover, he is readier to invest in projects where the pay-off may be long delayed."

**Mr. Bromley:** You should enunciate your words more clearly; we cannot understand you.

**Mr. WHARTON:** The point I am making is that—

**Mr. Bennett:** You are taking a long time to make it.

**Mr. WHARTON:** And the hon. member takes a hell of a long time to understand it. The point I am making is that while we want expansion we do not want to saddle this section of the community with further burdens when we could tax some of the things that are less necessary.

One bright feature of the Budget is the allocation for dairy pastures. This is a very good scheme which will be quickly taken advantage of by dairymen. They are very interested in it. It is a businesslike approach to dairy-farming. I commend the Premier and his Cabinet for this scheme which was vitally necessary to the industry. Undoubtedly it will have a long-term effect. I am sure that it will pay big dividends in the future. I hope that it will arrest the drift mentioned by the hon. member for Port Curtis. Undoubtedly dairying is on the wane and we have to find the reasons for it. I hope that this will be one of the answers to the problem.

Like other hon. members I have previously expressed concern about the sugar industry. Naturally I am vitally concerned about the sugar industry because growers in my electorate supply five mills in the Bundaberg area. I know that the Government realises the problems facing a group of people who work on a quota or assignment basis with a regulated production and who are tied to a return which has not been very good in the last couple of years. Certainly they received better prices previously. When I first entered Parliament they were ploughing cane out; three years later they were receiving record prices, and today they are getting one of the lowest prices on record. The industry fluctuates, and with fluctuations come problems. The Government has acceded to the industry's request for assistance, and I am sure this is very much appreciated. Whatever way it is looked at, the industry today is suffering a loss. The return of £43 a ton is far below the required cost figure of £48 to £50 a ton. Unless they are assisted some farmers will fall by the wayside. We cannot allow this to happen. The sugar industry is very highly organised and regulated. It is very organised within itself. I pay tribute to the industry for its organisation. It has very rarely sought Government aid. A person who can succeed on his own merit is much better than one who has to be propped up. To ensure its stability the sugar industry has had to regulate itself, and its present position is indeed unfortunate. I know of several growers who have been forced to sell their farms because of pressure from their banks. A farmer who has to sell when the economy of the industry is so low, cannot get a return on his capital.

It is a matter of great concern that the growers may have to sell on a very depressed market when there are very few buyers. The depression in the sugar industry affects the whole community in my electorate, and the city of Bundaberg, which has always been a thriving city, is suffering a real depression through lack of funds in the industry. The business houses are affected and, in turn, the employment therein. Whilst the Government loan was greatly appreciated, and provided much help, it is only short-term help. The only answer is to get more money for our sugar. I know that the

Premier has played his part and that Cabinet Ministers and other members will play their part with the Commonwealth Government in trying to raise the international price of sugar. It is a very difficult problem but let us put our shoulders to the wheel and try to achieve a better return for the industry. Loans are only temporary expedients; the industry requires a fair return for its product. Costs in the sugar industry, as in every other industry, are rising—perhaps a little more rapidly in the sugar industry than in others.

I now turn to a matter that greatly affects a group in my electorate. They have to pay a levy of 40c a ton on cane delivered to the Wallaville mill. These people live in the Maroondan area which was zoned to supply the Wallaville mill. The 40c levy means that they receive just so much less than the already depressed sugar price. This is a matter of concern and I hope that the Government may be able to render some assistance.

Whilst the season has been reasonably good in the last few months, over the years benefits have not been received from irrigation. This, too, is a very important matter in my electorate. Possibly £250,000 has been spent on irrigation surveys and we are anxiously awaiting the results before approaching the Commonwealth Government. First, we had to determine the economics of the scheme. Unfortunately, this is being done a little slowly; we have been awaiting the report since June. I appreciate why the report has not been released. It seems that the State officers have gone elsewhere for higher pay or that there is a shortage of men trained in the specialised field of irrigation. It seems that the principal cause of delay is the shortage of survey staff. This is unfortunate because people have been waiting a long time for irrigation. Hon. members will appreciate that farmers who are trying to grow crops, who have waited a year for the survey and a bit longer for the report, and who then face a delay following the report, cannot feel other than anxious. I am concerned because many people in my electorate are anxiously awaiting the report. I asked the Minister today if he could expedite it so that farmers may know the result and plan accordingly.

**Mr. Hanson:** You would think the Minister would do something about it.

**Mr. WHARTON:** He said he would look into it. In reply to the hon. member for Port Curtis I point out that I am referring mainly to the Kolan River survey, which embraces the scheme for the Burnett. The Kolan scheme will serve Gin Gin and Wallaville, two important areas which have suffered in the recent drought and from frost. It has been a better season this year and the crops are better. The Gin Gin mill is operating on a much bigger tonnage. It must be kept that way. It is no good having a good crop this year, a frosted crop next

year, and no crop the following year. Difficulty will be encountered in water conservation. It is difficult to see the green light for the sugar industry in its present state. There is no question that irrigation will increase tonnage. Irrigation is important and has its own rewards. But a banker will have a good look before making finance available for irrigation in an industry which is a little depressed. The Government is doing everything possible to ensure a decent return to our sugar producers. At the same time it has done a good deal in representations to the Commonwealth Government to inject some capital into the banking system so that the banks will not apply pressure to their clients, and will wait until the market is more favourable.

I believe that the Snowy Mountains Authority personnel should be brought to Queensland. They would do a great deal of good. Water should be conserved not only for irrigation, but also for the generation of electricity.

**Mr. Wallis-Smith:** What do you think about the de-salination of water?

**Mr. WHARTON:** I am not worried about that; I am interested in conserving it. There is ample scope in Queensland for the authority to become an electric as well as an irrigation authority. There are huge mountains in the Barambah Creek-Burnett River basin, and there is no reason why we could not produce electrical power there as well as conserve water. We should not allow the Snowy Mountains Authority to go out of existence; it should be brought to Queensland. What it has done for the Southern States it could do for Queensland.

Electricity, roads, and water are the main essentials for development of country areas. They will always attract people to an area. There has been a great deal of talk about how much has been done on projects such as that at Calcap. They are all very good, but still many people cannot get electric power.

**Mr. Bromley:** Wait until they put the 10 per cent. on the tariff.

**Mr. WHARTON:** My Government would never do that; only a Labour Government would do that. We removed the 10 per cent. surcharge when we came into power. If the State is to develop and progress it has to have roads, power, and water, and I am now directing my remarks to power. I still say that not enough of it is available. Apparently funds are short, because the supply of electricity is not progressing as it should be. Many country people find it absolutely impossible to obtain. Some rural extensions should be subsidised; this would be money well spent and money that would be returned in terms of development and progress.

**Mr. Bennett:** If you follow Dr. Patterson's ideas, you will have plenty of water.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Yes, and a lot of steam, too. Never in my life have I heard anyone talk as much as Dr. Patterson talks.

**Mr. Tucker:** With a lot of sense, too.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Maybe. I have heard a lot of sense here, too, but I have never actually seen much happen, either.

Another point on which I wish to touch is the need for a survey of the pig industry. I am sorry that the hon. member for South Brisbane could not follow my line of argument on business principles. The pig industry today is changing. Several years ago a survey was conducted, and there is no doubt that it did indicate the trends in the industry. Today we see a trend different from what was forecast at that time. There is now an intensive system of pig production, and no longer are there the over-productions and under-productions of past years. Great fluctuations are not wanted, either.

Because of the intense interest in the pig industry, I am concerned about some difficulties it may have to face, just as the hon. member for Barcoo was concerned about production of safflower. People will go where they think there is some money to be made. The trend today is towards concentrated production of pigs and it worries me that the time may come when some people face calamity through engaging in this activity only. It may be a fair proposition in conjunction with other pursuits, but could possibly be dangerous when undertaken as the sole activity, with perhaps 500 sows and the latest scientific methods of feeding. It is high time a Commonwealth survey of the pig industry was undertaken to show the industry where it is going. I worry—

**Mr. Sherrington:** You are a very worried man.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Only when looking at the hon. member for Salisbury.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I want to know whether you are for or against the Budget.

**Mr. WHARTON:** In these changing times we must take all steps to meet the situation. It is impossible for the ordinary man to undertake such a survey so that industry trends may be known. It is, however, within the capacity of the Government.

I should like to say a word or two about the development of coastal land in my electorate. Many of the beaches on the coastal strip are almost inaccessible and very few people know of them. In fact, I would have difficulty in getting to them myself. However, between Bundaberg and Rodd's Bay there are some beautiful beaches that are little known. For example, Agnes Water is said by people who claim to know to have the finest surf anywhere on the eastern coast of Australia, and that is a very big claim to make.

**Mr. Davies:** Where is that?

**Mr. WHARTON:** Agnes Water, out from Miriam Vale.

**Mr. Davies:** It is not quite as good as Hervey Bay.

**Mr. WHARTON:** Oh! I am talking about surf, not salt water. I agree that Hervey Bay is a good place to go for a holiday; I have been there many times; but I am talking about surf and people who go surfing. I am endeavouring to make the point that Agnes Water cannot be developed unless the Government takes some action. As hon. members know, there are various Government reserves—memorial reserves, and so on—and leases in coastal areas and if the land is to be developed, the Minister should throw it open for development. If the Government cannot develop the land itself, it should allow people with capital to develop it.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Get the Minister for Labour and Tourism to go on safari through the area.

**Mr. WHARTON:** That is fair enough.

**Mr. Bromley:** Too many mosquitoes up there.

**Mr. WHARTON:** No mosquitoes and no sandflies.

In conclusion, I say that I think the Budget is fair enough in difficult times. It matches the season, and I think the Treasurer has done a reasonably good job in ensuring the continued development of our great State.

