

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 1971**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 1971

The House met at 11 a.m.

### ABSENCE OF MR. SPEAKER

The Clerk informed the House that Mr. Speaker was absent owing to an eye operation.

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes) read prayers and took the chair as Acting Speaker.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Acts Interpretation Act Amendment Bill;
- Legal Assistance Act Amendment Bill;
- Elections Act Amendment Bill;
- Audit Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2);
- Vehicle & General Insurance Company (Australia) Ltd. (Motor Vehicle Insurance) Bill;
- Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill;
- Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Act Amendment Bill;
- Constitution Acts Amendment Bill.

### DEATHS OF MR. W. C. HEATLEY and MR. V. E. JONES

#### SEATS DECLARED VACANT

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that the Registrar-General has forwarded certified copies of the registration of the death—

(a) on 29 October 1971, of William Clarence Heatley, Esquire, lately serving in the Legislative Assembly as member for the electoral district of Albert; and

(b) on 30 October 1971, of Vincent Edward Jones, Esquire, lately serving in the Legislative Assembly as member for the electoral district of Callide.

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

“That the seats in this House for the electoral districts of Albert and Callide have become and are now vacant by reason of the death of the said William Clarence Heatley, Esquire, and of the said Vincent Edward Jones, Esquire.”

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.7 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“1. That this House desires to place on record its sense of the loss this State has sustained by the death of William Clarence Heatley, Esquire, lately serving as member for the electoral district of Albert

and of Vincent Edward Jones, Esquire, lately serving as member for the electoral district of Callide.

“2. That Mr. Speaker be requested to convey to the widows and families of the deceased gentlemen the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained.”

In the brief interval since the House last met we have experienced the loss by death of two of our fellow members. Both were very friendly men, and I am sure they were respected by every member of the House.

William Clarence Heatley, whose death occurred unexpectedly on 29 October, shared our company and friendship in this House for a little under two years, and in that relatively short time he gained the friendship and esteem of every honourable member. To many of us he became known as “Gentleman Bill” because of his courteousness and the way he conducted himself. He entered the Chamber on 4 March 1970 as the member for Albert, following in the footsteps of the late Cec Carey, who also died suddenly, in late 1969. Mr. Heatley was an earnest worker in the interests of his constituents.

In a career spanning 51 years, Bill Heatley tackled life as he found it and won his place on the sports field, in the rural sphere, on active service, in industry, and, lastly in the political arena. He was educated at Charters Towers, Townsville and Southport, and studied first-year medicine at the University of Queensland. But it was as a man of the people, rather than as a man of medicine, that Bill Heatley was to make his mark. He was a tar-boy and jackaroo on properties in the Gulf Country and the Charters Towers and Cloncurry districts. He managed timber yards and furniture factories in Townsville, and owned sheep and cattle stations at Warwick and Condamine. Following this, he became a prawn-trawler owner and a director of a trawler company operating in North Queensland.

On active service in World War II in the desert campaign in North Africa and New Guinea, Bill Heatley rose from the rank of private to captain, was twice wounded, and was mentioned in despatches.

Bill Heatley's interest in politics led to his occupying a seat in the Senate in 1966, although his term in that Chamber lasted only eight months. Later, with characteristic vigour, he entered State politics, standing for the seat of Albert in last year's by-election.

The passing of Bill Heatley is mourned by his widow, two sons, two daughters, a wide circle of friends and acquaintances and, I am sure, every member of this House.

Vincent Edward Jones died, at the age of 61, on 30 October, shortly after returning from a two-week parliamentary visit to New Guinea. He was a member of this House for 21 years and very efficiently carried out

the duties of Chief Government Whip for nearly 12 years. I had the pleasure of being the first member to go into the Callide electorate and campaign with him 21 years ago when he made his successful first attempt to enter this Parliament.

Therefore, I came to know and appreciate him from the very beginning of his parliamentary career. He was prominent and very active in Country Party activities, and we will miss his strong support in very many areas.

Apparently the end also came to Vince Jones without warning, following his attendance at a church function in his electorate of Callide. The late gentleman was highly respected and was a firm friend of all of us in this Chamber. He closely identified himself with a wide field of interests, particularly anything touching on the welfare of Central Queensland. I know I speak for all in saying we shall miss his friendly presence in this House and his ready co-operation, as Whip, to accommodate members who desired to absent themselves from the House. In this way he endeared himself to all honourable members.

Before his election, Vince Jones was a primary producer, being closely involved in farming pursuits such as pig-raising and pig-breeding. At that time he owned a Berkshire stud piggery. He was interested in and was a keen follower of trotting. He was a supervisor of the Trotting Control Board of Queensland, and also served the Central Queensland Trotting Club both as president and on committees, and spear-headed negotiations with the Rockhampton Agricultural Society for the introduction of night trotting to Central Queensland. Through his close association with the Rockhampton Agricultural Society he was in constant touch with the primary-producing sector of his large electorate, and for many years he served in the capacity of judge in various sections of shows. I frequently came into contact with him at shows throughout Queensland where he was acting as a judge.

Vince Jones leaves a widow, a son and a daughter, as well as a far-reaching circle of friends, to mourn his most untimely death.

I feel it is fitting that this House should record its appreciation of the services that these two deceased gentlemen rendered to the State, and its deep sympathy for their families and relatives in the loss they have sustained.

**Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer) (11.14 a.m.): I rise to associate myself and the members of my party with the motion of condolence moved by the Premier, who covered fairly fully the activities of the two honourable members whose deaths everyone in this Chamber sincerely regrets. Both were comparatively young men.

Mr. Heatley, at 51 years of age, undoubtedly could look forward not only to continuing his career in politics but also, because he was associated with many activities, to achieving greater eminence in this Chamber. His death came as a great shock not only to every honourable member but also to the community generally.

Bill Heatley was one who in every-day life was able to associate himself with every type of organisation. I know that, during the short period he was in this Parliament, he was not only a loyal member but was also prepared to work actively in the interests of his party and of the State as a whole. I knew him earlier in life because of the association of his family with North Queensland. The name "Heatley" is very well known throughout the State, and I join with many other people in Queensland today in the passing of this motion of condolence to the wife and family of the late Bill Heatley.

Vin Jones came to this Chamber in 1950. He was therefore one of the few members on this side who at one time sat in Opposition. He was aware of the many problems associated with politics, and he served his area loyally and well. He was not afraid to express himself as opposed to certain things when he felt that the views of the majority did not cover the needs of the minority in his electorate, and I always admired him for his sincerity of purpose.

I join with the Premier in the moving of this motion of condolence to the wives and families of the two honourable members who passed away during the recent short recess.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.17 a.m.): I desire to join Opposition members with the Premier and the Deputy Premier in this motion of condolence to the wives and families of both the late Bill Heatley and the late Vin Jones. As the Premier has covered the full extent of their activities, both private and in this House, I do not intend to recount them. Naturally, I endorse what has been said.

I am sure it was a great shock to all honourable members to hear that Bill Heatley had passed away. No sooner had we recovered from that shock than we heard that Vin Jones had also passed away. Although Bill Heatley was under medical care prior to his death, I understand that the condition for which he was being treated was not the cause of his death.

Deaths such as these demonstrate the tremendous pressure under which members of Parliament, whether they be back-benchers or Ministers, work, as neither of the deceased gentlemen was elderly. They were both young enough to have very full lives ahead of them, and were very active in their electorates right up to the time of their passing. The fact that four members out of 78 have died during the term of this Parliament, three of them this year, is some indication

that the death-rate among members of Parliament is rather high. I do not intend to look for reasons for that—certainly not at this stage—but I do believe that it is something that must enter our minds when motions such as this come before us.

Naturally we will all miss these two gentlemen. Honourable members on this side of the House found them both very easy to get along with. We had no great arguments with them, either inside or outside the House; in fact, there were some personal friendships between the two late members and members of the Opposition. I believe that that is as it should be. As members of Parliament, we should argue and fight for the principles in which we believe and which the organisations to which we belong support. However, as human beings, we should extend to one another courtesy and friendship, particularly as we must work together. Although we may hold different views as to how a particular end should be attained, I do not think anyone would deny that those who have the privilege of serving in this Chamber have as their main aim the betterment of Queensland. Certainly both the deceased members, each in his own way, took the opportunities offered to them to achieve that aim.

The Opposition regrets the need for the Premier to move the motion, but supports it wholeheartedly.

**Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT** (Mackenzie—Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs) (11.22 a.m.): I associate myself with the remarks of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. My association with the late Vince Jones went back over a great many years. I lived in the Callide electorate before entering Parliament; in fact, I lived there when I first entered this Assembly. As a family man, he could only be described as one of the best. He always thought first of his family, and he did a wonderful job for both his children. He also gave his electorate very able representation. As most honourable members know, Callide is a very difficult electorate to represent. Of course, no matter which electorate one represents, one has problems from time to time.

Although, as the Leader of the Opposition said, we have our differences in this Chamber, our one aim should be to work for the benefit of Queensland. That certainly was the policy of the late Vince Jones. The honourable member for Rockhampton North and I travelled with him for approximately 15 years between Rockhampton and Brisbane and came to know him very well. Naturally, I join with other speakers in offering condolences to Mrs. Jones, Darrel and Gail.

As far as Bill Heatley is concerned, let me say at the outset that few honourable members knew the strain under which he served the people of this State. He was a

wonderful soldier, and, after the end of World War II, one never heard him complain. He spoke to me on the telephone one day in the week in which he died. Although on that very morning he had had some shrapnel removed from a war injury, he took the trouble to discuss with me problems associated with his electorate. In my opinion, that indicates the wonderful spirit of a wonderful man, and I also express my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Heatley and the members of her family.

Motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

#### PAPERS

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

##### Reports—

Public Service Board, for the year 1970-71.

Health and Medical Services of the State, for the year 1970-71.

Queensland Radium Institute, for the year 1970-71.

Queensland Institute of Medical Research, for the year 1970-71.

Director, Department of Children's Services, for the year 1970-71.

Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies, for the year 1970-71.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Act 1971.

##### Orders in Council under—

Greenvale Agreement Act 1970-1971.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1968.

The Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1967.

Water Act 1926-1968.

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1969.

##### Regulations under—

Pay-roll Tax Act 1971.

Racing and Betting Act 1954-1971.

Stamp Act 1894-1971.

Report of the Brisbane Market Trust, for the year 1970-71.

#### PROPOSED BY-ELECTIONS, ALBERT AND CALLIDE

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.27 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That by-elections be held for the electoral districts of Albert and Callide, and that Mr. Speaker take steps for all necessary things to be done to have this decision carried out.”

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North) (11.28 a.m.): I second the motion.

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 28

Aiken  
Baldwin  
Bennett  
Blake  
Bromley  
Casey  
Davis  
Dean  
Hanson  
Harris  
Houston  
Inch  
Jensen  
Jones  
Jordan

Marginson  
Melloy  
Moore, F. P.  
Newton  
O'Donnell  
Thackeray  
Tucker  
Wallis-Smith  
Wood, B.  
Wood, P.  
Wright

*Tellers:*  
Hanlon  
Lloyd

NOES, 39

Ahern  
Alison  
Armstrong  
Bird  
Bjelke-Petersen  
Camm  
Campbell  
Chalk  
Chinchen  
Cory  
Fletcher  
Herbert  
Hewitt, N. T. E.  
Hewitt, W. D.  
Hinze  
Hodges  
Houghton  
Hughes  
Hungerford  
Kaus  
Knox

Lee  
Lickiss  
Lonergan  
McKechnie  
Miller  
Moore, R. E.  
Müller  
Murray  
Porter  
Rae  
Richter  
Row  
Sullivan  
Tomkins  
Tooth  
Wharton

*Tellers:*  
Crawford  
Lane

PAIRS:

Sherrington  
Bousen

Delamothe  
Low

Resolved in the negative.

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

### ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL COUNCIL

**Mr. Houston**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) On what date did the Environmental Control Council first meet?

(2) How many meetings have since been held?

(3) What positive decisions have been made at these meetings?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The Environmental Control Council first met on May 11, 1971. However, a considerable amount of preliminary work in the way of preparation of working papers for consideration was carried out before the meeting and in fact, this is done before each meeting is held."

(2) "Two."

(3) "Decisions have been made to set up the following committees:—(a) An executive committee to deal with urgent matters and to forward matters requiring attention to the appropriate department; (b) A Waste Disposal on Land Committee,

on which representatives from the Chamber of Manufactures, the Institute of Health Surveyors and the Brisbane City Council have been included. This committee is working and has appointed a sub-committee to study agricultural wastes; (c) A Noise Control Committee, which includes representatives from the Trades and Labour Council, the University of Queensland, the Australian Medical Association and the Chamber of Manufactures; (d) An interim committee to consider a number of submissions on matters relating to land utilisation and to advise the council on a course of future action in regard to the problems and conflicts arising in land utilisation. It has also been decided to publish a regular Newsletter for general distribution and to furnish information to the Department of Education for distribution to schools."

### ABORIGINAL AND ISLANDER RESERVES

**Mr. B. Wood**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

(1) How many reserves exist where Aborigines or Islanders live in a community adjacent to towns and cities in Queensland?

(2) Which towns and cities have a reserve adjacent to them?

(3) What is the average population at each of these reserves?

*Answers:—*

(1) "I draw the Honourable Member's attention to the Annual Report from the Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs which is tabled in this House. Detailed within the report is a list of communities showing population together with areas and a map of Queensland showing their location to the nearest city or town."

(2) "As the number of reserves is considerable, a list is being prepared detailing each reserve indicating the city or town in which the reserve is located or the nearest city or town to these areas and this information will be forwarded to the Honourable Member when it has been completed."

(3) "Details which would provide information of individual average populations are not available and such an assessment which would entail considerable costs, does not appear at this time to be justified."

### WAGE RATES, ABORIGINAL AND ISLANDER RESERVES

**Mr. B. Wood**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

What is the present wage being paid to Aborigines and Islanders at the reserves of (a) Cherbourg, (b) Yarrabah, (c) Woorabinda, (d) Palm Island, (e) Badu Island

and (f) Edward River in the categories of (i) labourer, (ii) mechanic (non-staff member), (iii) policeman, (iv) staff teacher (senior), (v) stockman and (vi) carpenter?

*Answer:—*

“As has previously been pointed out in answer to Questions on March 10, 1970, November 13, 1969, November 6, 1968, September 10, 1968, all persons employed within the staff establishment in the categories identified by the Honourable Member are paid conventional award rates, irrespective of racial origin, based on qualifications and ability. Other persons assisting in the various functions receive allowances within the range indicated in a statement which, because of the amount of detail it contains, I now table for the information of the Honourable Member. I again emphasise for the Honourable Member's information that the Government does not undertake to provide award wage employment for all persons who seek to live within a reserve area and indeed, economically, this would not be possible; however, there have been regular increases in the allowances, the most recent being \$2 weekly retrospective to and effective from July 1, 1971.”

*Paper.*—Whereupon Mr. Hewitt laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

#### LOCAL AUTHORITY CASINO POLLS

**Mr. Hinze**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

As the establishment of a casino is not the function of a local authority, does this preclude a local authority from conducting a referendum to establish the opinion of the people within its area on this question? If so, will he consider amending the Local Government Act to allow such a referendum to be held?

*Answer:—*

“I am of the opinion that a local authority would have no power under the Local Government Act to take a poll of electors to obtain an expression of opinion on the question of the establishment of a casino in its area, and that the Act would have to be amended to constitute such establishment a function of local government before such a poll could be taken. As the Honourable Member will appreciate, in view of the Government's policy decision in relation to the establishment of casinos in Queensland, of which the Honourable Member is aware, I can only say at this point in time that the Local Government Act will not be amended to constitute the establishment of casinos a function of local government.”

#### HOUSING COMMISSION PENSIONER UNITS

**Mr. Hinze**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Are pensioners within Queensland being deprived of the benefits of pensioner flats or units at a cheap rental, which apply in other States?

(2) Are any pensioner units or flats planned for the Gold Coast area?

*Answers:—*

(1) “No. Contracts already let, or tenders called to date, provide for 93 units.”

(2) “Yes. Discussions are in hand with the Gold Coast and Albert councils. Plans and specifications are being prepared for eight units at Currumbin and at the suggestion of the Albert Council consideration is being given to units for Beenleigh. The Housing Commission has been able recently to acquire a large area of land at Southport for residential subdivision and the Gold Coast City Council has requested some adjustments to the subdivisional design to conform to its overall planning. This is in hand and it is intended that part of this land will be made available for aged persons units. Land previously held at Southport was released for freeway purposes.”

#### EFFECT OF S.T.D. ON DEPARTMENTAL TELEPHONE ACCOUNTS

**Mr. Hinze**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Has there been a substantial increase in the telephone accounts of the various Government departments in the Brisbane area since the introduction of S.T.D.?

(2) What steps are being taken by his Department to ensure that this convenience is not abused?

*Answers:—*

(1) “Telephone accounts of the various Government departments throughout the State, payment for which is the responsibility of the Department of Works, have increased from \$227,481.02 per annum in 1967-68 when S.T.D. was introduced to \$383,423.88 in 1970-71. In the same period, there has been an increase of 17.5 per cent. in basic rental and 20.1 per cent. in charges for local calls. Trunk line and phonogram charges have also been increased substantially. Separate figures are not readily available for the Brisbane charges. Having regard to expansion of Government services, the increase in costs is considered to be within reasonable bounds.”

(2) “The dialling of trunk calls direct from extension telephones has been prohibited and instructions promulgated

through my Department and also client departments that trunk line calls must be routed through the switch operator. Returns of trunk line calls made are examined by senior officers of my Department and returns furnished to client departments to enable any abnormal increases to be investigated. The automatic barring of telephones against direct S.T.D. dialling was subject to joint departmental investigation and was not approved on a cost basis."

NATIONAL PARK STATUS FOR TURTLE  
ROOKERY, MON REPOS BEACH

**Mr. Bromley** for **Mr. Sherrington**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

As the land subdivider concerned with land development at Mon Repos beach, which area involves the turtle rookery, has indicated his willingness to co-operate with the move to have the area given national park or other status, what are the reasons for the delay in finalising the matter?

*Answer:—*

"The proposal for a national park at Mons Repos beach involves an area of about 145 acres which includes some 92 acres of reserve with the remainder on freehold land under three separate ownerships. Mr. B. Palm offered to donate 6 acres under his ownership and his generous offer was accepted. Action in respect to this area must await finalisation of negotiations in hand to acquire additional areas to form a park that may fulfill the purpose for which it is being sought."

TEACHER RESIGNATIONS, BRISBANE  
STATE HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has he read the claim made by Mr. J. Reed, Acting Principal, Brisbane State High School, at the school's speech night, that 35 teachers had left the school during twelve months?

(2) What is the reason for this general exodus of teachers from this, the most outstanding high school in Queensland?

(3) What happened to the fifteen teachers who, after joining the staff this year, decided to leave the services of the school?

(4) Does his Department propose to implement a contract system for teachers as suggested by Mr. Reed?

(5) How many resignations from the school are presently pending?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Yes."

(2) "In the staff of 101 there were 35 changes in the last twelve months. These changes were caused by:—Retirements, 3; transfers to positions of higher classification, 3; resignations to teach overseas or in other States, 6; to teach in independent schools, 3; transfers to meet departmental requirements, 6; transfers at teachers own requests, 2; resignations for family reasons, 6; resignation to enter business, 1; no reason given, 5; Supply B (or part-time) teachers who are not required to give reasons for resignation."

(3) "The 15 staff changes which occurred during this year were occasioned by:—Resignations to teach in independent schools, 3; resignations to teach overseas or in other States, 4; resignations for family reasons, 2; retirement because of illness, 1; transfers to meet departmental requirements, 4; no reason given, 1; Supply B (part-time) teacher."

(4) "No."

(5) "To date advice has been received of the secondment of one teacher to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea at his own request. One teacher is believed to have been called up for National Service but no official confirmation of this has been received by my Department. Five teachers have indicated to the principal that they intend to resign but no official letters of resignation have as yet been received at Head Office."

UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

**Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Is he aware that at the Indooroopilly State High School speech night on October 25, Professor Zelman Cowen claimed that, because of the Radford system, the university could well have to impose stricter entrance examinations in order to preserve a quota system for entrance to the university?

(2) Does his Department propose to allow these examinations which would appear merely to replace the erstwhile Senior public examination for matriculation to university?

(3) If so, will this give the university the right to determine who should enter the campus instead of the previous system whereby the right to enter was determined by an independent examination thus preventing preferential treatment to any category of students?

(4) If the university is to impose this qualifying entrance examination, will it be common to all schools throughout the State and, if so, will this not defeat the very purpose of the Radford Report?

Answers:—

(1) "I am aware of the address by Professor Zelman Cowen."

(2 to 4) "Under section 34 of "The University of Queensland Act of 1965" the Senate is authorised to make statutes not inconsistent with the Act on many matters including "The matriculation of students". As an autonomous institution the university has always had the right to determine its entry qualifications. My Department has no authority to interfere in the university's domestic affairs. The Senior examination has been used by the university as the basis for matriculation; it has determined from time to time the standard of results to be obtained in the Senior examination by a candidate to qualify for entry to the university. Implementation of the recommendations of the Radford Report ensures that secondary school students have a curriculum to suit their needs and not one based on examination requirements. The Board of Secondary School Studies has university representation and there is every reason to believe that the Senate of the University will be reluctant to impose another examination, the prescriptions for which would be incompatible with the Radford recommendations."

PERIODS OF SERVICE, RAILWAY APPEAL BOARD CHAIRMEN

Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) As he informed this House, following the sacking of Mr. O'Connor, S.M., from the Railway Appeal Board, that all magistrates were going to be placed on a six-months' roster system thereafter, what are the names of the magistrates and the time each has served since the removal of Mr. O'Connor?

(2) How long was Mr. Wolfgang, S.M., who replaced Mr. O'Connor, allowed to remain as chairman of the Railway Appeal Board and, except for the period of his long service leave, was Mr. Wolfgang allowed to remain on the Board until his retirement?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The names of stipendiary magistrates available for appointment on the Railway Appeal Board are supplied from time to time by the Department of Justice to the Railways Department. Stipendiary magistrates serving on the Railway Appeal Board are necessarily appointed from the Brisbane Bench where provision was made some years ago by the Public Service Commissioner for an additional stipendiary magistrate for the purpose. While a roster system for the stipendiary magistrates serving on the Railway Appeal Board is favoured by the administration of the Department of

Justice, it has been found rather difficult to implement. Most of the stipendiary magistrates are adverse to travelling away from home and many good reasons are supplied by them to substantiate their objections. The following stipendiary magistrates have been appointed from time to time to be Chairman of the Railway Appeal Board:—

Name of Stipendiary Magistrate	Period of Appointment
P. M. O'Connor ..	23-1-64 to 4-10-64
D. C. Wolfgang ..	5-10-64 to 30-6-70
F. P. Hickey ..	1-7-70 to 22-10-71
H. T. Brooks ..	25-10-71 continuing

Certain other appointments have been made of stipendiary magistrates to act as Chairman of this Appeal Board during the absence of the Chairman. Mr. Wolfgang, S.M., retired on June 30, 1970."

SERVING OF LIQUOR TO WOMEN IN HOTEL PUBLIC BARS

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

Although there has been amending legislation, does the licensee of a hotel still have the right or prerogative of refusing to serve a woman in the public bar even if she is accompanied by her husband or some other close male relative and is acting in a sober, proper and decent manner?

Answer:—

"There is no provision under the *Liquor Act* 1912-1970 which requires a licensed victualler to serve any person, male or female, in a public bar of a hotel. The sale of liquor is no different at common law from the sale of any other commodity. Apart from any statutory provision, a trader is entitled to trade or not trade as he, in his wisdom and desire, sees fit."

DEMOUNTABLE UNIT, HEATLEY STATE SCHOOL, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) When was the present demountable building at Heatley Primary School, Townsville, manufactured?

(2) At how many schools has it been erected and dismantled since that date?

(3) Do such buildings receive regular inspections and maintenance and, if so, is it considered that the building in question is in a good state of repair?

(4) From where are the additional demountable classrooms, which are to be erected next year at this school, to be obtained?

*Answers:—*

- (1) "During the 1963-64 financial year."
- (2) "Heatley State School is the third school at which this building has been erected."
- (3) "Yes. Flooring was previously replaced and the building internally painted since its erection at Heatley State School. Reports received indicate that this building provides reasonable classroom accommodation."
- (4) "New demountable buildings are being provided by O'Neill Industries (Qld.) Pty. Ltd."

PALLARENDA LAND DEVELOPMENT,  
TOWNSVILLE

**Mr. Tucker**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

Will Three Mile Creek and its environs be interfered with when his Department begins the next stage of the development of its land at Pallarenda, Townsville and, if so, will he give particulars, including details of any plans for preserving the environment in that area?

*Answer:—*

"At the present time, the Townsville City Council is investigating possible methods of developing Three Mile Creek and its environs and until these investigations are completed and the Council decides on a permanent course of action for the area and in the light of any other relevant factors, my Department will defer consideration of further 'stage' residential development there."

STUDENT ASSESSMENT, RADFORD  
REPORT

**Dr. Crawford**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

With regard to the implementation of the Radford Report in secondary schools—

- (1) Could an allotment of a specific number of 6 or 7-level passes to a specific class in a particular school occur?
- (2) Would the assessment of scholars' performances two years before Senior level in any way influence the final level of Senior marking?
- (3) How are open scholarships to the university to be assessed from 1972?
- (4) How often this year has it been found necessary to carry out an external examination in lieu of internal assessment and in which subjects is this occurring most frequently?

*Answers:—*

- (1) "This should not occur. For each subject, the school estimates how many of each grade it will award over the total Grade 10 population. Where the Moderation Committee considers this estimate to be reasonable, the proposed distribution becomes the approved distribution of ratings for this school. A small variation is permitted when final awards are being made."
- (2) "The assessment at Grade 10 level has no bearing on the final level of Senior marking. As from 1972 students will be awarded a grade of achievement for each completed semester unit of work. The Senior Certificate will show grades of achievement for the four semesters of Grades 11 and 12."
- (3) "This has not been determined."
- (4) "External examination in lieu of internal assessment has not occurred this year. There is no reason to believe it will ever occur."