**Mr. R. JONES (Cairns) (5.43 p.m.):** At the outset, let me say that no-one in Queensland can be other than concerned about the trend of developments in budgeting to meet ever-increasing demands and deal with the problems associated with financing Government activities, both Federal and State. Each year the Government's supreme test and task is the consideration of its Budget. It is the culmination of its year's activities. The Government of Queensland has applied its energies to this task with a wide knowledge of the resources and funds available to it, the benefit of assessments of experts, and, no doubt, a full use of all the assistance and facilities at its disposal. In spite of this, the plain fact is that the Country-Liberal Government was faced with a deficit of \$7,100,000 at 30 June this year, and, as a result, the Treasurer foreshadowed increased State taxation. It probably was influenced further by the deficit of \$2,982,024 for the first two months of the present financial year.

The nature and degree of increases in taxation have to be determined by the Government. One might wonder, then, with such a deficit and with increased taxation being levied to boost the coffers of the Treasury, whether the new Treasurer should not have prefaced the Financial Statement he delivered in the Committee of Supply on 29 September with his now famous remarks made on a similar "first"—his introduction of the Ford, Bacon & Davis report

as Minister for Transport—when he spoke of doses of medicine. On that occasion, he spoke of giving the doses in small sips. In the Budget that he has brought down this year, members of the Opposition fear that the patient may choke on the slug being administered by the Treasurer. However, he is to be congratulated on his first budget on the blasé method of presentation, bordering on utter hide and brashness when he states—

"I will attempt to present this Budget and my remarks relating thereto in simple language, language that can be easily understood by any citizen who is prepared to give a little time and thought to the finances of this State."

It could have been correct to say—

"can be easily understood by any citizen who will be slugged by the Treasurer in this Budget."

Let me assure the Treasurer that the citizens of Queensland do understand the Budget. It is quite simple to them; every Queenslanders understands all too well and every Australian is a champion in his own right in interpretation when he gets a good sound kick in the pocket. The late Ben Chifley wisely and aptly designated this type of administration as "a kick in the hip-pocket nerve." That kick has been very soundly administered by the Treasurer in this Budget.

During the debate on the Appropriation Bill the Treasurer in effect said that we had emptied the coffers and went on in this strain: "Put your trust in God and hope like hell it will rain." Of course, adverting to the speeches made during the election campaign, Queensland was supposed to be an awakening giant. Under this administration it has turned out to be a stumbling somnambulist. I hope that God is kind to the Treasurer and does provide rain, because Queensland and its future is at stake and once again we are riding not only on the backs of the workers of Queensland but, as is usual, on the backs of the primary producers as well. If God has to provide as the Treasurer hopes, I believe that the Government is responsible and it should face up to these matters with a down-to-earth realism and render assistance to those who need it.

I believe, too, that this Budget will prove to have dire results for the Government. It will react against the parties who control the Government. It is an unwise and an unjust Government. It is responsible for what has happened and it will have to answer to the people of Queensland. I am concerned not only about the content of this Budget but also about what it does not contain. During the course of its presentation the Treasurer said—

"Under the recent Appropriation Bill I dealt fairly extensively with the economic effects of the drought on our revenues and I therefore believe it unnecessary to further pursue that avenue."

Yet no less than six times on the front page of his Financial Statement he mentioned the word "drought".

As I said, I am really as much concerned about what the Budget does not contain as about some of the things it does contain. One matter that will affect my electorate comes under the heading of "Revenue" on page 7, where it says—

"Again, following the practice in other States, we will introduce from 1st January, 1967, a stamp duty of 1 per cent. of the consideration on the registration of all motor vehicle transfers and on the registration of all new motor vehicles."

I should like to know whether this 1 per cent. will be levied on the capital city price or on the sale price in a provincial or country centre such as Cairns. If the Government decides to go on with the proposal and levy this 1 per cent. stamp duty and it is assessed, in the case of a new vehicle, on the price in such country towns as Cairns it will mean the payment of an additional 1 per cent. on the rail freight on the vehicle from Brisbane. For example, it will cost £60 more to purchase a car in Cairns than in Brisbane because of freight. If the people of Cairns have to pay 1 per cent. on the additional £60 it means that they are being less favourably treated. This suggested freight increase and intended 1 per cent. stamp duty is especially unfair as it will be a further imposition that will affect the country man only. The city dweller will get off scot free.

No fear! We are concerned that the Government intends to impose this 1 per cent. stamp duty on the over-all sale price of all new and used motor vehicles. In addition there is to be a 7½ per cent. increase on rail freights. Once again the country man is being asked to bear the burden.

As I have said, I am concerned about what is contained in the Budget but I am also concerned about what it does not contain. I refer now to port development. Cairns is famous for many things, including the fact that we have the world's greatest high jumpers in equestrian events.

**Mr. Coburn:** He came from Ayr.

**Mr. R. JONES:** Mr. Vic Parker came from Ayr—I will concede that one to the hon. member for Burdekin. They always come to Cairns to jump the highest. They have jumped 7 ft. to beat the record of 6ft. 10½ ins. under world championship conditions.

This has not much to do with the Budget under consideration, but other world records have. I draw the attention of the Committee to a photograph that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" on 28 September last over the caption "Stretching the tape at 13 ft. 10 ins., this black marlin weighing 1,064 lb. caught off Cairns broke the Australian record for marlin by 384 lb. and the world record by 230 lb." That record was broken

off Cairns. As the newspaper headlines indicate, Cairns will in future become the "hot spot" for fishing.

After reading the Budget we still do not know when we are going to get a small-boat harbour in Cairns. Quite a deal was said about this matter in August, 1964, when geophysical and boring surveys of the Cairns harbour and channel were carried out. Subsequent to that it was estimated that during the 1965-66 financial year work would commence which was estimated to cost £500,000, or \$1,000,000. It was estimated that 2,400,000 cubic yards would be dredged from the channel. On 22 February, 1965, the former Treasurer, now Sir Thomas Hiley, announced that 110 acres of the Esplanade at Cairns would be reclaimed. He further said that the Government had firmly accepted the fact that Cairns needed a small-boat harbour and that of the £500,000 allocated £150,000 had been set aside for its construction.

On 23 March, 1965, the Premier was reported by the Press to have stressed in particular the need for Commonwealth assistance for port development. He detailed the cases for port development, and Cairns was included. On 24 July, 1965, the State Treasurer again said that tenders had been called for the Cairns boat harbour, and that they would have to be considered and evaluated.

The plan was to have one dredge which could be used to carry out the work at Cairns, Weipa and Townsville in the one parcel. It was to be a large project in Cairns, an all-weather basin for small craft. On 1 August we were told that requests for financial assistance for harbour dredges were made in an approach to the Commonwealth Government for the sugar port of Cairns. On 12 October, 1965, we were told that Commonwealth assistance for Weipa only could be approved, but that the work at Cairns would proceed from the State's approved debenture allocation. I am now quoting the former Treasurer.

In relation to the Cairns foreshore reclamation, it was stated on 15 December, 1965, that dredging tenders called were rejected but the scheme was still on the urgent list. Tenders were to be resubmitted by August, 1966. I direct hon. members' attention to this project.

Cairns is a maritime city and in the absence of the facilities which the boat harbour would provide interest is being diverted from Cairns—interest which could be very vital to the city. The promotion of big-game fishing automatically needs the provision of a small-boat harbour. We had a very distinguished visitor in Cairns in the person of His Royal Highness, Prince Charles. I am very proud of the fact that he is also Prince of Wales as my ancestors were Welsh. It affords me a great deal of pleasure to know that the Prince of Wales visited my electorate. He did not come with the usual protocol



or sounding of heralds, but as an ordinary tourist to find out what we in the tropics do. We provided him with the facilities found in Cairns, namely, the fishing facilities, and he did quite well. He was the private guest of a very prominent Cairns family. He was travelling to see things at first hand, and I understand that unfortunately he had to climb down railings and clamber over other boats to become seaborne.

If we in Cairns can attract such distinguished people as His Royal Highness to sample our fishing, the Government has a duty to provide boating amenities in Cairns. The world-record black marlin was caught in the area and at present Bob Dyer, the well known television personality, is in Cairns trying to beat it. We have the "Fun in the Sun" Festival and, if I may use a pun, we cannot have fun in the sun without the "mon.". We certainly need the money in Cairns to cater for these very important people and to put Cairns on the map as a tourist town and to give effect to the reclamation scheme.

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

**Mr. R. JONES:** I have been pointing out that the facilities at Cairns should be at least equal to others in the State because in Cairns we are developing world-class activities. A world record for an equestrian high jump and world records in big-game fishing have been set there. Prince Charles visited Cairns. Next week-end we stage a yachting race which attracts 4-metre champions of world class from the Netherlands, Sweden, America, Canada, New Zealand, and Japan. If Cairns can attract this type of world-class competitor, it should have a small-boat harbour. These world-class yachtsmen will compete in an ocean race from Cairns to Green Island and back to Ellis Beach. They may gain the wrong impression if we cannot provide first-class facilities for them. The provision of such facilities would keep them in Queensland. Without those facilities we could well lose them to other States or other parts of the world.

This race is an annual event and it is imperative that a small-boat harbour be provided in the precincts of Cairns at any early date. In addition to being an asset in itself, its construction in conjunction with the reclamation scheme would beautify the Cairns foreshores and would be of value as an attraction in that city. It would also remove the eyesore of extensive areas of mud on the seaboard. The boat harbour could be a revenue producer as well as a valuable city and State asset not only in attracting tourists, but also to the local boating fraternity.

The project seems to depend on the dredging of Cairns harbour. In the meantime Cairns is being deprived of this warranted amenity. In the allocation of funds Cairns is being less favourably treated than other ports in Queensland. This facility could and would be used by not only the people of

Cairns but of Queensland and Australia. It could be financed from the Commonwealth Aid, Marine Works, Fund for harbour development. The need for such development has not been stressed sufficiently or strongly enough along the lines I put forward in this Chamber not long ago. Cairns has a good case for a small-boat harbour. It has been under negotiation for too long, and the people of Cairns demand some constructive action.