GEORGETOWN-GILBERT RIVER ROAD

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

- (1) When will the sealing of the road section from Georgetown to Gilbert River be completed?
- (2) When will the new bridges over Little River and Norman River be open for traffic?

*Answers:—*

- (1) "Sealing is complete except for three miles which will be done within two weeks."
- (2) "It is anticipated the Little River Bridge will be open for traffic by the end of December. The contract time for completion of the Norman River Bridge is the end of March 1972 but at this stage it appears unlikely this date will be met."

WATER SUPPLY, KARUMBA

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

Further to my Questions concerning a suitable water supply at Karumba and as a permanent supply is needed for both the residents and the prawning industry, what steps are to be taken to provide suitable water for this area?

*Answer:—*

"Provision of a water supply scheme for Karumba, at an estimated cost \$1.91 million, based on supply from the Norman River above Normanton, was reconsidered by the Government recently. It was decided that under present financial conditions the

Government could not make funds available for this project outside the ambit of the State's normal subsidy scheme applicable to local authorities. The Government is however prepared to consider any proposals put forward by prawn processing firms operating at Karumba which might be prepared to assist in this regard. Meanwhile supply must continue to be obtained from shallow groundwater and artesian supplies presently being used."

#### TEACHERS, ABORIGINAL AND ISLANDER SCHOOLS

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

(1) How many teachers are now teaching in schools which were previously under the administration of the Aboriginal and Island Affairs Department and, of these, how many are married?

(2) Is suitable accommodation available for all teachers so employed?

(3) Has any request been made for him to staff other schools which are now under the control of the Aboriginal and Island Affairs Department?

*Answers:—*

(1) "There are at present 73 teachers teaching in schools which were previously under the administration of the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. Of these, 23 teachers are married."

(2) "At present all teachers employed in these schools have suitable accommodation."

(3) "No."

#### APPLICATIONS FOR DEBT RECONSTRUCTION AND BUILD-UP LOANS

**Mr. Kaus**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

(1) How many applications for debt reconstruction have been received by his Department and how many have been serviced?

(2) How many applications have been received for farm build-up loans?

*Answers:—*

(1) "To November 8, 1,092 applications have been received for debt reconstruction and 283 of these have been approved."

(2) "257."

#### COAL-MINING COMPANIES AND TRADE WITH JAPAN

**Mr. O'Donnell**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

What are the names of all coal-mining companies now operating in Queensland, what is their annual trade with Japan,

which companies have firm contracts with Japanese interests and from what locations are the contracted supplies drawn?

*Answer:—*

"I table for the information of the Honourable Member a list of coal mines in operation in Queensland. This list gives, among other information, the names and addresses of the operators. For the year ended June 30, 1971, 6,865,037 tons of coal valued at \$71,391,463 f.o.b. trimmed, were exported to Japan. The following companies have firm contracts with Japan:—Thiess Peabody Mitsui Coal Pty. Ltd., Utah Development Company, Thiess Coal Company, Central Queensland Coal Associates (Utah Development Company and Mitsubishi Development Pty. Ltd.), Dacon Collieries. Contracted supplies are drawn from—Moura-Kianga Mines, Blackwater Mine, South Blackwater Mine, Goonyella (1971), Peak Downs (1972), Dacon Colliery, Collinsville."

*Paper.*—Whereupon Mr. Camm laid upon the Table of the House the list referred to.

#### FAIR RENTS OFFICE

**Mr. Bromley**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) What personnel were employed in the Fair Rents Office during each of the years 1968 to 1971?

(2) What staff are presently employed and what are their duties?

(3) How many complaints were received from tenants during each of the years mentioned and what was the main basis of the complaints?

(4) How many landlords were prosecuted during this time and what are their names?

(5) How many (a) cases for eviction were heard and (b) court eviction notices were issued in the same period?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The numbers of personnel employed in the Fair Rents Office during the years 1968 and 1969 were stated in Answers to the Honourable Member's Questions of September 26, 1968 and September 23, 1969, respectively. In 1970 the staff consisted of the Registrar, who was Clerk of the Court, Brisbane, three authorized officers, one male assistant and two clerk-typists."

(2) "The Landlord and Tenant Acts were repealed by *Termination of Tenancies Act* 1970 which came into operation on and from January 1, 1971. The Office of the Registrar of Fair Rents ceased to function as from the close of business on December 31, 1970."

(3) "The number of complaints received from tenants during each of the years 1968 to 1970 was—1968, 60; 1969, 52; 1970, 5. These complaints mainly related to over-charging of rental, and interfering with use and enjoyment of the premises."

(4) "Fifteen landlords were prosecuted in 1968, 1969 and 1970. Staff is not available to carry out the necessary examination of official files to enable the names of those prosecuted to be stated."

(5) "During this period 179 applications for eviction were heard and 178 Warrants of Possession were issued."

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE, MR. MORIARTY,  
EASTAUS SCHOOL OF ART

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) With regard to Mr. Moriarty, who is known as "The Flying Art Instructor", what areas in the State does he cover and what financial assistance does he receive from the Government?

(2) If he receives no assistance of any kind from the Government and in view of the great work that Mr. Moriarty is doing, will he have the matter investigated so that Mr. Moriarty can assist more people in art instruction by receiving direct help from the Department of Cultural Activities?

Answers:—

(1) "Mr. Moriarty's Eastaus School of Art currently covers most of the principal centres of culture in Queensland, from Brisbane, north to Cairns, west to Mt. Isa and south to Charleville. No claim has yet been received from this organisation. The requisite form was sent to Eastaus on October 21, 1971."

(2) "The Department has already considerably helped this cultural project from its inception with information and contracts, and is closely watching its development."

EDUCATION COSTS, STATE PRIMARY AND  
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

Excluding all costs other than for the provision and maintenance of school buildings, what is the average cost per child per annum of children being taught in (a) State primary and (b) secondary schools in Queensland?

Answer:—

"I feel sure that the Honourable Member meant to exclude the costs for the provision and maintenance of school buildings and not to exclude all costs other than these. The recurrent cost per annum

per child based on 1969-70 expenditures for State primary children is \$216 and that for State secondary children is \$349. It is emphasized that these figures do not include the provision and maintenance of school buildings."

REFUNDS OF T.A.B. BETS

Mr. Hanlon, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) For the information of T.A.B. patrons who may be unaware that they have money due to be refunded to them on unplaced horses which carried more than 50 per cent. of the place pool, will he list those in this category since July 1, 1971, if there are any other than Deerfoot at Coonamble on October 21 and Dual Choice at Caulfield earlier in October?

(2) Will he waive the three months' collection limit for claimants who can evidence a rightful claim of this nature and who were not aware of refunds due to them?

Answers:—

(1) "Dual Choice at Caulfield on October 13, and Deerfoot at Coonamble on October 21, were the only unplaced horses which carried more than 50 per cent. of the place pool since July 1, 1971. However, in addition to the two horses mentioned, Penview at Kembla Grange on September 23, 1971, was placed third in a six horse race on which two place dividends were payable. As this horse carried more than 50 per cent. of the place pool a refund was payable to the investors concerned."

(2) "There is no time limit on the payment of refunds in respect of horses which are scratched or on horses which carry more than 50 per cent. of the place pool."

SCHOOL TRANSPORT SERVICE, BESSIE  
POINT AND SECOND BEACH, CAIRNS

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

In view of his Answer to my Question on October 13 that the school transport service from Bessie Point and Second Beach to Cairns was considered to be unsatisfactory and was receiving urgent attention, what is the progress and position in this regard?

Answer:—

"Following my Answer to the Honourable Member's Question on October 13, the Regional Director of Education, Townsville, has now advised that the Federal Department of Environment, Aborigines and the Arts, has declined to advance a loan to the prospective bus operator. Although the Local Conveyance Committee has not yet announced the permanent appointment of an operator, it is

known that the inspector of schools has arranged for the operation of a temporary service as from Monday the 8th instant. Details are not yet to hand."

REFLECTORISED NUMBER-PLATES FOR  
MOTOR VEHICLES

**Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) Since the introduction of reflectorised rear-lighting was made compulsory for all motor vehicles, has the number of night rear-end collisions been reduced in Queensland and, if so, has a date been determined for the introduction of reflectorised number-plates as a standard fitting in Queensland?

(2) If not, what is the position and has the Australian Transport Advisory Council considered for adoption as a recommendation the standard fitting of reflectorised number-plates in all States?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Appropriate figures relevant to this type of crash are not available. The registration of motor vehicles does not come within my jurisdiction."

(2) "No such recommendation has been adopted. A.T.A.C. Ministers have agreed, however, that States carrying out studies on the effect of reflectorised plates should keep the council informed of results."

SLEEPING-CAR ACCOMMODATION,  
"SUNLANDER" SERVICE

**Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) Is he aware of the difficulty being experienced by the travelling public in obtaining sleeping-car bookings from Cairns since the Sunlander services were curtailed and a new time table was introduced?

(2) In view of the short-fall and the demand for sleeping berths, what action will he take to meet requirements for sleeping-car accommodation in the forthcoming holiday period and in the future?

(3) Are any figures recorded at booking offices which show the number of enquirers for berths and seats who were turned away and, if so, do these figures confirm the need for additional air-conditioned services and, if not, will he consider this method of assessment for future requirements?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) "The curtailment of the 'Sunlander' service was due to lack of patronage. Record is maintained at booking offices of intending passengers who cannot be accommodated at the time of their

enquiry, but who wish to be considered for accommodation should a cancellation occur. It would only be on rare occasions that seating accommodation would not be available."

ESTABLISHMENT OF CEMENT WORKS,  
HEMMANT-LYTTON AREA

**Mr. Harris**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

Has there been any application or enquiry regarding the establishment of a cement works in the Hemmant-Lynton area within the Wynnum Electorate? If so, what are the names of the companies?

*Answer:—*

"I am unaware of any current proposal of this nature."

SUSTENANCE ALLOWANCES FOR CROWN  
EMPLOYEES

**Mr. B. Wood**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Will he list the sustenance allowances for public servants in remote areas?

(2) What is the reason for the delay in payment until January 1, 1972?

*Answers:—*

(1) "I table a statement which sets out the main points of the new scheme for the payment of sustenance allowance to public servants, teachers and police officers serving in remote areas. I might add this information has already been published in the Queensland State Service Union Journal."

(2) "The initial scheme was introduced in 1923. It was unaltered when Labour left office in 1957. I am unable to give any reason for the absence of any improvement during the period of Labour administration. Since then, by comparison, this Government reviewed the scheme in 1960 and will now introduce this new substantially improved arrangement from January 1, 1972."

*Paper.*—Whereupon Mr. Bjelke-Petersen laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS APPEAL

**Mr. MELLOY:** I ask the Minister for Health: Will the money received from the Children's Hospitals Appeal be paid into the collections account or the Hospital Administration Trust Fund, or will a specific trust fund be established?

**Mr. TOOTH:** This is a matter for the consideration of the board. I have no doubt that, when the funds become available from the appeal, the board will give the matter due consideration. Its decision will be conveyed to me, and I shall inform the honourable member of the result.

#### ABORIGINES BILL

##### INITIATION

**Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT** (Mackenzie—Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to provide for the conduct of reserves for Aborigines and for the admission thereto of persons who wish to reside there; for the grant of assistance to Aborigines who seek it; for the repeal of certain provisions of law; and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

#### TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS BILL

##### INITIATION

**Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT** (Mackenzie—Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to provide for the conduct of reserves for Torres Strait Islanders and for the admission thereto of persons who wish to reside there; for the grant of assistance to Torres Strait Islanders who seek it; and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

#### STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL BILL

##### SECOND READING

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.32 p.m.): I move—

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

During the debate on the motion for the introduction of a Bill to provide for State and regional planning and development through a co-ordinated system of public works organisation, for environmental controls, and for related purposes, and after I had announced the broad principles of the legislation, there was general agreement that this was a desirable measure and that a Bill based on these principles should be introduced.

As I indicated in my introductory speech, certain vital sections in the original Co-ordinator General's Act, namely, the

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act, 1938-1970, have been extracted and incorporated in the proposed new legislation. Having had time to peruse the printed Bill in detail, no doubt honourable members will have satisfied themselves which sections of the original Act have been incorporated in the Bill before them and what additional provisions have been made to give effect to the Government's policy of regional planning and to again highlight the importance of environmental matters on a State-wide basis. Thus, they will now be in a position to visualise also the complete coverage and implications of the proposed legislation.

It was obvious at the introductory stage that there was general agreement on the need to provide for the principles contained in the proposed legislation, but various members expressed some concern about the details likely to be contained in it, and, naturally, that was to be expected. No doubt their examination of the printed Bill either will have allayed their fears or will prompt them to raise certain matters for comment or explanation. Therefore, I do not propose to speak at any length at this stage. There are, however, a few points to which I should again draw the attention of honourable members, and I now propose to do that.

I stress that it is the Government's intention to involve as many people as possible, from all sections of the community, in gaining information and seeking ideas, and to provide as wide a range of discussion as it can on matters of a regional concept. It is the Government's responsibility also, in the light of that, to govern and, having taken all views into consideration, to accept the responsibility of determining issues in the interests of the common good.