The reclamation work in Cairns has, of course, been talked about and advocated for many years. I have here a brochure issued by the Cairns Harbour Board in 1926 to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the port. On the front page is an outline of a proposed reclamation scheme, so apparently this has been advocated for quite a considerable time and is not a new proposal. As Cairns has come to place great reliance upon the tourist industry, it has become more apparent that we should have our boat harbour and reclamation scheme as quickly as possible.

Previous reclamation schemes in Cairns have proved rather expensive ventures, and no doubt this has caused the Government to hesitate before embarking upon another one. We know that the last 4½ acres reclaimed on the present site next to the Cairns baths cost approximately £21,000, of which £7,000 was found by the Cairns Harbour Board, £7,000 by the Cairns City Council, and £7,000 by the State through the Land Administration Commission.

The next reclamation scheme in our area was the East Cairns reclamation scheme in A, B, and C areas, as they were known. This involved some 1,027,537 cubic yards of soft fill, which included 3,676 cubic yards of hard fill for bund walls. I understand that the unit cost of that reclamation varied from 4s. 3d. to 4s. 7d. a yard. The labour content was approximately 2s. 1-29d. a yard. In addition to the Cairns City Council and the Cairns Harbour Board, the Land Administration Commission, A.C.F. and Shirleys Fertilisers Ltd., and the Shell Co. of Australia Ltd. contributed in part. I understand that the Land Administration Commission was required to pay for only about 49 per cent. of the work, and its contribution amounted to approximately £229,000. Of the total amount deposited, approximately 80,834 cubic yards were put in above what is known as the Alligator Creek Bridge, and 305,350 cubic yards below it. As I said before, the maximum cost was approximately 4s. 7d. a yard, and of the total cost of the East Cairns reclamation scheme the Cairns City Council contributed approximately £34,000. The Land Administration Commission paid £120,000, which included a drainage cost of £26,559. The yardage that I am giving is in barge yards, or cubic yards in solids, and it was measured and the levels were taken before and after filling.

Of course, what I am advocating will be made even easier and cheaper by new methods of dredging that have come to light

since the scheme was undertaken. I have been in touch with a company in Western Australia—it is operated by Australians but is an American company—that has had outstandingly good results with pipeline dredges in reclamation work all over that State. It has done jobs in Geraldton, Esperance, Bunbury, Albany and Fremantle in Western Australia, and on 22 October, 1965, the date of the letter I have here, the company was still working in the Fremantle area. The letter states that the company has pumped millions of cubic yards of fill onto reclamation sites at a price that has made practicable many projects that were too costly to be undertaken otherwise, and that it is growing at a rapid rate. The Queenslander who wrote to me said—

“It disturbs me to know that Queensland has produced less work than any other State in this field. I know that there is a lot of work to be done there and that a staff in North Queensland with a 12-inch or 14-inch dredge would quickly produce some results as far as work promotion is concerned.”

He goes on to say—

“For the past year I have been project superintendent of our company's largest contract in Australia and have been directly concerned with the operation and administration of dredging and reclamation work in this State (Western Australia).”

Having indicated that he comes from Cairns and that he is certain that Cairns and district could be developed cheaply and quickly by this method, as could many other northern coastal towns, he said—

“I am keen to approach our company in an endeavour to have them establish a dredge in North Queensland with myself as superintendent. This would mean a considerable downgrade in position for me, but I have a lot of faith in the North and feel that I could promote enough work to keep the company in Queensland once established on any job.”

He says that the initial cost of establishing the dredge is the most costly step in dredging, and that, once the dredge is established, the cost can be reduced to as little as 2s. 2d. a yard.

In the light of this, I say that the problems of dredging and reclamation in Cairns have not to await the diversion of dredges from other ports. The work could be undertaken at cheap rates and land would become available in Cairns. I believe that it is practicable and that it should be done. Over the years various schemes have been put forward in Cairns, including the diversion of the Barron River through Thomatis Creek. This may have to be done by a State Government in future to prevent the flow of mud into the harbour. However, I believe that dredging at Cairns is imperative now, not only for the boat harbour but also for a deep-water port for the bulk-sugar terminal.

Dredging has constantly been deferred at Cairns because dredges have been allocated to the Weipa project. If one compares the figures in last year's Budget with those in the Budget for the current financial year, it is surprising to find that last year the commitment at Weipa was £5,651,790, or \$11,303,580. The new harbour works to be provided were for £2,366,790, or \$4,733,580. The existing part of the works to be provided were at the set price of \$3,400,000. In addition to this, the Queensland Government apparently is committed to the provision of township facilities and so on for a price of \$2,170,000. Again this year, although we sought a \$9,000,000 Commonwealth aid grant for Weipa, we were advanced only \$2,717,000 and a further \$552,700 will be advanced this year. This totals \$3,270,000 by way of repayable grants, yet we made approaches to the Commonwealth Government for a \$9,000,000 Commonwealth aid grant.

Because of the failure of this Government to secure the extra \$5,730,000 originally sought through a Commonwealth aid grant we, as a State, are required to provide in this year's Budget for expenditure of \$1,830,517 on harbour works at Weipa and also \$1,280,000 on Weipa township facilities. We might well ask why. We might also ask whether the money being expended on the development of this port is being spent to the detriment of other port development in Queensland, or is being wasted.

I want to know, and I am sure the people of Queensland have a right to know, whether it is a fact, engineering-wise, that because of the geophysical set-up the entrance to Weipa harbour will have to be continually dredged with dredges of large capacity in order to keep the port open. We might well ask if all the money that has been put into port development there would not have been more economically used and the expenditure less to give Weipa rail access through the port of Cairns. This is not beyond the bounds of capability. I feel that this may be the answer to the problem of Weipa if we had not already financially overstepped the mark in this regard.

While advocating port development in Cairns, do not let us stray from the situation that will probably arise there. I want to reiterate what I said originally in my Address-in-Reply speech, and I also want to quote from “The Cairns Post” a statement made by the Mayor of Cairns. On 30 June, 1965, the Mayor of Cairns is reported as commenting on the harbour reclamation and also on the Cairns cultural centre. The report reads—

“Alderman S. D. E. Chataway stated there was no question of choice for the council between these two projects.

He said, ‘I feel that I should clarify a misconception that has arisen in Cairns regarding these two projects.

A great number of people have formed the opinion that it must be either one or the other of these two projects as far as the council is concerned. That is not the case. Even if the proposed reclamation and boat harbour project was not under consideration the council would have been told, as a matter of Government policy, that no loan approval would be granted for the Cairns cultural centre this year. Some people have formed the opinion that if for any reason the proposed reclamation and boat harbour project is not gone on with, the council would receive approval to borrow money for the Cairns cultural centre."

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Twelve months later the money has not been provided for either the Cairns cultural centre or the boat harbour. In my maiden speech in August last year, in the Address-Reply debate, I said—

"Cairns was less favourably treated in the provision of funds for the small-boat harbour. The people of Cairns have been deprived of a justly deserved amenity and not fairly treated when comparison is made with loan allocations granted to ports throughout Queensland over a period in the provision of small-boat harbours. I cite Townsville, Bowen, Mackay, and Gladstone as instances. The people of Cairns have been made an experiment in financing through repayment of a loan to their local authority with interest and redemption for their small-boat harbour, a loan which was not even sought by the Cairns City Council. I doubt if the council would ever have applied for such a loan of £175,000 for this harbour development. But by an imposition and a reversal of a decision for economic expediency—for ransom—take this or get nothing—not even the choice of a boat harbour or a cultural centre, a cold-blooded direction, 'The loan for the boat harbour will have to be applied for and accepted or you will receive no loan funds.' Ransom—call it what you may, but it was not a decision I could tend to cite as an example of a democratic process."

Still we are awaiting the Treasurer's grace to assist us with our boat harbour. A boat harbour is a State responsibility, and that is why I am on my feet now urging for a boat harbour for Cairns.

At this stage I should like to urge for something else which I believe is a necessity for the development of Cairns as a city, and for the development of tourism in our area. At the back of Cairns there is a forestry road commonly known to the citizens of Cairns as the Whitfield Range forestry road. Geographically it is not exactly the Whitfield Range, the correct name being Isley Hills. It includes the peaks of White Rock, Mt. Sheridan, Waddlebla Peak, Boi Boi and Moorooloolooloo Peak. The existing forestry road starts at the base of Moorooloolooloo and is a gazetted

road to a point between Waddlebla Peak and Mt. Sheridan. It is under the control of and maintained by the Department of Forestry beyond this point. In other respects it is a public road and is frequented by sightseers and tourists. I understand that investigations have been made into its being gazetted as a tourist road. I am not urging that it should be exploited as a tourist road because I think it will be developed at a later stage.

At the present rate of development I should say that this road at Isley Hills would be too costly to develop at this stage, particularly as it is being used by the Department of Forestry and could be a rather dangerous road for the public during daylight hours. However, I suggest that a road that will have more consequence and benefit to Cairns, and better tourist potential and attraction, is the road I refer to as the Mt. Whitfield-Lumley Hill road, which would take in the scenic reserve within the Mt. Whitfield and Lumley Hills areas. I believe that this area is now a part of the city of Cairns; if it is not a part of the city it is awaiting finalisation of arrangements for gazettal. I understand that an origin-and-destination survey has been set down for Cairns by the Main Roads Department within the next two years.

I advocate the acceleration of this plan. A gravel road up these peaks, to Mt. Whitfield and Lumley Hill, to a height of 1,200 feet, assessed as a road with a grade of 1 in 10, would extend for about 15,000 feet and the estimated cost is \$150,000. This would be a rather cheap exercise in road construction. If 50 per cent. of the cost was paid on a \$1-for-\$1 basis through the Commonwealth Aid, Roads, Grants Scheme, with a Main Roads subsidy of a \$1 for \$1, it could be readily built and would prove a definite asset to the city of Cairns. It would provide an outstanding view of our coastal port from Buchan's Point in the north as far south as the eye can see, taking in Cairns, as well as giving a panoramic view, and a drive through jungle country with Cairns at the base with its harbour and Green Island and Fitzroy Island.

With a little poetic licence I may go a little outside my electorate and deal with the Yarrabah settlement. People from this settlement are bringing their children to school at Cairns, so I really have a direct interest in it. This matter also relates to the Cairns boat harbour, as the children's boats do not have adequate mooring facilities. A direct access road to Yarrabah would be a wonderful asset to the settlement. It would also provide an alternative method of getting to the city for the people of the settlement. It would be a much better facility and would certainly make it more convenient for those who wish to work in Cairns and send their children to school there.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: There is the safety of the children, too.

**Mr. R. JONES:** I agree with the hon. member for Tablelands that it would be much safer. When a storm blows up in Trinity Bay it can be dangerous for the children coming from Yarrabah. Also, if the bay looks like being rough the children miss school, which is particularly bad for secondary-school students.

I draw the Minister's attention to an editorial that was published in an OPAL news-letter. It was quite well done; so much so that I believe it warrants quoting. It is headed—

“Men ? or Animals”  
and it continues—

“Each year the various Governments throughout Australia are providing millions of dollars for what are known as Developmental or Beef Roads. The purpose of these roads is clear, and the idea of building all-weather roads to transport cattle from stations to meat-works by road train is highly desirable. If money can be found in such large quantities for such desirable work as these beef roads, then we would believe that money would also be forthcoming for even more important work.

“But this is not so. The various Governments have millions of dollars to spend on beef roads, yet cannot find a few thousand to build a road linking a township of nearly 1,000 people with the outside world. The township is YARRABAH, and is situated about 7 miles from the nearest road. This road has been promised to the people of YARRABAH for many years, but has not eventuated. The current ‘reason’ for the delay is the difficulty in finding a suitable route across the mountain range. Yet the Cairns Regional Electricity Board put through a track for 4-wheel-drive vehicles about four years ago, and is still trafficable.

“Because the proposed road is located in a local authority area, the State Government says that the road should be built by the Mulgrave Shire Council. The Council says that it should be built by the State Government. While these two Authorities engage in verbose tug-of-war, forty school children are regularly ferried to and fro in small boats across frequently rough seas to the launch which brings them to the High School in Cairns. In one week of rough weather, these children could not attend school for three days. Frequently, they are unable to leave Cairns to go home, because of the rough seas. Serious hospital cases are brought to Cairns by a 16-foot boat, if the sea is not too rough.

“Perhaps it will be necessary for one of these boats to be swamped and several people drowned, before the Government acknowledges that PEOPLE ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN ANIMALS.”

I do not think I need say any more. The editorial covers the subject adequately and should bring the matter before the attention of the Ministers directly responsible.

In my Address-in-Reply speech last year I referred to tin production in North Queensland. In answer to a question that I asked recently about the tonnage of tin shipped through Cairns, the Minister kindly referred me to the Cairns Harbour Board. I was able to get the information from the Board. The latest figures available on Queensland tin production are those contained in the 1964 review, which shows that production increased from 1,622 tons, valued at £1,145,647 in 1963 to 2,079½ tons, valued at £2,111,248 in 1964. The major producers were the Tableland Tin Dredging N.L. and Ravenshoe Tin Dredging N.L. Tin concentrates shipped through Cairns totalled 1,974.15 tons, valued at £2,009,224. Those figures show that the major proportion of tin produced in Queensland is shipped through Cairns away from our State and away from Australia. I advocated recently, and I shall continue to advocate, that it is time that the Government of the day realised that our mineral resources should be processed here, not shipped away from our country. We have seen this happening in Townsville, and the industrial boom that has followed the establishment there of the copper refinery and copper treatment works.

I feel very strongly that if an area is to be developed it should be developed through the product indigenous to it. Nobody can deny that Cairns is the port for the greatest tin-producing area in Australia, if not the world. I assure hon. members that the tin resources of the Herberton field and other fields in my area have scarcely been scratched. There are tin deposits there that are not mined because it would be too expensive to do so. Because of Taxation requirements, 7-ft. seams are mined for only small periods of the year.

Queensland has more decentralisation of population and industry than has any other State. We can, however, improve the present position and make sure that industries are decentralised in areas where they can make use of local products. Everything should be done to ensure that the processing of raw materials is done in this country, and until areas are developed by the exploitation of their natural resources we cannot expect towns, and the country generally, to prosper.

In my Address-in-Reply speech I told hon. members that we were forming in Cairns a Northern Development Bureau, which would be in effect a local development council, to work in the area. The idea is to obtain support from the community and work out a programme, backed by organisations and interested people, to put before the Government of the day. Once again I appeal to all Ministers to listen to submissions made by the Northern Development Bureau, which will be established to assist community development in Cairns. We believe that we can focus attention on things that will unite people in the area and bring about greater productivity by the use of resources indigenous to it.

I also believe that Cairns very badly needs activity apart from the tourist industry to assist its development and the development of the district. It is a very rich area. The recent recession in the sugar industry has shown that Cairns—and, indeed, every Queensland sugar town—has become too dependent upon the sugar industry, and will be adversely affected unless there is an increase in the world market price of sugar in the near future.

I believe, too, that the tourist industry would develop automatically if industries were established in the area. More tourists would be drawn by natural tourist attractions such as the Barron Falls, and I do not think I am being unrealistic in suggesting that cable cars such as those used at Katoomba will travel up the Barron Gorge from Barron Waters, or Lake Placid as it is known today.

In my opinion, if the port were developed it would be easy to establish a naval base at Cairns for the New Guinea area, perhaps with advance bases at Thursday Island and other places. It would be ideal for motor torpedo boats. If one flies over Cairns, it is easy to envisage the area within the Admiralty Islands becoming a naval base and providing complete security. During the Second World War it was used as a flying-boat base, and large ships were anchored in the Smith's Creek area. With the introduction of roll-on, roll-off ships, it would be easy to establish a container port at Cairns.

While I am on that point, I might digress for a moment and say that ships such as the Princess of Tasmania and the Empress of Australia should be encouraged to come to Cairns in the off-season. They could bring caravanners and tourists to Cairns and off-load them there to make safaris similar to that undertaken by the Minister for Labour and Tourism, who travelled direct from Brisbane. It would be an innovation, but I do not think it would be impossible to have ships that ply between Melbourne and Devonport and Sydney and Hobart diverted to North Queensland in the off-season. If suitable roads were available, tourists could go through to Weipa, Karumba and other parts of the Gulf area that are unique.

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD** (Logan) (7.58 p.m.): In speaking to the Financial Statement, I fully realise that the discussion must cover a very wide field. In fact, it covers virtually all phases of administration within the State.

I must be very fair in my approach to the Budget because it affects me as it affects everyone else. I realise that the Treasurer has not had an easy task in balancing the State's economy in the current financial year, and I say to him that I am mindful of his difficulties and that he has my full support. It is very easy to criticise, and I was trained to believe that if one puts forward a criticism one should at least suggest some remedial action.

**Mr. Davies:** Do you think you are getting enough from the Commonwealth Government?

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** I will give the hon. member the five minutes after the bell goes to make his contribution.

I have listened to all those hon. members who have spoken in the debate today and, apart from the constant cry that there should be more assistance from the Commonwealth Government, I have heard very few suggestions or alternatives put forward. As he said in his Financial Statement, the Treasurer was not satisfied with the treatment given to Queensland by the Commonwealth Government and he had to find the money from State sources. I did not hear today any suggestions for State finance to cover the deficit. We in local authorities know full well that we have been short of finance over the years and in a much smaller way we have been doing this type of thing for many years. Consequently, we are used to making ends meet.

I also noticed that there has been a constant emphasis on road transport and the heavy taxes on motor vehicles. I must agree with the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Gregory. I have been in the western country; I spent much of my life there. I have been there in this time of drought and I agree that this is a difficult imposition on them. But let us be very fair in the matter.

As the Minister for Main Roads would know full well, the big proportion of heavy trucks in use in Queensland would be on the coast. Let us deal with the coral trucks running over the Redlands roads and tearing them to pieces and the sand-mining trucks on Stradbroke Island reducing the roads there to a deplorable state. We have not been getting enough money from the Main Roads Department to keep these roads in order for the trucks running the sand-mining winnings to the port of Dunwich. I feel that the imposition on these heavy trucks is well warranted, but I say again that it is most unfortunate that the western areas were caught up in the increase.

I am fortunate in that the electorate of Logan probably embraces more activities of various types than any other electorate in the State, and I take this opportunity of mentioning a number of them. I know that the Treasurer has pointed out that the Commonwealth Government is prepared to increase the State's allocation for loan works by only 6.6 per cent., whereas its own services and public works are increased by 100 per cent. That worried me to a considerable degree because I am interested in water conservation. I do not agree with the hon. member for Gregory that road systems are necessary for development. From my experience of the western country I say that road systems will come after development.

**Mr. Wallis-Smith:** Water is more important.

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** Water, to my mind, is more important, and I suggest that water should be put in first in the closer settled areas. In my Address-in-Reply speech I dealt with the Logan and Albert Rivers and I know that no provision has been made this year for the damming of these rivers. My colleague the hon. member for South Coast very rightly pointed out that there are six rivers south of Brisbane—the biggest rivers in South-east Queensland next to the Brisbane River, I should say—and not one dam for agricultural purposes has been put on any of them. They drain the premier agricultural area of the State.