Much has been said, both inside and outside of this Parliament, about a new Victorian Act entitled the Land Conservation Act of 1970.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** The honourable member for Salisbury said that the Labor Party supported the proposal in its entirety. It opposed it six times in Committee.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Did it? That is very interesting.

**Mr. Sherrington:** The honourable member for Chatsworth is a master of distortion.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Victorian Act has been hailed as a major step forward and as a pattern which should be adopted for Queensland. An examination of that legislation, however, in fact reveals that it provided for a Land Conservation Council which appears to rely heavily on staff, projects and investigations associated with the former Land Utilisation Advisory Council set up in 1958 under the Soil Conservation Act of 1958. In fact, the Land Conservation

Council is composed of the members of the former Land Utilisation Advisory Council plus the Director of National Parks and three representatives of outside organisations.

The Land Conservation Act of 1970 has been in operation for approximately 12 months, and to the best of my knowledge, no reports have yet been submitted to the Minister, so the full impact of the legislation cannot be assessed. Also in relation to the Victorian Act, I should like to clearly make the point that it applies only to public land, and not privately owned land. In fact, as public land is defined, it refers only to unalienated Crown land and to reserves, either temporary or permanent, and certain other lands vested in Government or semi-Government bodies.

The incorporation of the Environmental Control Act as part of the present legislation strengthens the relationship between planning and the means to provide for the protection of the environment. It indicates an over-all approach to this problem and an awareness that conservation and environmental research, undertaken at State and regional level, will be of the utmost importance now and in the future. For the information of honourable members, the Environmental Control Council has already formed a steering committee to fully examine aspects of land utilisation for Queensland, and to recommend whether a permanent committee is needed, and, if so, what its composition should be.

The editorial statement of "The Courier-Mail" on Friday, 29 October 1971, stated "that the Bill was a welcome start to planning on a co-ordinated basis". As the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha mentioned in his remarks—and I entirely agree with this concept—it is better to under-legislate than over-legislate in regional planning. I am sure most honourable members will agree with that. Over-legislation could tend to place another level of government between State and local authorities, and this would be contrary to the principles which we are attempting to achieve in this Bill. Regional planning in the proposed legislation would be used to define over-all objectives and needs of regions, fully involving local authorities in the definition of the problems.

Implementation of the stated objectives would be by local authorities and State instrumentalities. In this way, there is no intention to take away from local authorities any of the powers which they at present have, but rather to involve them in regional planning, both at the planning stage and at the implementation of the results of regional planning. I can therefore assure honourable members that local authorities need have no fear that any of their powers will be restricted, but rather they will be assisted in their decision-making by the proposed legislation. This will be achieved by the formation of the regional co-ordination

councils, which will be concerned with promoting the co-ordination of State and local bodies in their fields of activity concerned with planned development.

Also there will be the opportunity for local bodies to submit to the regional co-ordination councils proposals which have a regional concept rather than a piecemeal interest in a region, and, in this way, greater benefits naturally will be achieved. In cases where regional co-ordination councils have not been set up, or where there is conflict of views between local authorities in relation to works generally, the Co-ordinator-General will recommend to the Minister, subsequent to investigation, what action he considers necessary.

In relation to the programme of works which is carried forward from the existing Act and incorporated in this proposed legislation, the preparation of this programme of works for the State will take into account results and findings which are presented by the regional co-ordination councils or received from other bodies competent to advise on developmental projects in Queensland. In this way, by relating the results of such advice to the implementation of the works programme, greater efficiency in the allocation and spending of limited public funds will be achieved, and I am certain that no honourable member will disagree with this concept.

It is true that Queensland, and indeed Australia, will continue to be faced with a shortage of capital and labour resources, and therefore the capital allocation and the correct priorities for much needed public works are of extreme importance. This allocation of priorities is a very difficult proposition. However, by inter-relating the technical planning with the drawing-up of the programme of works, we feel we have achieved an approach which has been lacking in similar legislation elsewhere.

It is my belief that the separation of planning from the availability of funds generally has brought about a state of affairs which has resulted in plans being shelved. There is no question about that. To me, the preparation of grandiose plans which have little relationship to the financial capacity of the constructing authority is nonsensical and results usually in no action at all. Queensland demands of us practical planning and achievement, and we aim to fulfil that obligation and responsibility.

The concept of State development areas, which forms a new part of the Bill, is intended to provide the necessary authority to undertake comprehensive development covering a broader range than could be provided by a single Government instrumentality and on a larger scale than would be possible within the normal capacity of a local authority.

It is recognised that the provision of project boards is not new, but they are intended to provide powers comparable with those of

a works board under the existing Act. However, they will be orientated towards planning, co-ordination, and management rather than detailed execution of the projects.

Certain powers incorporated in the existing legislation are included in this Bill to facilitate the operation of the Co-ordinator-General in relation to planned development, the purpose for this being self-evident.

Honourable members will, I am sure, realise the importance of this proposed legislation and the necessity for such an approach to solve the problems which are before us today, and the even more complex ones which will have to be solved in the future. The Bill aims at providing a co-ordinated and integrated approach to regional planning, utilising the resources of State departments and local authorities. If such an approach to the problem is not taken, unco-ordinated and fragmented situations will result, and any corrective action then taken would be difficult and costly.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.44 p.m.): As I indicated at the introductory stage, the Opposition considers that the general principle of co-ordination between various bodies in the State is desirable. We also believe in regulated planning and, therefore, support the principles behind the Bill. However, after perusing it in detail, we started to wonder exactly what was in the minds of the Premier and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha when this Bill was framed. The basic principles of regional planning are contained in the Bill, so naturally members on this side of the Chamber will not oppose its second reading; however, because we believe that many of its provisions are not in the interests of the people of Queensland—I have in mind the clauses that relate to administration or, in other words, the methods used to do the job—we will be moving certain amendments at the Committee stage.

In Australia there are three arms of Government, namely, the Federal Government, the State Governments and the local authorities, and the activities and responsibilities of each are clearly defined. For example, the Commonwealth Constitution sets out quite clearly those of the Commonwealth Government. In deciding that the Commonwealth should handle income and like taxation, the States gave away to the Commonwealth certain advantages that they previously enjoyed. However, the uniform collection and rates of taxation in many fields is to the advantage of the public, so I believe that the course followed by the States in handing over those powers was the correct one. As all of us know, the big fight going on now between the States and the Commonwealth arises from the desire of the States to regain the advantages that they previously held.

Since the formation of the State of Queensland its responsibilities have been clearly set out; however, from time to time the

method of carrying out those responsibilities has varied. Like the State, the local authorities have had certain responsibilities and duties delegated to them, and because, whether they be shire, town or city councils, they are elected in a democratic process by a compulsory voting system, the people believe that their wishes will be put into effect by their elected representatives. The Opposition believes that just as members of State Parliament have a responsibility to their constituents, so, too, do members of a local authority have a responsibility to the people who elect them. If candidates in a local authority election are voted into office on a particular issue, the people have the right to expect that the policy on that issue will be implemented. In other words, if the point at issue is the carrying-out of certain work in the local authority area, the people who elect the council have the right to expect that that work will be done.

Although the Premier claims this is legislation of co-operation, it gives the Governor in Council the power to veto a decision arrived at by a local authority, to prevent it from doing a certain job that it has planned to do, or even to force it to do a job that it does not want to do. How, then, can the Bill be referred to as legislation of co-operation—unless, of course, it is co-operation of the Nazi type?

Desirable as it is to have co-operation among the various bodies, I am concerned that, under this legislation as it stands, we are taking upon ourselves the right to make a decision that could be contrary to one taken by the people at a duly constituted election. Perhaps it would not be so bad in the eyes of justice if such a decision was made by this Parliament because we are members of Parliament elected by the same body of people. But decisions will not be made by this Parliament. In fact, the Bill states quite specifically that Orders in Council made under its provisions are not to come before Parliament. If that is so, decisions of the Governor in Council certainly will not come before Parliament.

**Mr. Sherrington:** They probably will not even get to the back-benchers on the Government side.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is so. They will be the last to know what is going on.

**An Honourable Member:** That would be pretty right.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I sincerely thank the Government member who interjected. He was quite right in what he said.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It came from your own side.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I did not intend to name the honourable member's colleague, but he is sitting just behind him.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** You should name him.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I have accepted his interjection, but I do not want to embarrass him among his colleagues.

The point is that decisions arrived at by the Governor in Council will not come before Parliament. As a result, the Executive of State Parliament, on only a majority vote, could decide to upset an issue determined by the people in a local authority area.

The Bill sets out the duties and responsibilities of the Co-ordinator-General. On my interpretation, he will be a very important and influential man in our society. I would even go so far as to say that, provided he picks up a couple of friends in Cabinet, he will be the most influential and powerful man in this State. I say that, because the expenditure of large sums of money certainly leads to power. When a decision of the Co-ordinator-General and his department is ratified by the Governor in Council, it is put into effect irrespective of the views of any other person or organisation. Anyone who refuses to co-operate may be fined. An organisation that refuses to co-operate can be fined \$500 a day, whilst an individual can be fined \$25 a day, and the fines can continue until it is considered that the offending person or organisation has done what is requested.

My first point is that, contrary to the Premier's assertions and those of people who write to the Press about the contents of a Bill before they even have time to look at the front cover, this legislation goes much further than merely seeking co-operation. It lays down, quite clearly and distinctly, that people shall co-operate—or else!

**Mr. Sherrington:** Co-operation by direction.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** On the wording of the Bill, it is the "duty of a local authority to co-operate". If the word "duty", used in that sense, is not in fact a direction, I am afraid I have a lot to learn about the meaning of words, particularly in the parliamentary sense.

I should now like to refer to the Bill in detail, without mentioning the individual clauses as such. As the Premier said, it incorporates vital sections of the 1938 Act and the amendments that have been made to them from time to time. Therefore it is true to say that the Bill is based on the State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1970. It is important to understand the purpose for which that Act was introduced and, having gained that understanding, relate it to today's requirements.

This is the long title of the 1938 Act—

"An Act to Provide for Improving the General Economic Welfare of the State and for the Encouragement of Employment Generally by Providing for an Orderly Planned System of Public Works and Constructional Utilities by Means of

the Marshalling and Co-ordinated Organisation and Control thereof, and for other purposes."

That Act received assent on 22 September, 1938. The preamble reads—

"Whereas for the peace, welfare and good government it is considered necessary, in the direction of improving the general economic welfare of the State and in the direction of encouraging of employment generally, that provision be made for an orderly planned system of public works and constructional utilities and matters appertaining thereto by means of the marshalling and co-ordinated organisation and control thereof . . ."

Those words could be related equally to the Bill under consideration. We agree with the underlying principles of the Bill, but we have grave doubts about the method of implementing them. Under the 1938 Act, there was no compulsion. I realise that there are weaknesses, as the Premier pointed out. One weakness arises when two local authorities disagree. I cited a case close to Brisbane. In such a case it is necessary to find a solution. However, I do not think that direction is the answer. Direction certainly implies "big brother" standover tactics, and, if an organisation loses on one issue, it will be well geared so that it does not lose on the other.

The 1938 Act was to operate for seven years, and I have already mentioned that it received assent in September 1938. At that time the world was at peace. We had come through a severe depression, and Queensland was still showing the effects of that depression. The Government of the day—a Labor Government—in introducing the 1938 Act to encourage the undertaking of additional work, had two purposes: firstly, to develop the State, and secondly, to create employment. The paramount themes throughout that Act were the creation and continuation of employment and the welfare of human beings. It provided for employment and development and guarded against the waste of public money.

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

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Before the luncheon recess, I was referring to the existing Act and comparing it with the Bill. Under the present legislation, the Co-ordinator-General has very wide powers. However, on examination of the Bill one finds that there is not a great deal of difference between the powers conferred on him by the Act and those specified in the Bill. The big difference is that although under the Act the Co-ordinator-General is backed by the Governor in Council, in the field of planning and authority over local councils, this power has been greatly extended. Under the Act, as under the Bill, the Co-ordinator-General has the power of a constructing authority, of a co-ordinating authority and of a directing authority. He also has power to acquire

land, chattels and other property. In other words, under the present Act the Co-ordinator-General has very wide powers.

The powers already possessed by the Co-ordinator-General make one wonder why there was need for their extension into the regional field. After carefully analysing the situation, I am of the firm belief that what we are seeing is the putting into effect of the policy as set out by the Liberal Party over a long period, namely, the eventual abolition of shire councils as we know them today and their replacement by regional boards or committees. I feel that this is the reason why so much emphasis has been placed on regional co-ordination councils, and why it is that the Co-ordinator-General's powers have been extended through them.

Of course, once these regional councils are set up, it is easy to see more and more duties at present undertaken by local authorities being passed over, by other legislative measures, to them. This will mean that the elected local authorities, as we know them today, will become little more than collectors of rates and taxes and payers of bills. I warn the people of Queensland to beware of developments of this type, because it is becoming very evident that Liberal policy is gradually being translated into legislation.