One-sixth of Brisbane's milk supply comes from the Logan catchment area, and the damming of the Logan and Albert Rivers should be given top priority. As this area is east of the Great Dividing Range there has been a concept that it is drought-resistant, but it is nothing of the sort. During the last drought the mighty Logan River—it is a mighty river, indeed a huge river in flood-time—the farmers were reduced to 12 hours' pumping a week, and for five days of the week there was no pumping at all. Near Gleneagle the total flow did not cover the foot valve of one pump.

Through the courtesy of the hon. member for Fassifern I had the privilege of investigating the Moogerah Dam irrigation complex. That made me realise how much the coastal areas are dependent on irrigation. The whole area of the Fassifern Valley is now within reach of permanent water, and there is production as far as the eye can see.

It is rather difficult for me to realise that after 100 years of settlement no attempt has been made to dam the Logan River or the Albert River. Five million dollars would be sufficient for schemes for both rivers, and this is much less than we will spend this year on three schemes. I do hope that the Minister for Local Government and Conservation takes note of the fact that I am calling for the damming of the Logan and Albert Rivers. I have several supporters in this Chamber with the same desire.

**Mr. Davies:** Have you put the matter before him?

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** I have put the matter before him several times, and I propose to keep it before him. I propose to make it my life's work.

I shall deal now with the sugar areas south of the Logan, which are also greatly dependent on the damming of the Logan and Albert Rivers. \$19,000,000 of interest-free loan from the Commonwealth relieved the situation in the sugar industry. Though the production from this area goes into No. 1 Pool the growers there are still labouring under difficulties. Production must be raised to an economic level. As I pointed out in my maiden speech, this can be done only by adequate drainage, a scheme that would cost \$500,000. It is difficult to see how it could be implemented by the shire,

or the industry itself, under present conditions without Commonwealth assistance by way of matching grants. I, too, keep making this appeal for Commonwealth assistance, which I hope will eventually be made available. The wet conditions this season in the low areas have resulted in a low c.c.s., and there has been difficulty in getting flooded cane out. If this area is to flourish as it should, a drainage scheme must be effected as soon as possible.

I come now to local authorities and point out that we in local government are striking new difficulties brought about by drainage problems created by piggeries, lot feeding, and fowl and stock abattoirs, which are all major problems. It is no longer a question of the number of pigs carried on the land or how big the abattoirs are. It is the drainage capacity that is presenting many difficulties. I am very doubtful whether the Local Authority Acts allow any authority to pass by-laws that control the number of birds that can be killed or the number of pigs to be carried in a certain confine. Without doubt I think that we rely solely on the Health Acts to refuse to pass certain building plans, but that is a very devious way of controlling this issue. Unless something is done about these by-laws, the pollution of streams and neighbouring lands will become a major problem. It should be realised that in fowl abattoirs 4 gallons of water is used for every bird that is killed. The Department of Local Government in conjunction with the Department of Primary Industries has evolved a system of septic tanks—three in number, I think—one draining into the other, and the final fluid, being heavily impregnated with chemicals, is used for irrigation purposes. This is an expensive item, but it seems to be the only method they can devise to control this problem. In brief, we require uniform control and power to limit the number of animals carried or the number of birds killed.

I refer now to the Mining Act, which brings to mind Stradbroke Island. Due to a defect in the Mining Act the local authority suffers as there is no provision in the Public Works Land Resumption Act whereby a local authority can resume land from a mining lease. This is quite understandable as it would be very difficult if a company were exposed to resumptions in ore bodies, but sand-mining is a bird of quite another feather. On Stradbroke Island there could be leases which have to run for 30 years before the land reverts to the public. Unless the Mining Act is altered to allow resumptions for road purposes, one of the best beaches in Australia, the 18-Mile Beach, will be kept from the public. Sand-mining covers such large areas that it is quite impracticable to apply the usual mining legislation, which was framed to cover ordinary mining operations.

The Logan electorate covers the major part of Moreton Bay, which brings me to the control of coral and the difficulties the Treasurer may have had in dealing with the this issue. He has my sympathy in dealing with harbours and marine matters. There is big potential in the use of dead coral for cement and glass manufacture. In addition, the Redland Shire requires a large amount for road-making on Stradbroke Island. The fishing industry says that it wants no live coral touched, that it is the fishing resort for tourists and the local people. Unfortunately, live coral surrounds the dead coral. I can readily understand that if a big company like the Queensland Cement and Lime Co. Ltd. decides to put in a big installation costing millions of dollars it must be given security of tenure with its coral leases. But when other industries require coral the suggestion is that as such large areas were handed over to this company, and as areas of green coral around Peel Island were reserved for the fishing industry, the coral in the oyster leases off Stradbroke is the only alternative supply for glass-making.

I do not agree with that, but if a person starts criticising he must be prepared to suggest a remedy. The owners of oyster leases should have security of tenure. But oyster leases are granted on an annual basis. The industry is only small—about £3,600 a year—because of this insecure tenure. If this was being run by the Department of Lands it would give special leases with a definite tenure. If it is decided to mine these oyster leases for coral the owners have no right of compensation or other redress when their leases are terminated. The industry does not thrive. The Department of Harbours and Marine should give serious consideration to the commercial people growing oysters. They should have security of tenure. I am not now referring to the small oyster leases scattered throughout the bay that are held by private individuals for their own use.

At Peel Island there is a vast mass of green coral surrounding dead coral. To the north-west of that there is Lazaret Gutter. If the Department of Lands intends to make this a scenic resort it had better do something about changing its name in order to remove the stigma of Hansen's Disease. Lazaret Gutter is a deep anchorage which can hold five or six boats. It has been suggested to me that this gutter should be excavated. My shire engineers tell me that assuming there is eight feet of coral, as there is in most of the bay, approximately 250,000 yards of coral could be removed to enlarge this basin.

**Mr. Bromley:** They are taking a lot out now, aren't they?

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** No.

Consequently, I feel that the Department of Harbours and Marine will have to look in this section for coral. The royalty rate on coral is 8c a yard. The department would

obtain the royalty rates; the coral would be taken out for it and a reserve of coral obtained for industry; and a swinging basin would be provided for small boats in the centre of the main fishing area.

The operations of the Queensland Cement and Lime Co. Ltd. have shown that the use of cutter suction dredges, which they have been operating off Ormiston, leaves an area of sediment which is fast developing round all the foreshores. It has been suggested that any attempt to widen Lazaret Gutter would cover some of the green coral on the fishing grounds, but that is not so. I understand that the coral should be taken out with a bucket dredge, and that under no circumstances should cutter suction dredges be used in this area. The sediment from this type of dredge presents the greatest difficulty. The Redland Shire Council will have to take some action to ensure that the foreshores at Ormiston are not spoilt by dredging operations.

I now refer to the bay islands. In Moreton Bay there are a number of islands beyond the control of any local authority. I instance Russell, Macleay, Lamb, and Karragarra Islands. Ultimately they will have to come under the administration of a shire council, although at this stage the economics of taking them over preclude this being done successfully. The difficulty arises from the actions of subdividers who subdivide them without giving due attention to the requirements of the public. The foreshores are not protected; the allotments are of inadequate size; and, when a shire council eventually takes the area over, irreparable damage has been done.

**Mr. Bennett:** You should get the Government to refer this matter to Mr. Arnold Bennett.

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** That is not the solution at all. Control could readily be exercised over these islands. The Titles Office could refuse to accept subdivisions unless adequate provision had been made for public purposes, or the Department of Lands could control them till local authorities were in a position to take them over. Unless the Government was prepared to donate large sums of money to local authorities, it would be quite impossible for them to administer these areas.

The same difficulty was experienced by the Redland Shire Council when it took over Coochi-mudlo Island. One subdivider had gone on to the island and used watercourses for roads, hollow logs for drains, and provided allotments that were too small. We have not been able to remedy that situation. Once a subdivider builds roads and bridges in the wrong place and makes an incorrect subdivision, the damage has been done for generations to come.

It is very important that subdivision of these beautiful bay islands be controlled till they are under the administration of a local authority. Over the years the Redland

Shire Council has been engaged in a dispute with the Queensland Cement and Lime Co. Ltd. which envisaged the establishment of a factory in the better area of a subdivision on the foreshores at Ormiston. A town plan has been prepared and accepted by Cabinet. It provides for the cement company to stockpile coral there for cartage to Brisbane. However, the difficulty has not been ironed out, and I think that for too long the Redland Shire has been held to ransom by the company. The plan should be pushed through. The shire is quite prepared to accept the stockpiling of coral in the area, but not under any circumstances will it accept the establishment of a cement works. Even with stockpiling roads are being destroyed by heavy vehicles, and the council has not the money to keep them in order for transport of that type.

I appeal to the Department of Local Government to ensure that the Redland town plan is put through at an early date, and also to ensure that the cement company is not allowed to establish cement works within the area.

I have asked the Queensland Housing Commission to build houses at Beenleigh and Cleveland. I point out to hon. members that Beenleigh is a thriving centre. It is a dormitory area for Brisbane; it is a dormitory area for many farm and rural workers and for meatworkers. Appeals for houses have been made to the Commission for some time, and I hope they will fall on fertile ground.

Cleveland, of course, has been precluded in the past from participating in Housing Commission projects because it did not have reticulated water. Now that the big dam has been built at Capalaba at a cost of about \$5,000,000 for the whole scheme, the Commission may be able to begin operations within the area. Shires north of Brisbane—the Pine Rivers Shire is an example—have found that development increased six-fold once a reticulated water supply was provided, and without doubt the Cleveland area will now develop rapidly and should participate in the provision of Housing Commission houses.

In my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate I referred particularly to the connection of the Redland Shire to the Brisbane area by way of the so-called Rickertt Road bridge, which the Brisbane City Council is anxious to construct. It is not part of the Wilbur Smith plan, but it is shown on that plan as a feeder route to the eastern freeway. Certain difficulties have arisen in relation to its construction. The Redland Shire is prepared to contribute one third of its cost, the Brisbane City Council is prepared to contribute one third, and it is hoped that the Government will increase its subsidy from 20 per cent. to 33½ per cent. so that the bridge can come into being. I understand that the Brisbane City Council has finance available for the purpose.

The Redland Shire Council is in some difficulty because of its large commitments—about \$600,000—for a water supply scheme, and this has meant that other work has had to be curtailed. However, it is intended to make further efforts to get a loan for the construction of the bridge, and I appeal to the Government to raise its subsidy from 20 per cent. to 33½ per cent. as compensation for the recent closure of the railway into the Redland area.

**Mr. Davies:** Do you think the railway should have been closed?

**Mr. Bennett:** It is not much of a dormitory without a railway.

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** We are getting good roads in lieu thereof. On the matter of the closure of the railway, when it was closed the town leaped ahead very quickly. The people thrive with bus transport. That is the answer to the hon. member for South Brisbane.

In my Address-in-Reply speech I made an appeal for the senior citizens of this State, and I have been asked to make a further appeal on their behalf.

**Mr. Davies:** The Labour Party made a big appeal for them last week-end. You should have been there.

**Mr. E. G. W. WOOD:** If I may add to that, I point out that His Excellency the Governor, at a recent Old People's Welfare Association meeting, appealed for a subsidy on moneys raised by various senior citizens' organisations, and I am disappointed to see that no provision has been made in the Budget for these people. I think every hon. member here would know what a wonderful benefit it is for old people to remain in their own homes and to go out to the various clubs. This seems to be a move in the right direction, and I think that if we are prepared to subsidise parents and citizens' associations within schools we should also be prepared to subsidise old people's associations.

I heard a speech here not long ago on therapy. This is an avenue where therapy could very adequately be used. I refer in particular, of course, to speech therapy, which is a science that is coming more and more into its own. I understand it is used in conjunction with the treatment of aged people affected by strokes, of children with defective speech, and in other ways, and I should say that all aged people's homes should have their own therapists of all types readily available instead of having visiting therapists. They should, of course, have adequate homes. I should say that the homes the State has for them could be improved on, and I think there should be a general effort to improve the conditions for the aged.

I have been asked to make some reference to the subject of margarine. The Logan electorate covers a fair part of the dairying area of the Beenleigh district and these people are worried about margarine. I have pointed out here previously that it is quite



useless to expect the dairying areas on the coast, which are mostly undulating lands, to be converted to agriculture. They are grazing lands but they are too small for grazing purposes alone. They are useful only for dairying purposes, so is it not better to have dairying on them? It strikes me as strange that New Guinea, which by virtue of its relationship with Australia must enjoy the same conditions as the States enjoy under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, cannot compete with us in dairying but can compete with us in vegetable oils, and I think that the suggestion to convert any of the dairying areas to margarine production should be resisted as much as possible. My thoughts in this matter are with the dairying people.

**Mr. P. WOOD** (Toowoomba East) (8.35 p.m.): Before developing the principal arguments I want to adduce in this debate I wish to refer to the resignation this morning of the Leader of the Opposition. It was a most distressing occasion for the hon. gentleman, and also a most distressing occasion for me.

The hon. member for Toowoomba West has been in the Legislative Assembly for 31 years as a member for various Toowoomba electorates, whatever name they may have had at the time. In those 31 years as a member for Toowoomba he has most favourably impressed all Toowoomba people. The impressions or ideas electors have of political parties and politicians are not gained in a few days, weeks or a year, but over a period of many years. In his 31 years in politics the hon. member for Toowoomba West has caused the Australian Labour Party to be more favourably considered in Toowoomba than in most other parts of this State and most other parts of this country. He has achieved this by his sincerity in 31 years of elected office, by his undoubted ability and by the great work he has done for Toowoomba people. Over the years the Toowoomba people have been proud to have the hon. member for Toowoomba West as one of their representatives in the Queensland Parliament.

After my election to this Assembly I said something to him privately which I should now like to say publicly. I told him that but for his fine example in Toowoomba over that long period of years my election to Parliament would have been considerably more difficult than it was, or it may well have been impossible. His reputation in Toowoomba was such that he made my standing as a Labour candidate so much easier. He made my election so much easier because Toowoomba people so highly regard him. Because they so highly regard him they highly regard the Australian Labour Party in that area.

The electorate I represent is considerably more conservative in character than many of the electorates in Brisbane held by Liberal members. Perhaps I could better say it the other way: there are many Liberal-held

electorates in Brisbane which are more of a working-class nature than the electorate I represent. That I was able to win what is really a difficult seat for Labour to win is a tribute more to the hon. member for Toowoomba West than to me.

The Australian Labour Party in Toowoomba over a period of many years has been very well served by its elected representatives, and with all modesty and humility I must include among those elected representatives my own father.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I pay that particular tribute to the former Leader of the Opposition. I have said this to him in private conversation, and I am proud and pleased to have this opportunity to pay this tribute to him in public. If my pleas were to be heard he would still be Leader of the Opposition. I regret very deeply the circumstances which he felt obliged him to relinquish that position.

I wish to enlarge on a point I made during my maiden speech concerning decentralisation in Queensland. It will be just one brief point. Hon. members may be interested to hear of the experience of a large industrial concern in Toowoomba. In 1964, I think it was, a mission was sent by this Government to London seeking skilled migrants to come to Queensland to work.

The Toowoomba Foundry was one of the industries that participated in this drive and succeeded in attracting 40 skilled migrants from England. Forty of them came to work for that foundry but it had difficulty in keeping the skilled labour. As an incentive the company offered a bonus of \$100 if employees stayed for a qualifying period. I am unable to say just how long the qualifying period is, but of the 40 skilled migrants who came from England to join the staff of the Toowoomba Foundry only one stayed long enough to qualify for the incentive which the foundry hoped would keep them in Toowoomba working for them. I suspect by now that the last one of the 40 has left Toowoomba. This is a very difficult situation for an industry such as a foundry, but I will not dwell on it at length. I point out the difficulty facing all country, rural and provincial areas, in keeping young people, skilled employees and professional men. I was very interested recently to read details of a scheme proposed by the Cloncurry Shire Council to air-condition all buildings within the shire. This will probably be very difficult to implement but I wish the council well because I realise, and I think all hon. members realise, the necessity to make conditions in country areas as pleasant as possible so that we do not have an unnecessary exodus of young people or skilled people from the country areas to the city.

I was told by some of the management at the Toowoomba Foundry—and this is cause for concern for all hon. members—that the English migrants who left Toowoomba did

not come to Brisbane. Virtually all of them went to Sydney and Melbourne. The attraction of the big cities is to be found there but I am unable to say what attraction takes people away from places like Toowoomba and similar cities to the big lights of Sydney and Melbourne. This is a matter of concern for all hon. members and, with due regard to the hon. member for Townsville North, Toowoomba is quite a pleasant spot, and, if we cannot keep migrants in Toowoomba, how can we keep them in places such as Townsville? In a more serious vein, this is the problem: Toowoomba has found it impossible to keep 40 skilled British migrants and the chances of keeping young people in the remote and unfavourable areas of the State are indeed small. I wished to bring this matter to the attention of hon. members to give them the benefit of this information.

My other comments concern educational matters. I make a plea to the Minister for Education to give serious consideration to the necessity of a third high school in Toowoomba. I know that other provincial cities are making similar requests and I do not doubt that the need for a third high school is as great in those cities as it is in Toowoomba. The Department of Education has reserved land in various corners of Toowoomba for future educational needs. There is a site in Ramsay Street, Toowoomba, set aside for a future high school. The Toowoomba Opportunity School now stands in one corner of that site.

Experience in recent years has shown us that the area of land in Ramsay Street reserved for a high school will in future be totally inadequate. It is in an area where a great deal of residential development is taking place. If the Government acts quickly it can buy some of the land still available, in large area, that is suitable for an additional high school. If the Government is slow and does not purchase this land that is still available to the State for a high school, the area will be completely built out. The cost of resumption, should it be necessary in future, will be so much greater than the cost of purchasing the land now. I make this request to the Government: that it look urgently at the possibility of buying further land in the Ramsay Street area and reserve it for the needs of a future high school there.

There are two high schools at the moment in Toowoomba, each of which has a school population of approximately 1,400. The high school in my electorate, the Toowoomba High School—the Mt. Lofty High School as it is popularly called—is very cramped now for space. It has recently been given a Commonwealth grant for a science laboratory. The only space remaining for the science laboratory is the last patch of lawn in the school. Members of the staff are quite disappointed to see their one small patch of lawn disappearing for the new science block which has to come. This school is very short of space, as no doubt many other schools

throughout Queensland are. Fortunately the Government has agreed to resume an area of approximately 3 acres over the road from the school. It was previously a Toowoomba City Council gravel pit. This will in a small way assist in the accommodation and space problems of the Toowoomba High School. Neither the Toowoomba High School nor the Harristown High School is centrally situated. They are in diagonally opposite sections of the city. Both are inconvenient for access by many of the pupils who attend them. Apart from the considerations of overcrowding and difficult access, it is important that a third high school be built. If it cannot be built within the next few years I urge the Government to at least acquire what further land is still available in the area.