I now move to a discussion of the purposes of the original legislation, the main one being employment. The side heading of section 9 of the present Act is, "Scope of orderly planning and development". Many of the provisions of that section have been transferred to clause 28 of the Bill. I have no intention of referring to that clause other than in a general way, and noting what has, and what has not, been carried forward from the Act. It is important to note exactly what has been changed. Section 9 (i) of the present Act reads—

"the orderly arrangement of a general programme of public works . . . for the period within which this Act shall in the first instance be in force—"

As we know, it is now being extended for all time. It continues—

"The creating of additional means or methods of employment generally;".

As I say, that was one of the principal purposes of the original Act. Although the Bill also contains that provision, other subsections of section 9 referring to the desirability of full employment have been eliminated. In particular, a paragraph in section 9 of the Act reading, "The maintaining of persons in full-time employment on full-time wages" has been omitted from the Bill.

However, the one about which I am most concerned is section 9 (ix) (d) of the Act, which reads—

"The securing of a fair return for the public expenditure on works generally;".

I suggest that that sentence in the original Act is worth including in any legislation. The originators of the legislation had in

mind that, whether the expenditure was merely for beautification purposes or to assist the arts, or something of that sort, there had to be a fair return for the public expenditure—in other words, that the public had to receive a fair return for the money outlayed.

I ask the Premier and those responsible for the preparation of the Bill why they saw fit to exclude that provision. They included all the other provisions in one form or another. Why did they leave that one out? The only reason I can see is that the Government has shown that it is not very concerned about the return to the people as a whole from developmental projects. As long as the Government can boast of its achievements and foreign investors are receiving a good return on their investments, it is not concerned. The miserable return that the State receives from the sale of its coal and bauxite bears out that contention. I do not wish at this stage to engage in an argument about the return to the Government from rail freights. The operations of the Railway Department are showing a loss, so it would be a case of "God help us" if it was not receiving a return from mineral freights.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I don't suppose you would like to raise the question of how much was spent on the "grog" party at the week-end?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is part of the Government's way of life to have "grog" parties.

Section 10 of the original Act, which is headed "Functions of the Co-ordinator-General", provides—

"It shall be the general duty of the Co-ordinator-General to take steps and measures and devise means and give directions whereby the programme of works and constructional utilities for the development of the State in accordance with the considerations hereinbefore set forth in section nine and in accordance with the provisions of section twelve hereof shall be co-ordinated, regulated, and controlled.

"In addition to the general duty of the Co-ordinator-General as above provided, he shall have such other powers, duties, and responsibilities as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine."

In other words, the original Act set out quite clearly that the Co-ordinator-General had power to do all the things that the Bill now before the House gives him power to do. In effect, there are only two vital changes: Firstly, the one ensuring a fair return to the State; and, secondly, the omission of any reference to the desirability of maintaining full employment. I regret that in the rewriting of the law as covered by the Bill, the reference to a guarantee of full employment has been deliberately omitted.

Under the existing legislation the Co-ordinator-General has certain powers with regard to local authorities, but in every case the local authorities have had the right to appeal against any recommendations made by that officer. Although the Co-ordinator-General was given the power to ensure that work that a local authority was not prepared to undertake was in fact carried out, the local authority had the right, if it so desired, to disagree. What is more important, the Co-ordinator-General did not have any power to prevent a council from doing something it wanted to do. That is the important difference between the existing legislation and the Bill, clauses 11, 12, 14 and 18 of which all contain a reference to the powers and duties of the Co-ordinator-General. It is all tied up with the performance of work and how it shall be done.

In 1970, the then existing law was amended to provide for the establishment of the Environmental Control Council. All honourable members will remember the great fanfare of trumpets with which that body was heralded. We were told that every Government department would be represented on the council, that it would meet regularly, and that it would be putting forward all sorts of ideas and suggestions. We were told that, as a result, great deeds would be done. That was 12 months ago. Today I asked the Premier how often the council had met. It has met only twice—in near enough to 12 months. It first met on 11 May, and apparently it has met once since then. It has made some decisions, which are worth recording. For instance, it decided to set up an executive committee to deal with urgent matters, and to put items requiring attention before the appropriate departments. Surely it did not take 12 months to set up an executive committee composed of leaders of the various Government departments.

The second decision was to set up a Waste Disposal on Land Committee, on which representatives from the Chamber of Manufactures, the Institute of Health Surveyors and the Brisbane City Council have been included. That committee is working and has appointed a subcommittee to study agricultural wastes. A committee can be set up any day of the week without having this Bill become law. The law as it existed before 1970 gave the Government power to set up any subcommittee it wanted to. Committees have been set up in the Liberal Party and Country Party for years. One that comes quickly to mind is the committee that was set up to investigate the Valuer-General's Department. I think Mr. Eric Gaven, who was a member of this House six or seven years ago, was chairman of that committee, from which we are still waiting for a report.

The point I am making is that all the propaganda associated with what the Government says it is going to do is a lot of nonsense. For 12 months we have had the necessary law to set up the Environmental Control Council, but in that time it has had only two meetings.

The Environmental Control Council has also set up a Noise Control Committee, which includes representatives from the Trades and Labor Council, the University of Queensland, the Australian Medical Association and the Chamber of Manufactures. I wonder how often that committee has met. We all know that there is far too much noise generally, and that the noise from some industries creates a hazard to the nearby residents. Surely it does not require the setting up of a special committee to tell us how to handle a bit of noise.

The other committee which was set up—and this is the one that the Government thinks is such a wonderful idea—was an interim committee to consider a number of submissions on matters relating to land utilisation and advise the council on a course of future action to overcome the problems and conflicts arising in land utilisation. It had also been decided to publish a regular newsletter for general distribution and to furnish information to the Department of Education for distribution to schools.

This is something which the Government brought into this House 12 months ago with a great fanfare of trumpets. Wonderful things were going to be done with this Environmental Control Council. So much so that the Premier, in moving the second reading today, again said that that part of the original Act has been incorporated in this legislation. As the council has met only twice in 12 months, I would be interested to know the real purpose. It will obviously take it a long time to come up with anything concrete. I notice that the Minister for Local Government is in the Chamber; he knows how ridiculous this whole matter really is.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What about the Clean Water Bill he has been talking about for years?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The only clean water he ever sees is when he gets into the bath. At any rate, the main thing that concerns us is the introduction of legislation simply to frighten people or to stand over them, or legislation that is introduced for purely propaganda purposes. Had the Premier said today that this council had met on 10 or 12 occasions and had put forward definite, concrete views on projects, we would have given it our complete endorsement, but it appears to me that all the council established 12 months ago has done has been to set up another two or three committees, which could have been done in the first instance without legislation.

**Mr. Tucker:** Good old buck-passing!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is buck-passing in legislative form.

Let us have a look at the difference between the two Bills. The big difference, of course, is the introduction of the two parts—Part V and Part VI—covering regional co-ordination and planned development. Through these two parts, the Government is

setting up, first of all, the regional co-ordination councils. Let us pause there for a moment to consider what the Premier had to say. If my memory serves me correctly—and I am sure it is good on this occasion because I wrote most of this down—he made some interesting submissions on the co-ordination and co-operation he was going to get. He said that the regional co-ordination councils would be designed to involve local bodies. He also said that the spirit of the legislation was co-operation and co-ordination of effort by all sections of the community and at all levels of government.

He further said that town planning and town-planning schemes remained the prerogative of local government, to be effectively executed within the provisions laid down by the Department of Local Government and the appropriate existing legislation. He then said, "I emphasise that point. Indeed, it is not intended that this legislation should detract from the present rights and responsibilities of local government."

On this issue he finally said—

"Our aim is not to detract from the rights and responsibilities of local authorities but to plan on a co-ordinated basis and to this end to avoid duplication or unnecessary over-lapping."

Relative to local authorities and the regional councils, we find in the legislation a clause headed, "Co-operation with Co-ordinator-General" in which it is stated that subject to this section it is the duty of the local authority to do certain things. I said earlier that, if it is anyone's duty to do something, that person or body has no alternative. If a second body is set up to deal with matters that are already handled by an existing organisation, only one of the two can have any real authority.

The Bill provides that the Co-ordinator-General, with the approval of the Governor in Council, will designate regions within the State. Although the Bill goes into great detail in certain minor aspects, it does not contain great detail on many important factors and certainly does not lay down any guide-lines as to the creation of regions. Are they to be created simply by drawing names from a hat or to suit the whim of some individual? It is obvious that a region, when created, will encompass one or more local authority areas. The present system is that, if a local authority desires to carry out a project of such magnitude that it requires State assistance, either directly or indirectly, or in full or in part, it notifies the Co-ordinator-General and makes certain submissions on which a decision is arrived at.

Under the Bill that system will not continue. If a local authority decides to carry out certain work, it will no longer be able to get the ear of the Co-ordinator-General. Instead, it will have to go through the regional council, which, as provided in the Bill, will consist of four or more persons

chaired by a representative of the Co-ordinator-General. The council need not necessarily contain any representative of a local authority, or, for that matter, a regional electricity board, a harbour board or a river trust. If proper regional planning is to be implemented, surely the views of the local authorities, regional electricity boards and harbour boards should be sought. If the State is to maintain its trade, it must have outlets, so if a region contains a port the regional council must have a representative of that port's harbour board among its members.

In the light of what I have just said the Opposition will be moving amendments to provide that local authorities, regional electricity boards and harbour boards will be represented on regional councils that encompass areas controlled by those bodies. I am not concerned about a local authority that supplies electricity, because the Opposition's amendment envisages that as a local authority it will be represented on the regional council. Such an amendment will not in any way limit the function of the regional council. Instead, it will provide greater coverage and, as well, will ensure that decisions are not arrived at in ignorance. Frequently, as a result of the presentation of insufficient material and incorrect sifting of evidence, wrong decisions are made, so it is essential that the bodies to which I have referred be represented on the regional councils.

Without redrafting the whole provision in the Bill, which we do not have time to do, I do not see any better way of achieving the best in terms of co-ordination in regional planning. The local authorities must be given some say in making recommendations to the Co-ordinator-General and, in turn, to the Governor in Council because they are best able to represent the people.

So that no-one will have a wrong idea about the powers of a council, I will outline some of them. The functions of a regional co-ordination council are outlined in the Bill in these terms—

"(a) promote the co-ordination of the objectives, policies, organisations and operations of all departments of the Government of the State and all local bodies in their respective fields of activity concerned with planned development;

"(b) continuously review the state of development;"

What person would know the financial arrangements and other relevant factors better than a member of the local council?

The functions continue—

"(c) review and investigate submissions made to it or referred to it concerning planned development;

(d) recommend to the Co-ordinator-General concerning—

(i) planned regional development;

(ii) submissions relating to regional development;

(iii) research projects pertinent to the affairs of the council;

(iv) matters referred to the council by the Minister;

(v) matters relevant to the state of the environment for submission to the Environmental Control Council,

(e) collect, and disseminate within departments of the Government of the State, local bodies and at large information concerning all aspects of planned regional development."

Surely that is more than ample evidence that local authorities should be represented on this body.

When a decision is made, it goes to the Co-ordinator-General who, through his officers, makes an assessment, and it then goes to the Governor in Council. After that happens a State development area is established, but it may, or may not, conform to the regional council areas. The Bill is very open in this matter; no guide-lines are provided. Surely it should contain guide-lines for a State development area. That is necessary because other clauses in the Bill open up a wide field relating to the purposes and power of the Bill.

Before I finally agree to all the provisions in the Bill, I want to know clearly what the guide-lines are. It might be possible to declare an area a State development area to suit the Government's political policy, and to use a further provision of the Bill to commandeer another area. Surely that should be outside the principles of the Bill.

Let me refer for a moment to the Springbok tour when the Government used the Transport Act to introduce a state of emergency throughout Queensland in order to obtain, as it said, the use of the Exhibition Grounds for the Springboks. In doing so, it made Queensland the laughing stock of the world. More importantly for Queenslanders, it jeopardised the holding of the Royal National Show. If there had been a few days of wet weather prior to the football match, or if it had rained during the match, the oval would have been unusable. Royal National Association officials told me conclusively—the Minister for Local Government and Electricity attended the dinner at which I spoke to the men concerned—that had it rained during those vital days there would have been no ring events for horses during the first two days of the Show.

As an old horseman, the Minister for Local Government knows that it would be dangerous to hold horse events if the oval was not in reasonable condition, and I know that he would not take a horse over hurdles under bad conditions. The point is that in that instance the Government went to a great deal of trouble. At a later stage it was said that ways and means would be found to make it easier to deal with such a situation. On my interpretation of the Bill at present, ways and means have been found, and the Bill contains them.

**Mr. Campbell:** Rubbish!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The minister can say "rubbish", but I doubt whether he would know one clause in the Bill. I do not cast any reflection on his integrity. I know he has many other matters to attend to.

Let me now examine the logic of it. Under the Bill, a State development area can be declared. No guide-lines are set out. Any area can be declared a State development area. Even the City of Brisbane could be declared a State development area.

Under other clauses, once a State development area is declared, the Co-ordinator-General can take over any land for any purpose and give it away to anyone else to use.

Another clause states that the Co-ordinator-General may take or otherwise acquire land for the purpose of dealing satisfactorily with conditions of natural disaster (those words are contained in the Transport Act) or hazard (those words are contained in the Transport Act) or act of war (those words are in the Transport Act) or civil strife, of bad layout or obsolete development.