I draw the attention of the Committee to statements made recently about school buses. I have served as a teacher in many areas of the Darling Downs. For some years as a relieving teacher I served in about 30 country schools. I have seen various standards of school transport. So I find myself in agreement with a statement made on 18 September by Mr. George Schofield, secretary of the Queensland Motor Bus Proprietors Association. He said, "Sub-standard vehicles are being used on some Queensland country school bus runs." When a school bus has broken down I have seen school children placed in cattle trucks, and dirty cattle trucks at that, to get them to school. I feel that many of the buses operating on school bus runs in Queensland are city bus run rejects that are no longer serviceable. They are prone to break down, and their general appearance is such that no self-respecting adult would enter them. These buses are being sold to private operators for use on school bus runs. There is now quite a trade in used buses, and I have in my electorate what might be called a used-bus yard. The buses in it are most dilapidated, as are many of those used on school bus runs. I have seen used as school buses converted trucks and utilities with canvas sides and nothing more. The children sit on the tray of the truck. If it rains, the canvas is pulled down. The children are then perhaps a little safer and the danger of their being thrown out is reduced. When the weather is fine, the canvas is hauled up again and the children have to hold on wherever they can.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Don't forget the "bird cage" buses—the ones in which they lock them in.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** That is right; I have noticed those cages. The responsibility for school buses, as the Minister pointed out in reply to a question of mine, rests on local conveyance committees, which are committees formed by parents of the children who will be using the school buses. It is the responsibility of such a committee to select a contractor and to operate the school bus service. Some of the school bus runs are most profitable; others are less so. Established bus runs that are profitable can be sold at high prices, and an examination of

the classified advertisement columns in some country newspapers will reveal from time to time advertisements offering for sale at high prices established school bus runs and buses. In many instances the operation of school buses is a very profitable business. If it is not profitable on a full-time basis, it becomes profitable to some who are able to do it on a part-time basis.

It is a pity that the Government is not able to supervise more adequately the standard of school buses. From time to time when it has been my responsibility to supervise children who are entering buses I have been disgusted at the way in which they are crammed into totally inadequate vehicles. The children are crowded together in what can only be described as unhygienic and ill-ventilated vehicles. And the trip may extend for perhaps 30 miles, although towards the end of it the bus is much emptier. Many of the buses operating in Queensland as school buses are completely inadequate for the number of children using them.

I think it reasonable that our children should travel to and from school in these buses in some standard of comfort. It is certainly essential that they be able to travel to school with a high standard of safety. Yet time and time again I have recorded instances of buses breaking down on the road and children being late for school. Many of the buses are not safe.

I bring these points to the attention of the Committee and urge the Government to supervise more adequately the standard of school buses. I can only say at the moment that the Department of Education is happy to pass the buck in this matter to local conveyance committees. The department's response to any such complaint that I make is that the responsibility for school buses rests on local conveyance committees. This is merely passing the buck. In many respects local conveyance committees do not fulfill their obligations and are happy to accept existing conditions, even if they are most unsatisfactory. I hope the Government will see its way clear to institute some sort of control over school buses, so that the Department of Education or machinery inspectors are able to order off the road immediately any buses that are mechanically unsound.

I turn then to another subject that looks more to the future. I have been dismayed over a period of years by the primitive standards of hygiene in most Queensland schools. Toilet facilities in many of the State's schools, to put it kindly, are very unpleasant. There are totally-inadequate washing facilities for children. The usual washing facilities in school toilets are one tap situated outside the toilets. No basin is provided; no soap is provided; there are no amenities. No tangible encouragement is offered to children to wash their hands after they have been to the toilet, yet this is a very important part of health training in schools. In other areas of the schools, horse troughs are offered to children for drinking

purposes and for washing purposes. That is exactly what they are, Mr. Rae—horse troughs with a number of taps spread along them. If the children do not bring their own cup or glass to school, they have to put their mouth down and drink from the tap. If they wish to wash their hands, they do so in cold water. No washing facilities are provided; no drying facilities are provided. The standard of hygiene is very low indeed. Teachers throughout the State are charged with the responsibility of giving lessons in hygiene to children, yet the example in hygiene provided by the department is very miserable indeed.

I speak now of eating facilities for children. In common with most hon. members, I came through State schools as a pupil, and the facilities that were provided then, and are still provided, seemed to me to be the normal thing. But a year or so ago I had the privilege of teaching at schools in London and I had my eyes opened to what good facilities can be provided by an enlightened Department of Education. All school children there are provided with a hot mid-day meal, if they wish to have it. They sit down at tables and are provided with cutlery and crockery. They are encouraged to wash their hands in hot water and with soap before they eat, and they eat in heated premises.

I do not suggest that these same things ought to apply in Queensland; our climatic conditions are very different; but I do suggest that we ought to do better for our school-children than we do. When children are dismissed for their lunch in Queensland, the usual practice is for them to run downstairs. They might sit on a slab of wood set in concrete; more likely, they sit on grass in an open playground. If they are in unfavourable areas of the State, the grass does not exist and they sit on the dirt. They might sit next to open bins into which all their refuse is thrown. It is easy to imagine the menace to health from the dust and from the flies, but this is tolerated. I suggest that conditions such as these should not be tolerated any longer. It may well be true that priorities in education mean that money has to be spent more urgently on other features, but I think we should bear in mind the need to improve, over a long period of years, facilities for children for hygiene and eating.

I have a very unusual document here that I wish to discuss briefly. It is part of the campaign by the Queensland Teachers' Union addressed to the Treasurer, Mr. Chalk—"When the subject is money, everybody listens. Well, nearly everybody. Right, Mr. Chalk?" The Queensland Teachers Union decided this year, of necessity, that it must spend \$10,000 on a publicity campaign. This decision was taken on 4 May, and it was an unprecedented decision. Never before has the Queensland Teachers' Union

and never before have Queensland teachers felt the need to carry on a publicity campaign such as this.

This pamphlet says—

“Let’s do this: Make sure that every parent realises how little Queensland spends on education.

“The plight of Queensland’s school children demands a larger financial commitment by the State Government.”

I may or may not agree with those exact sentiments, but the point I want to make is the remarkable situation that has arisen when teachers who have never felt the need to take action such as this are now spending \$10,000 of their money on a publicity campaign. This fact alone, this \$10,000, highlights the distress that teachers feel over their conditions. I do not need to remind hon. members of the strike talk that has been prevalent in many branches of the Queensland Teachers’ Union. It is unfortunate indeed that teachers feel they have cause or need to strike to make their cries heard.

We have many other examples of the discontent currently felt by teachers about their conditions. We have had student work-outs, we have had education campaigns, public meetings, protest meetings, we have had organisations formed to canvass teachers—organisations which might almost be considered as rivals to the Queensland Teachers’ Union.

I do not think I need stress the point that teachers in Queensland feel a great deal of dissatisfaction with present educational standards and present educational amenities in Queensland. On 24 July, the president of the Queensland Teachers’ Union said—

“There is a great deal of dissatisfaction among branches of the union throughout the State.”

That could be called an understatement. I have been in staff rooms and other places where teachers congregate more recently than perhaps most other hon. members in this Chamber and I think that I can, without contradiction, assert that the discontent presently felt by teachers is unprecedented and should not be dismissed by the Government as a passing phase. The moves for a strike that were made by teachers were serious moves and they were made not out of any light regard for education, or for sensationalism, or for some sort of free publicity. They were made because teachers genuinely felt that their grievances were such that they were not being heard and that the only way they could be heard was to strike. It was a genuine expression of their feelings. Numerous branches of the union throughout Queensland were wanting to strike. For the moment this strike threat has been deferred; but it has not been abandoned.

Nobody likes to see strikes among teachers any more than among other workers, and I want to point out to the Committee the

motivation teachers had and their sense of frustration in feeling that the only way they could make their cries heard was by taking this unprecedented action.

The discontent is strongest in high schools, and the chief cause for complaint among high-school teachers is the tremendous responsibility and the tremendous burdens placed upon them by the problem of inadequate staffing. I quote from the Queensland Teachers’ Journal of August, 1966. The editorial is headed, “Wanted 1,000 Teachers,” and the article reads—

“The union estimate of the staffing position in Queensland State primary and secondary schools is that we are 1,000 teachers short, and no formal estimate of the ancillary staff shortage has been made.

“In secondary schools 254 teachers are required so that classes in Grades 11 and 12 will have a maximum enrolment of 25, and Grades 8, 9, and 10 will have maximum enrolments of 35. These figures allow teachers five correction-preparation periods per week, an arrangement well behind that operating in New South Wales, where teachers in high schools are allowed 10-12 correction-preparation periods in the week.”

The union’s estimate of 1,000 teachers has brought this response from the Government in the Treasurer’s Financial Statement—

“What are the main expenditure features in the Budget? They are these—

A record level of expenditure on education.

Provision for recruitment of 300 additional trainee teachers from 1st January, 1967.

100 new Diploma of Science Fellowships to the Institute of Technology, commencing in the 1967 Academic Year.”

The Government is prepared to recruit an additional 400 teachers in a year. This is hardly adequate when we consider the numbers of teachers that have resigned. I will deal with that point shortly.

I want to bring to the attention of the Committee the justification for teachers’ complaints about the staffing situation and how they are overburdened. Most teachers want to do a good job; most teachers are anxious to do the very best for the pupils and students under their care. Teachers who are burdened by over-large classes feel a tremendous sense of frustration at being unable to do their best. In many instances classes are far too big for them to be able to devote all their efforts in the directions they feel they should. Although the position is considerably worse in high schools than in primary schools, it is still not good in primary schools.

The Department of Education is aiming at a class size of fewer than 40 in State primary schools, yet in State primary schools in 1966 there are 946 classes with more than 40

pupils, 207 classes in excess of 45, 22 classes in excess of 50, and four classes in excess of 55. In high schools the position is worse. The department is aiming for a class size of 35. Of a total of 119 Grade 12 classes in high schools throughout the State 44 are in excess of the figure being aimed at by the Department of Education; of 173 Grade 11 classes, 77 are in excess of 35; of 560 Grade 10 classes throughout the State, 328 are in excess of the figure that the department considers desirable. Of 628 Grade 9 classes, 437 are in excess of the 35 considered desirable; of the 598 Grade 8 classes, 423 are in excess of what the Minister considers to be a desirable class size in high schools. These figures indicate that teachers in high schools have a tremendous problem with over-large classes.

The Queensland Teachers' Union has said that there is a shortage of 1,000 teachers. The Budget contains provision for an additional 400 teachers, but two years will elapse before they become effective.