**Mr. Casey:** I wonder if that covers the row between the Country Party and the Liberal Party.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No paddock is big enough to hold the Country Party and the Liberal Party when they get stuck into each other. That is why they will not let us all participate in a by-election in Albert. They know that their fighting would be made public and that the Australian Labor Party would win the seat.

Why is it, with all the other legislation on the Statute Book, that this Bill provides that land can be taken over by the Co-ordinator-General, once an area has been declared a State development area, for the purpose of dealing satisfactorily with civil strife? What does the Government contemplate? Does it contemplate long-term concentration camps for people who object to its policies, or is it to deal, more discreetly, in the Premier's words, with situations such as the one which arose during the Springbok visit? In such a case the Government could act under this Bill, without declaring a state of emergency.

**Mr. Davis:** It ought to appeal to them.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I should say it would: so much so that it was included originally. That is the reason for its inclusion.

**A Government Member:** It's a pity you haven't read the Bill.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** We know the honourable member's attitude to Rugby Union and to apartheid. We know he is a great supporter of South Africa and what it stands for. I am not disturbed at his claim that I have not read the Bill. The problem for the Government is that Opposition members

have studied the Bill. It was introduced only last week and normally, with a Bill of such vital importance to the whole of Queensland, containing 122 clauses, Government members and Opposition members should be given more than a week to study it. However, we knew it would be rushed on with the idea of getting it through Parliament. I pay great respect to my colleagues who, during the past week—

**Mr. Bird:** You have had a fortnight, not a week. We were in recess last week.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** All right, the last sitting week. I apologise to the honourable member for Burdekin. It was introduced nearly two weeks ago. If the honourable member were paid for nearly two weeks instead of for two weeks, he would squeal and yell pretty quickly, so do not let us argue the toss about four days.

**Mr. Chichen:** You had a whole week with nothing to do.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not have much time to discuss the whole of this Bill. It is obvious that the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt judges others by what he does. I have no doubt he had nothing to do. He was seen frequently at the Gold Coast. I hope he will not claim he was investigating the parlours down there. The honourable member for South Coast told me that he did not take him around. I do not know what he was doing at the parlours or in the surf. On the contrary, I compliment Opposition members on the extensive work they did in analysing this Bill to the full. It is my privilege today to speak on their behalf on the various matters they brought to my attention.

It is in the field of State development that the Co-ordinator-General, as the mouthpiece for the Governor in Council, is to be empowered to lay down to local authorities exactly what they will or will not do. Local councils will have to apply to the Co-ordinator-General for authority to carry out public works. A local council could have won an election campaign on the undertaking of some water-supply work, or other developmental project. The Co-ordinator-General could say, "That is not part of the plan as submitted by the regional council. You will not do that. You will do this, because it satisfies us. An overseas company is coming here to develop another coal mine, and we want that land. We want you to build a dam to supply them with water. Because we want these things for our overseas friends, you will not be allowed to carry out your work. You will do as you are told." If the council said, "We will not do that", the Co-ordinator-General could go ahead and carry out the work, and hand the bill to the council. And the Government talks about co-operation!

Much of the content of these provisions stems from experience with various overseas companies and the problems that arose between them and local authorities. It

should be remembered that it is not only Government members who keep newspaper cuttings and other records of what various Government members say from time to time. They make quite interesting reading. The leaders of some companies that have come to this State have complained of problems with local authorities. Honourable members will recall the case of the non-payment of rates by one company to a local authority. They will also know that there was argument between another local authority and a company over the location of a township. The Bill is designed to give the Co-ordinator-General power to override local authorities in such circumstances. His decision has to be backed by Cabinet but, after all, Cabinet opinion is a reflection of Government policy of the day.

The Bill provides for the setting up of project boards, and again there is no detailed definition of the duties of such boards. All that we are told is that project boards will be set up. Is a project board to control one project, or all projects? In a consideration of development in its general sense, let us take the example of Gladstone. I instance Gladstone because my colleague the honourable member for Port Curtis has taken a great interest in its development, and he will be able to follow up my remarks at a later stage. In Gladstone, there were many problems in providing water not only for industry but for the residents as well. The housing problem was so bad that, as children of established families married, there were no houses available for them. There were also problems with the provision of roads, drainage and sewerage. All these problems arose from the developmental projects that were proceeding. There is now a problem with the electricity supply.

The development of an area involves the carrying out of work over a very wide field. I therefore expected to find in the Bill some idea of what project boards would handle. Is a project board to be administrative, or is it to carry out the actual work? The Bill provides that a project board shall be elected for a term of three years, which suggests that the work in respect of which the board is established will take some time. I therefore presume that the board will cover the whole of the project, from start to finish.

So there is to be set up, outside the Government and outside the local authority, a regional council and, still in the same area, a project board. One wonders what overlapping there will be. Will the same people be on both the council and the board? The Bill does not say whether they will. Provision is made for their being elected for a three-year term. What happens if a project is completed in less than three years or, say, in 4½ years? If it is a board associated with works—in other words, a board of experts who are to assist the smooth operation of the project—it is possible that some of the people concerned may have financial interests in one or other of the projects being undertaken. They could,

for example, be suppliers of material. I have in mind a person who, if road work is involved, has the lease of a quarry, or one who is connected with a company supplying material or doing work for the project. The Bill does not provide that a person appointed to a project board shall not have a financial interest in the project, or an interest from which he may gain financially when a contract is let.

In the appointment of the Co-ordinator-General, it is laid down in the Bill that he may not belong to such-and-such an organisation and that he cannot do this, that or the other thing. If he dies or is removed from office, the obvious is stated. Here provision is made for the setting up of project boards and no qualifications or disqualifications of persons who may be appointed are set out. Therefore, the Opposition proposes to move an amendment at the Committee stage—admittedly we do not yet know what the functions of project boards will be—so that the position of those who are appointed cannot be misinterpreted.

It is all very well for the Premier or the Minister for Local Government to say, "It is our intention to do this or that under the Bill." I accept such statements as being made in good faith. But the legislation now being considered will be administered not by them or their immediate successors but by people who today are far removed from Parliament. Those who advise the Government of the day on the legislation will not be among the Government's present advisers, either. As honourable members have seen before when Acts that have been passed in this House have been taken to the High Court for interpretation, that court's interpretation of the wording has been completely different from the intention stated to honourable members at the time of the Bill's introduction. So we have to consider a Bill from the point of view of all the interpretations that may be put on its provisions, and that consideration is particularly important when a clause is so wide open that it contains no guide-lines as to what may or may not be done.

Many clauses in the Bill deal with the financing of projects, and I shall deal with those in more detail at the Committee stage. It is sufficient to say at this stage that, although the Opposition is not opposed to the principle of regional planning, and certainly is not opposed to State development, it is concerned about the implementation of the provisions of the Bill, particularly those that will make local authorities less effective and take from them some of the power that they now have. Although the Bill does not deal specifically with certain aspects of development and administration, the mere fact that regional councils and project boards will be in operation and will have powers under the Act that supersede the provisions of other Acts makes it obvious that the effectiveness of local authorities will be diminished. In fact, they will not be bosses in their own right.

I have one further point to make in conclusion. To me, it is the culmination of what I consider to be legislation that throws full power into the hands of the Executive Council. I refer to the publication of Orders in Council with no provision that they shall be put before Parliament for endorsement or rejection. To my knowledge, there are very few Acts under which the relevant Orders in Council do not have to be laid on the table of the House so that we can ask questions about them and, if necessary, object to them. The final clause of the Bill provides that Orders in Council shall be published in the Gazette, and that is all. I point out to Government members, particularly those who, over the years, have been very outspoken against the power of the Executive, that in this Bill they are handing over to Cabinet the complete control of the legislation, including its operation and the recommendations of the various councils and boards. In other words, in the field of State development they are making Cabinet supreme in this State.

**Mr. AIKEN** (Warrego) (3.2 p.m.): The title of the Bill is very impressive. I only hope that I can read into the provisions of the Bill the long-hoped-for implementation of the Government's stated policy of decentralisation.

"Decentralisation" is a magical word. It could save so much of what we are now quickly losing—the life of the Outback, its heritage, its traditions and its industries. Surely, with the economic collapse of our inland areas, we must be aware of the extreme problems of centralisation, with the localisation of excessive city populations and the perpetual drift of people from the country areas to the cities in search of employment, schooling for their children, and more congenial living. In a few short years the heavy imbalance of centralisation has become an intolerable burden, not only to the surviving few left on the land and in the rural villages and towns but also to industries and cities.

The imposition of the imbalanced policies of this Government—there is no doubt that they are imbalanced policies; we have one policy expounded by the Liberal Party and another foisted onto us by the Country Party, with never a straightforward policy from the Government—with unbalanced members of the Government not knowing which way they are going, has forced 60 per cent of the people of the rural areas into an exodus to the urban areas. If we are to have a better balance of population and industry, regional planning and development is an absolute necessity.

Rural reconstruction, as we now know it, and as it has been pushed onto us, is totally inadequate to the occasion. If the Government does not realise that, it is not for the want of telling by the Opposition. I feel sure that all Government members are now

realising its inadequacies. Conceived in haste and as a Government expedient and convenience, rural reconstruction, without the true heart of the Government behind it, must be a failure. It cannot be anything else. From a substantive industry point of view, regional development can only be achieved by greater Government financial assistance, and industries such as grain-growing, fruit-growing, wool-growing, the beef industry and mining will need the location of treatment industries close to the point of supply. In other words, we must marry secondary industry to primary industry and sell the country to the city.

In any approach to decentralisation, the Government must be motivated by the drive of earnestness and not by political convenience, which has been characteristic of this Government. The Government must have an eye to balance-sheet gains and use the back country as a business investment. Surely the development of our vast inland is a business proposition and an investment in which we must take part. We must diversify the opportunity for employment and, particularly from a defence point of view, we must spread our industry.

The natural advantages of country location to industry must be patently obvious. We have there a low establishment cost; country land is much cheaper; rates and land tax are considerably lower—much lower in all respects than those in comparable city locations. Further, in general, labour is more plentiful in the country. Absenteeism is lower and the country labour content is more stable because of its desire to remain in the one job. There are fewer distractions than in the city, and, by living closer to their jobs, employees suffer less travel fatigue and, most importantly, have more time for relaxation and recreation. In the long run, this must mean greater gains for industry; it must mean greater productivity, and, with Government stimulation, this effort must lead to extensive relocation of industry in rural areas.

Because of lack of employment, and with job opportunity being at a shockingly low ebb, people in country regions have continued to drift steadily to the cities and the coast complexes, and this, of course, adds daily to population-growth problems in those areas. The establishment of industry or the expansion of existing manufacturing industries should be based on encouragement at high Government level—something we have never experienced in this State. I believe that if this thought is combined with direct rural-reconstruction plans, it is possible to make the inland of Queensland a viable and desirable place in which to live.

Listen for a moment to what happens in New South Wales, where there is an exercise in decentralisation that this Government could well copy. I refer to the State

Development and Country Industries Assistance Act, which has proved highly encouraging to rural development and, unlike anything in Queensland, represents an extremely strong approach to decentralisation. In New South Wales, Government assistance covering up to 90 per cent of industry establishment costs has been subsidised by local government assistance in the providing of necessary land and the expenses required to set up an industry.

Certain industries have been established in the large inland areas of New South Wales, and that State's very sensible and successful approach to decentralisation should be copied by Queensland. New South Wales offers long-term freight concessions and rebates, and also assists in the provision of housing and training facilities for employees. That assistance has been a major factor in the success in New South Wales of regional development and decentralisation in the true sense of those words.

Apart from the desire of Queensland's country areas to benefit from decentralisation, the obvious advantages to be gained are apparent for all to see. Both the New South Wales and the Victorian Governments are making strong endeavours to "sell" the country areas to the city dwellers. In Queensland, certain areas could be selected as attractions to industrial growth. They could be treated as pilot schemes in the establishment of the industries essential to the development of the inland areas.

I will admit that transport costs are a problem, but although they are high—very high in Queensland—they represent only a small proportion of the selling price of articles, and if Government assistance is really aimed at helping, I am sure they can be substantially offset. The fast-emptying inland areas presently contain only 5 per cent of the State's population, so surely the other 95 per cent could afford material assistance by way of extra taxation to provide concessions to the country areas as a bait to industry to expand into them. With the swelling of the population in the inland areas it would be necessary to provide better railway services than at present, and I am sure that what might appear to be a loss suffered by the railways in granting freight concessions could turn out in fact to be a winner as a greater number of people would require better services and larger quantities of goods.

From the point of view of the workers, living is cheaper in the country than in the city, especially in the field of real estate. It provides spacious areas without overcrowding in tenements; it offers clean and clear air; it enables people to live only short distances from their places of employment; and, above all, it allows children to grow and develop in a clean and safe environment. The country has much more than the city to offer, provided the Government gives some encouragement to industry to expand inland.

I ask the Government: Will it continue to encourage centralisation of smoke-stacks and bubbling boilers in the south-east corner of Queensland, or will it implement a practical policy of decentralisation and open up the back country? Does it propose to spend thousands of millions of dollars on further development in Brisbane so that people can live on top of one another, and will it tear down and build expressways and thereby probably further pollute and destroy the environment, or will it move in a positive fashion towards doing something that it has told the people for 15 years it will do—that is, decentralise?