The figures for class sizes have improved in recent years, but I wish to bring to the attention of the Committee the manner in which the improvement has been effected. Throughout the State an instruction has been given to head teachers of schools which have classes in excess of the size considered desirable to form composite classes, that is, to divide classes so that the total size is reduced. One section of one class is sent to another room with another teacher and another section is sent elsewhere so that a composite class of two grades is formed, and the total number of children in one room under one teacher is less. Between 1965 and 1966 there was an increase of 108 in the number of composite classes. I want to read the following comments of the assistant secretary of the Queensland Teachers' Union about these composite classes—

"Contriving combinations of classes to keep the average per teacher to a reasonable number will defeat its object if, in the reduction of numbers, the teacher's burden is increased and the amount of time per pupil available to the teacher is lessened."

While we have been able to improve our class sizes, this has been effected at the expense of many teachers who now find themselves with a smaller group of children in their care, but with considerably increased responsibility. The solution is not to be found in forming composite classes but by employing additional teachers.

**Mr. Campbell:** How does this compare with one-teacher schools?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I have not quoted one-teacher schools here. They are in an entirely different category and naturally they have one large composite class.

**Mr. Campbell:** I am referring to the strain on the teachers, or the inadequacy of the teaching that the children receive.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** The strain on the teacher depends on the number of children in the school. The strain on the teacher at a one-teacher school with 20 pupils is not great, but the teacher at a one-teacher school with 40 pupils is subject to considerable strain, especially if a large number of classes is involved. However, with a large number of classes in a school an additional teacher would be appointed.

The composite classes have been formed with the deliberate intention of making the statistical evidence look good. If an accountant acted in such a way he would be accused of fiddling with the books, or playing with the figures. That is what the Department of Education is doing. When composite classes are formed in this way a totally misleading picture of what is happening is portrayed.

The Government plans to recruit an additional 300 trainee teachers and is offering 100 new Diploma of Science fellowships. This is despite what I feel is a genuine statement by the Queensland Teachers' Union about the need for an additional 1,000 teachers.

I turn now to the recruiting of teachers in Queensland. At the Kelvin Grove Teachers' College girls outnumber boys by three to one.

**A Government Member interjected.**

**Mr. P. WOOD:** The boys at the college may not object to this, but those of us who are interested in education do object to the imbalance that is rapidly developing in our educational system.

Figures provided by the Minister in response to a question of mine indicate the seriousness of the position. We ought to have in all schools, both primary and secondary, at least a fifty-fifty balance of male and female teachers. Yet the 1965 figures disclose that of 1,845 teachers admitted into the Department of Education in that year, 436 were males. It is the male teachers who provide the long-term service to education in Queensland. Most of the girls entering the teaching profession will marry and leave the service. They may serve for a time as temporary teachers after their marriage, but after a few years most of them will be lost to education in Queensland.

It is a tragedy that we are not recruiting more young men into the education service in this State. In 1965, 197 male teachers resigned. They would not be any of the 436 who were recruited that year. But that shows that there was a net intake of 239 male teachers in that year. That is very unsatisfactory. The vice-principal of the Kelvin Grove Teachers College, when questioned at the union conference on this matter, said that men were not joining the Department of Education because there were more attractive

avenues of employment. If we want to attract young men to the teaching service we must make it as attractive as outside avenues of employment. That can only mean more attractive salaries and better teaching conditions. Many teachers are leaving not because their salaries are inadequate, but because of the hopelessness of the situation, particularly in high schools, where they cannot do the job as they would like to.

The Department of Education is finding difficulty in keeping its graduate teachers and as many graduates are leaving the department as are joining. There is no incentive for them to stay. As soon as those graduate teachers who have their degrees because of a teaching fellowship from the Education Department serve their bond, they leave the department. If they were able to leave the department without suffering any financial loss before their bond was served they would do so. In the latest award for teachers an allowance of \$160 was granted to graduate teachers. That is a pitiful incentive to these young men with degrees to stay in the Department of Education. We must offer them not only smaller classes but also a better financial incentive to stay in the department. In our primary schools we have just 61 graduate teachers. That is an alarming situation. With the expansion of high schools all primary schools were combed for graduate teachers and we have reached the stage where only 61 graduate teachers are left in our primary schools. I hope that this is not an admission or suggestion by the Department of Education that teachers in primary schools do not require degrees. It would be very wrong to think that.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** They need them more than teachers in secondary schools do.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** Perhaps not more than teachers in secondary schools need them, but at least as much as secondary-school teachers do. Many teachers lack the qualifications that they ought to have, and I cannot help feeling that the Government offers no encouragement of any description to teachers to gain higher qualifications. In Queensland teachers who gain a degree, or six university units towards one, go into Class I, which is the top classification of teachers. After a specified number of years in that classification they reach their top grading and can go no further.

In Queensland, according to figures provided by the Minister, there are just 2,141 Class I teachers. That means that we have 2,141 teachers who have what the Department of Education and the Government consider to be the necessary qualifications for a teacher. There are 7,477 who do not have those qualifications. If they are not fellowship holders, obtaining Class I standard requires much effort and study by teachers once they have left the college. There are sufficient Class I teachers in Queensland from which the Department of Education can obtain its head teachers.

I feel that the Government does not care about the large number of teachers who do not obtain additional qualifications, because a large number of Class II teachers and a small number of Class I teachers means a considerable financial saving to the Government.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Do you know that you can enter the Commonwealth Bank service after passing the Junior, and at the age of 40 receive a salary equivalent to that of a Class I.3 teacher?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I am not surprised to hear that. The difference between the salary of a Class I teacher who has gone as far as he can go and that of a Class II teacher who has gone as far as he can go without additional study is \$680. There are many thousands of teachers throughout Queensland who are halted at the top of the Class II scale who can go no further because they do not have the qualifications required by the department to obtain the higher classification. I feel that this suits the Government because for every teacher who fails to obtain the added qualifications in his own time the Government saves \$680 a year. It offers no encouragement at all to Class II teachers to obtain six university units towards a degree, or a degree. Those teachers who, by their own effort and at their own expense, obtain six units towards a degree, or a degree, do so not because of or through the department but in spite of it. They may be given one afternoon or morning a year off from their duties to sit for the examination, and even that is grudgingly given. If a teacher sits for a university examination in the morning, he is required to report for duty in the afternoon. This is so, we are told, because it is not desired to place an unfair burden on the teachers remaining at the school. The solution is not to bring these teachers back in the afternoon but to have sufficient relieving teachers to take their places.

I now wish to refer to the inability of teachers to make any public comment on education in Queensland. Regulation 36 of the Public Service Regulations reads—

"An officer shall not publicly comment upon the administration of any department of the State."

I wish to refer to this regulation, particularly as it relates to teachers.

By that regulation teachers are prohibited from taking part in any public discussion on education, from making any public statements on education, or from speaking on education in any way. The inference, then, is that if teachers speak on education they will speak irresponsibly. That is far from the truth. I think that all Queensland teachers who want to make a contribution to discussions on education will do so in a very responsible, sane and sensible way. The inference to be drawn from the regulation that prohibits teachers from making any sort

of public statement is that they would do a disservice to education in Queensland, and that is quite wrong.

I suggest to the Government that the regulation should be revised. In my opinion it is very necessary that Queensland teachers should be allowed, and even encouraged, to speak their minds on education problems. After all, nobody is more familiar with education problems in Queensland than the teachers in this State. What a ridiculous situation it is when those best qualified to speak on education are gagged and prevented from doing so!

In the field of education, I think that the Government has become the victim of its own propaganda. For election after election we have heard that our educational system in Queensland is excellent and that it matches any system in Australia. It seems almost that the Government has come to believe this. But if we are to use spending on education per head of population as any sort of measure—I believe that we may—the figure in Queensland is lower than that in any other Australian State. The figures are—

	\$
New South Wales .. .. .	3.70
Victoria .. .. .	3.66
South Australia .. .. .	3.95
Western Australia .. .. .	3.82
Tasmania .. .. .	4.19
Queensland .. .. .	2.79

I think it is valid for me to use those figures as an indication that Queensland is not matching the educational services and standards in other States.

It has been said by some officials of the Queensland Teachers' Union that the most urgent need of education in Queensland is more finance. I do not want to disagree with that statement particularly. I know that if the Treasurer had much more money available he may be able to do more for education. In my opinion, the basic problem of education in Queensland, before one comes to the financial aspect, is to make people realise that education in this State is not all that we believe it to be and is certainly not all that it should be. We should forget the sort of propaganda we hear from election to election about the Government's magnificent achievements in the field of education. I do not wish to decry what has been done in that field, but we should recognise and admit—there is a lack of inclination on the part of many members of the Government to do this—that there are serious problems in the State's educational services. Frequently one hears apologies and attempts to cover up the defects in the educational system. Instead of being given a frank admission of its faults, the people are told that everything is all right. Until the public generally realise that the present system is not good, there will never be an urge to spend more money on education. It is not a matter, firstly, of spending the money; it is a matter of realising that the need is there to spend the money.

I make an appeal to hon. members, and to the public generally, to try to face up to the problems of education, to come to a realisation that our education system is not as good as we think it is. Most hon. members are products, probably in one way or another, of the Queensland educational system, and because of that we would be reluctant to admit that our education was lacking in some respect or other. It is only natural that we should think that our education was a good one, and because we are the products of our own educational system there is a dangerous tendency for us to become blind to its faults, or to ignore them.

I think we can do no better service to education in this State than to discuss freely the problems that do exist and to realise the problems that are there, instead of attempting to cover up and conceal them.

I hope that I may be considered a friendly critic of education. I was a teacher myself and I would be the first to admit that the possibility is always there that I might some day be a teacher again. So the criticisms I make of education in this State are made seriously and, I hope, in a friendly way. I support the amendment before the Committee.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.34 p.m.