I will admit that the key question is: How can industry be developed and spread throughout the State? With its vast natural resources, its climatic advantages, and its cheap coal and natural gas to provide energy and power, Queensland could well become a magnet to industrial decentralisation by foreign companies. That would happen first with pilot industries, which surely would attract other overseas industries wanting to gain the benefits that are there to be reaped.

At the moment, water is the main problem in the inland, but I am sure it could be overcome. Modern methods of recirculation and filtering and the use of settling ponds and other expedients would help solve the problem. We must remember that urbanised areas are heavy users of water, and they must run into serious problems of supply in the years ahead. Very heavy expense will be associated with satisfying the demand for water caused by the present huge city expansion.

One of the problems of competitive industry—all industries are competitive—relates to the handling of the product concerned. This is a particular feature of the meat industry in Queensland. I believe that country killing is a "must". It has been reliably estimated that up to 30 per cent of Queensland beef suffers from bruising, and this costs producers millions of dollars annually. Bruising is caused by cattle being carted from the far south-western corner of the State, near the South Australian border, and from the Cape and other far-distant areas, for slaughter in the south-east corner.

Surely country killing would obviate this problem and provide for the more speedy and humane handling of stock. As well, it would probably prevent what amounts to a persistent closing down of many of our abattoirs, in most cases because of American insistence on certain standards for export as a result mainly of bruising and excessive handling of stock.

Modern methods of travel and communication make decentralisation without isolation possible in opening up inland areas. Many areas of Queensland close to major ports could become quite viable. In the years ahead, development would surely be possible in many such areas with diverse income

sources. It would make the districts concerned reasonably safe, thanks to the diversity of industry and, should there be an economic recession, it could be cushioned by the diverse industries. In a grain-growing area that also produces sheep, wool and beef, surely industry establishment related to the production of the area is possible.

Minerals, most of which are produced in inland areas, come into the same category. They would be an added incentive to decentralisation, because in most areas where they are found there are also primary industries; although dying, they are still functioning. Decentralisation, with increased country population, would result in the flow-on of many social benefits to areas that are now deprived of them. I visualise, for example, far better education facilities, with technical and management courses, and many non-vocational courses that are presently completely unheard of in country areas. Hospital, medical, and dental benefits, as well as television, would help to attract people to the back country and then hold them there. Many of these amenities are completely unknown in far too many country centres.

The drift to the cities will continue even if the plans for rural reconstruction, about which there is a good deal of doubt, become an operational success. I say this because farm mechanisation and modern rural technology, coupled with the expansion of attractive job opportunities and better living conditions in the cities, will continue to pull population from the rural areas. Whether rural reconstruction is a success or not, the rural areas will continue to lose population. That is unavoidable. There is only one answer. Rural regional planning and development to provide the necessary diversification is completely necessary if we are to preserve our back country.

If both the State and Federal Governments are sincere in their attempts to decentralise, the Federal Government must grant substantial tax concessions and set cheaper telephone charges and there must be other calculated bonuses such as reduced rail freights. These benefits would certainly lead to regional development. People would want to go west to gain these advantages. Instead of the present Government policy of encouraging people from the back country, we would then have the reverse, and that is exactly what we want.

Nobody realises more than A.L.P. members that strong forces will move against decentralisation. Many big business wolves will not want city land devalued as industry moves to the country; nor will they want a reduction in the rents of their huge palaces of concrete and steel, which represent city office splendour, as the benefits of country industry become apparent and more and more people and businesses want to move from the cities to the country. However, we must heed the masses. We must do something about encouraging the masses away from the coastal fringe.

Today, Australia holds 12th place in the trading nations of the world. However, it is capable of assuming a far more significant level because of its many vast natural resources whose potential has only been lightly scratched or touched. Therefore, greater Government attention must be paid to diversification of industry in the inland. As more scientific practices and a high degree of mechanisation become apparent, the people of the inland must be forced out of these areas unless we get the Government's stated policy of decentralisation. This is better illustrated by the over-all farming figures for Australia than by my words. During the 16 years from 1950, the quantity of primary production rose by 60 per cent while the rural work-force fell by 10 per cent. Since 1960, all records have been lost, just as all people in the West have been lost during the reign of this Government.

On the other hand, industrial urban activity has intensified to a very, very high degree, whilst country industry, if it could be called "industry", is only service industry and counts for very little. Conversely, in the context of this rapid urban population and industrial growth, and the affluence of living that has gone with it, social and economic levels have plunged to an all-time low in the depressed areas of the inland of this State. "Diversification" and "sophistication" are big words, and they mean a lot. But diversification and sophistication, coupled with a sound economy, are only possible in the inland with the strong implementation of a rural reconstruction plan that goes hand in hand with the decentralisation of industry. There must be a working-together for the mutual benefit of the people, and not an isolating of certain sections of the community such as those in the far western areas.

Unfortunately, the growth and stimulus of industrial development in this State have been largely the results of the investment of foreign capital, which has resulted in the Government's loss of interest in rural industries which were once the principal consumers and producers of revenue for the Government. Queensland is probably as well off as any other country in the creation of power and energy. This is most evident from Queensland's huge deposits of coal, and by the fact that there are constant encouraging reports of natural gas discoveries. As mining and manufacturing complexes rapidly extend, Queensland is growing more affluent, but probably at a cost, the greatest part of which has been borne by the people in the inland.

I cite Mt. Isa as an example of the point that I am endeavouring to make. If Mt. Isa was served with natural gas or had a supply of coal, it could develop into a manufacturing centre. And why not? It is the source of many metals, and I am sure that similar development could take place in other selected areas throughout the State. New South Wales and Victoria have realised

the implications of selling industry to the country, and I feel sure that if a similar pattern were followed in Queensland it would be a paramount factor in the recovery of the viability so necessary for Queensland inland areas.

Unfortunately—on far too many occasions that word has to be used in relation to Queensland—the investment of foreign capital in this State has been much too lop-sided. The agricultural industries have been outweighed as investors have plunged into the manufacturing and mining industries, and the other tertiary industries associated with those two major industries. Again unfortunately, the most fundamental and basic industries, the primary industries, have been neglected. To establish a balance of development and to build up population and stability, special attention is absolutely necessary to the inland areas, and decentralisation becomes a necessity if Queensland is to stabilise its economy.

President Nixon's economic action has been designed to activate the sluggish American economy that had reached an alarming stage of slowing down. The same thing is happening in this State, and the Government is doing nothing about it. However, I am hopeful that when action is again regenerated, and when the American pulse begins to quicken, there will be a chain reaction throughout the world. In the part of the world that I am most concerned about, namely, the western areas of this State, I am hopeful that this reaction will prove of immense benefit. I feel that wool and minerals will again move forward strongly.

I hope the Government is going to do something about following the pattern of the American economy. I hope it will take some strong statesmanlike action and show qualities of leadership that will put us on the road to recovery. With the return of confidence to industry, stimulus will undoubtedly be given to the establishment of industries in country areas. If the Government shows sympathy and people can forget the psychological depression that has swept through rural industries, possibly the decentralisation of industry will really result in the development of the potential of the Inland.

Queensland is daily demonstrating more strongly that it is a storehouse of huge mineral resources and possibly also the world's storehouse of energy-producing fuel—not only coal, but also petroleum and natural gas. Surely this must react in our favour and encourage more and more industries to come to this State. With planned methods of decentralisation, surely we can encourage these industries to go to the source of supply of the energy that they need, which, as I said earlier, is inland Queensland.

It is only natural that we, as individuals, should be concerned primarily with the problems closest to home. Those affecting my

electorate need the life-preserving stimulus of decentralisation. It would give the area the transfusion that it needs to take it out of the doldrums and into the productive field.

In today's economy, no industry can stand alone in a Robinson Crusoe-like existence. But that is what the Government is asking rural industries to do. Although they have done it for many years past, they find it impossible to stand on their own today. No man is an island; no industry can stand alone, as Robinson Crusoe did. The various sections of society are becoming more and more integrated; people are becoming more and more involved with one another. The problems facing primary industries in the inland—I refer particularly to those arising from cost inflation—and the consequent loss to the national economy will affect not only primary industries, as they are at the moment, but also other industries. The Government should really begin working and doing something to earn the increased parliamentary salaries that were agreed to about two weeks ago.

All honourable members must insist on bolstering primary industries and building up the population of country areas. Regional development must be planned along these lines and with that thought in mind. If it is not, we must perish as a nation. As I said earlier, we cannot afford to allow primary industries to slide into a decline such as the one they are now experiencing and expect the coastal fringe to exist with an empty inland.

Queensland's development as an industrial State has not altered its historic reliance for economic strength on primary industries. It is still heavily dependent upon them and they are still its basic industries. The Government has forgotten that because of the glamour of mining industries, Decentralisation is a complete necessity if we are going to preserve those industries. If we are going to do anything concrete about rural reconstruction, we must join our primary and secondary industries. No longer can either survive alone. To do what is needed will require action, which is something we have not seen from this Government.

There is a glaring imbalance of values in living standards, land standards and every other standard, including our much valued standard of citizenship, between the people of the urban areas and the people of the country areas. Dividends are so far out of balance that it is no longer humorous. The investment of \$100,000 in pastoral or rural activities probably would show a loss, but a return of 16 or 20 per cent on capital is quite common in the cities. The Government cannot expect the people in the country to survive much longer on promises. We need something more substantial than promises and hopes. We need some move by the Government which I hoped was coming under this Bill as it particularly mentions regional planning and development.

What would be the reaction of banks and business people if they expended \$100,000 in a country area only to show a loss? That is what the Government is asking us to do; that is what it is expecting us to do. It expects us to stay there and show a loss. I ask: Where, oh where are the statesmen of this Parliament? Are they to be found only in the Australian Labor Party? With the Government's minority thinking, has it got minority judgment, too? If it has not, let us see something done about that wonderful theme "decentralisation".

**Mr. ALISON** (Maryborough) (3.38 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I support the Bill introduced by the Premier. Every body or entity has limited resources. A private company, a public company or a Government—whether it be a local, State or Federal Government—has limited resources. By "resources", I mean finance, man-power, machinery and plant. And in order to make the best use of limited resources, the order of priorities for the various works to be undertaken must be properly sorted out. I firmly believe that the Bill is a big step forward in co-ordinated development. We, in this State, have to get down to regional planning if we are to get equitable development throughout the State and, at the same time, make the best use of our limited resources.

I know that my own electorate of Maryborough and the surrounding district will be watching closely to see how the Government implements the Bill. In particular I refer to the clause dealing with the objectives of the comprehensive programme of works, which includes, among other things, the creation of additional means and methods of development and of employment; the development of the State on an equitable basis—

**Mr. Bromley:** What clause is that?

**Mr. ALISON:** Clause 28.

**Mr. Bromley:** Read it out.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Houghton): Order! The honourable member is out of order in interjecting from other than his usual place.

**Mr. ALISON:** It also includes the provision of ways and means whereby finance for works and for the initiation of works may be spread over the State in equitable proportions. In Maryborough we will be watching the implementation of all those provisions with very great interest.

The legislation could not be introduced at a better time for Maryborough and district. For the past three years the Mary Valley Investigation Committee, composed of representatives of local government throughout the Mary Valley area and, latterly, representatives of the Co-ordinator-General's Department and the Forestry Department, has been conducting its inquiries. It has organised the Hunter Valley Research Foundation to carry out a survey of the resources of the Mary Valley area, at a cost of

\$10,000, of which the committee is finding \$5,000 and the Government the other \$5,000. I mention this to prove my point that this area is trying to do something for itself.

I understand that the preliminary report of the Hunter Valley Research Foundation will be available in the next week or two. I have had the honour to be the co-ordinating chairman since the inception of this committee. There have been surveys in other areas by Government departments and others, but to the best of my knowledge they have all been made at Government expense. As I mentioned before, my area is trying to do something for itself, partly at its own expense.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Are you achieving anything?

**Mr. ALISON:** We will be. The report by the Hunter Valley Research Foundation will include a very comprehensive survey of the human and physical resources of the area. It will put forward recommendations as to what public works should be carried out by the Government to create the right atmosphere and opportunities for private enterprise to carry out development.

**Mr. Casey:** This is being done in other areas of Queensland.

**Mr. ALISON:** That may be so, but the point I was making is that my area is bearing 50 per cent of the expense. To the best of my knowledge, it has always been done in other areas at Government expense.

Reverting to the forthcoming report from the Hunter Valley Research Foundation, I understand that there will also be recommendations as to particular economic areas in which further study should be made to ascertain just what should be carried out. It seems to me that the regional co-ordinator and his council would do well to take a good look at the recommendations of the Hunter Valley Research Foundation, particularly for public works, with a view to implementing them in due course, and to initiate further studies in the areas recommended as well as others.

I urge the Government not to let the work done by the Mary Valley Investigation Committee over the past three years go for naught but rather, when this Bill is passed, to proceed with the appointment of the regional co-ordinator and regional council, with an office at Maryborough, to carry on the good work where the Mary Valley Investigation Committee leaves off. I repeat that this is an area that is trying to do something for itself at its own expense, and I again urge the Government to set up the office of the first regional co-ordinator and council at Maryborough, so that it can carry on the valuable work that has been commenced and thus make the best use of the resources of Maryborough and district. Let us have planned development. I also suggest that, under the relevant provisions of the legislation, the Government

declare the appropriate portion of Maryborough and the Mary Valley to be a region in which to appoint a regional co-ordinator and council. I am happy to support the Bill.

**Mr. MARGINSON** (Ipswich East) (3.44 p.m.): I listened with great interest to the introduction of this Bill, and particularly to the remarks of Government speakers. Quite a number of them spoke in glowing terms of this legislation. I did not join in the debate then, preferring to wait until I had seen the Bill. However, I was shocked at the number of clauses in it that affect local government, a duly elected and democratic form of government in this State.

This Government is well known for the quality of legislation it has passed that has taken the word "government" out of local government. It is well known also for the legislation it has introduced that has thrown onto local government the responsibility of administering it. Take, for example, the recent Litter Bill. Although the Government drew up that legislation and introduced it, it threw the administration of it onto the various local authorities.

**An Opposition Member:** And the cost of it.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** And the cost of it, too.

Local authorities have reached the stage where, in many instances, they cannot even make their own by-laws. They have to submit to standard by-laws covering work carried out by them. As I say, because of the Government's attitude, the aspect of "government" in local government has been deleted. This Bill will now remove the "local" factor, so that in Queensland there will be nothing left in local government.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** You have very broad vision; there is no doubt about that.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** To indicate that the Bill is only further election window-dressing, I will refer to what the Premier said on 25 November 1970, when he introduced a Bill to provide for environmental control.

This is what he said—

"The introduction of this Bill highlights a new approach, a new outlook and a determined attitude on the part of the Government..."

Fancy that from this Government!

He went on—

"... to plan for the preservation of the natural environment."

Later, he said—

"The Government accepts the urgency of implementing measures to examine, and then take the necessary action to preserve, the environment..."

What has the Government done? It has convened only two meetings on that important and urgent measure, which was introduced by the Premier on 25 November of

last year. If he likes to interject again and ask for more, I will be only too pleased to give it to him.

Everyone has heard of the plans put forward by the Minister for Local Government to combat pollution, and those announced by the Minister for Health to provide clean air in Queensland. What has been done? The State is no further advanced than it was at the time of the introduction of those two measures, and I suggest that even when this Bill is passed, the State will be no further advanced than at present. All that the Government is doing here is overthrowing democracy in local government. It is not prepared to accept the will of the people as revealed by local authority elections. It is establishing a body of people that will simply override the wishes of the elected representatives of the people.

The Government set up its famous Environmental Control Council, which so far has done nothing visible. Incidentally, among its 22 members there is not one representative of local government. Admittedly there is a representative from the Department of Local Government, but there is a vast difference between a departmental officer and one who actually works in local government.

Apparently not being satisfied with the creation of that body, the Government now intends to create regional co-ordination councils. I am amazed that the Bill does not spell out that these councils will contain representatives of local authorities. The Premier said that on each council there will be a chairman and at least four members; but not one local authority representative will be included.

As to the proposed project boards, the Bill is silent on whether they will administer only one project or a number of projects. It does not even say whether they will have authority only within one region, or whether they will have State-wide authority. My main complaint, however, is that the Bill does not spell out that there will be at least one local government representative—either an elected representative or an executive officer—on any of these bodies, particularly the regional co-ordination councils and the project boards. As I see it, powers are being taken away from the local authorities. It amounts to bureaucracy as against democracy.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen** interjected.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** The Premier should examine the Bill. No doubt his speech was written for him.

An examination of the Bill discloses that the regional councils and the project boards can override duly elected local authorities. For example, a local authority might wish to undertake a certain project, but an overriding power is given to Cabinet, through the Co-ordinator-General, to have the final say on whether the work will be done, irrespective of the wishes of the local

authority, or even a group of local authorities. But the provisions in the Bill go even further than that. Even if a local authority does not want certain work done, it will be done for it and it will have to bear the cost. If that is not bureaucracy at its very worst, I do not know what is. I was surprised to see similar shocking provisions throughout the Bill. When I hear Government members speak in glowing terms about it, I am forced to conclude that they either have not read it or have not understood it.

I speak wholly and solely as one who is very interested in the work of local authorities. The Government should give them increased powers, but instead, their powers are continually being taken from them legislatively by the Government and they are being left with the menial task of administering what the Government legislates.

At the Committee stage I propose to speak on a number of clauses, but I now voice my protest at such a Bill being presented to this Parliament for ratification, particularly as it gives boards and councils appointed by the Government the right to override the will of local authorities throughout the State.

**Mr. Newton:** How long have you been a member of a local authority?

**Mr. MARGINSON:** For 18 years.

**Mr. MILLER** (Ithaca) (3.53 p.m.): In speaking briefly to this legislation—

**Mr. Sherrington:** Are you ashamed of it?

**Mr. MILLER:** I am proud of it. There are a few points I should like to clear up, if honourable members will give me the opportunity.

The honourable member for Ipswich East is concerned that the provisions in the Bill will permit local authorities to be overridden. I realise that the Bill deals with the over-all planning of the State of Queensland. I hope that it will deal with the small, mundane things controlled by local authorities, especially when they have problems that cannot be straightened out—problems concerning lines of demarcation between the Government and themselves on which there are some doubts.

**Mr. Newton:** Which one in particular?

**Mr. MILLER:** The particular matter I have in mind is Ithaca Creek. The Brisbane City Council claims that Ithaca Creek, because it is part of a tidal stream, comes under the control of the Department of Harbours and Marine. That department has stated quite clearly and categorically, and publicly, that it is the responsibility of the council.

**Mr. Houston:** How can it be?

**Mr. MILLER:** Please let me have my say. The honourable member had his.

**Mr. Houston:** You interrupted me.

**Mr. MILLER:** I did not.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Houghton): Order! Honourable members on both sides of the Chamber will refrain from making persistent interjections, or I shall deal with them.

**Mr. MILLER:** I hope that the proposed body will be able to define who is responsible in this apparently small and mundane matter, although I can assure the House that it is not a small and mundane matter to the people who live on this creek.

This morning I asked a question in the House about the city council dump in Bardon and the polluted discharge from it into Ithaca Creek. That pollution has killed all fish life in the creek and nothing has been done about it by the Brisbane City Council. Members of the public have brought the matter to the attention of the Lord Mayor and he has told them straight out that this is the result of progress and that they must put up with it. This is not good enough. I am surprised that the Wildlife Preservation Society has not had something to say about this matter. We have this situation in which the Brisbane City Council is polluting Ithaca Creek.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What about the Railway Department? It is doing the same to Breakfast Creek.

**Mr. MILLER:** The honourable member for Salisbury will have an opportunity to rise and speak about the Railway Department.

The Brisbane City Council is prepared to pollute Ithaca Creek, and, in addition, it dumps sand and gravel into the creek and silts it up. Then it says to the people, "It is not our responsibility." I hope that the proposed body will define who is responsible in this case.

I also hope that, as a result of this Bill, this body will be able to act on behalf of conservationists so that they will not have to appear before the Mining Warden's Court. I hope that the Co-ordinator-General will look after these matters on behalf of the people of Queensland.

**Mr. Casey:** The Bill takes that right from them.

**Mr. MILLER:** It does not.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Ithaca will address his remarks to the Chair. Honourable members on my left will refrain from making persistent interjections.

**Mr. MILLER:** On 18 November this year an application will be heard by the Mining Warden's Court in Brisbane to take water and to build roads, dams and tramways at the Eighteen Mile Swamp on North Stradbroke Island. I hope that conservation bodies will not have to appear before the

Mining Warden's Court in Brisbane to fight that application and that, as a result of this Bill, the Co-ordinator-General will fight the case on behalf of the people who are interested in conservation.

**Mr. Sherrington:** If the Bill is passed, they will have more fights on their hands.

**Mr. MILLER:** Surely the honourable member for Salisbury, as a conservationist, would rather have this body fight the case than have people begging for finance so that they can appear before the Mining Warden's Court.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Salisbury will refrain from making persistent interjections.

**Mr. MILLER:** Under the Bill, the Environmental Control Council will comprise representatives of 19 Government departments. I hope that the Premier will give favourable consideration to including a member of the Queensland Conservation Council, who would be able to do a very good job indeed. I do not think that is an unreasonable request.

It also concerns me that the Co-ordinator-General can take gravel, sand, stone, clay, earth, and other materials from any creek, stream, river or watercourse. To me, that provision appears to dilute the legislation dealing with that subject. At no time has the removal of such materials from marine habitat reserves been permitted. If I read the Bill correctly, the Co-ordinator-General is to be given power to move into marine habitat reserves. I want the Premier to spell out clearly that that is not the case. I do not want the Co-ordinator-General to be given power to go into any marine habitat reserve.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Look at clause 107.

**Mr. MILLER:** I am coming to that now.

The Bill provides that a regional co-ordination council shall consist of a chairman and four members who shall be appointed by the Governor in Council. I should like those four members to be independent experts who are not associated with any interests in the area under consideration. I hope that the Premier in his deliberations will consider this point. If, for instance, sand-mining is under consideration, I believe it is essential that the four members appointed to the council be not appointed by sand-mining companies. Although I do not for a moment think that that would be permitted, I should like to have the position clearly spelt out so that it could not possibly occur. I am not so much concerned about the situation under the present Government. In the future, however, anything could happen. Let us therefore have the best legislation possible.

The Bill also provides that declared areas are to be delineated on a plan which will be available for inspection at the office of the Co-ordinator-General. That is all very

well, but surely persons or bodies would want to study such plans for much longer than the hours available to them at the Co-ordinator-General's office. I hope the Premier will give serious consideration to my suggestion that copies of the plan be made available, at a reasonable cost, to any persons or bodies who desire them. After all, it would cost only about 60c to photostat a copy of a plan.

I hope that the points I have brought up will be considered by the Premier. Perhaps some amendments might be introduced at the committee stage. I hope the Premier will clear up the problems that I have raised, and spell out the position clearly so that the public will be in no doubt about the role of this body.

**Mr. CASEY (Mackay)** (4.4 p.m.): As the day has proceeded, it has been rather surprising to watch the reaction in the Government parties to this debate. One gets the impression that the introduction of this Bill is the greatest "con" trick perpetrated on them since the first electoral redistribution Bill. It appears that only some selected members of the Government parties had any real knowledge of what was in the Bill, and accepted it as it was presented by the Premier as a piece of political propaganda that was going to be good for them. As the Bill has been criticised from this side of the House, we have been able to see members on the other side scurrying in and out of the House. The Premier has been unable to remain in the House; he has been too busy receiving members of the Government parties who have been approaching him with problems as they see them in the Bill. They had not seen them till they were brought to their notice today by the Leader of the Opposition and other members on this side of the House.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Perhaps they will withdraw the Bill and begin again.

**Mr. CASEY:** That could happen, because Government members are doing a great deal of lobbying after suddenly finding that provisions of the Bill pose problems.

I should like to revert for a moment or two to some of the points that were made when the Bill was introduced. The Premier said that he was very appreciative of the assistance given to him by the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha in the preparation of the Bill. Both he and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha referred in complimentary terms to the provisions of the Bill; in fact, the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha made the rather astounding statement that, as a result of the introduction of the Bill, every man, woman and child would again play a role in the State. The Premier, not to be outdone, said that it was not intended to detract in any way from the rights and privileges of local government, and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha

added that the Bill was based on co-operation and co-ordination that would make the State grow strong.

If one deletes from the Bill the clauses that were taken from the original State Development and Public Works Organisation Act and looks only at the new clauses that have been included, one finds that the Bill is nothing more than an attempt by the Government to set up a fourth tier of Government in this State, quite separate from Federal Government, State Government, and local government. As has been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members, under these clauses local bodies will have no real say in and no proper right of appeal against the decisions of some of the instrumentalities that will be set up under the Bill. In fact, a fourth tier of government is being set up that will be responsible only to the Co-ordinator-General, because the regional co-ordinating councils and the project boards will be responsible only to him and, through him, to the Governor in Council. Does that seem to imply that every man, woman and child will be able to play a role in the development of the State? Rather does it give the opposite impression—that the rights of every man, woman and child are being taken away from them by some of the provisions of the Bill.

Even worse is the fact that democracy itself is being usurped. Another major difference between the Bill and the existing Act is that the provision relative to the presentation to Parliament of Orders in Council has been deleted. That means, in effect, that a fourth tier of Government is being set up and none—not even the Parliament of this State, the democratic institution set up to look after the wants and needs of the men, women and children in this State—will have any say in how it operates.

Orders in Council will not be tabled in Parliament. Parliament will have no right to criticise the setting-up of regional co-ordinating councils, their constitution, or the method by which they are set up. It will not have any right to criticise the work that they undertake; what is even worse, it will not have any right to criticise the cost of regional co-ordinating councils or the cost of the work that they undertake. Certainly that is not for the benefit of every man, woman and child in this State. It is exactly the opposite. Similar methods have been used by other Governments throughout the world, but certainly not by those that are democratically elected.

I believe that the scrapping of the provision for the tabling of Orders in Council so that Parliament may be informed of what is being done by regional councils is completely wrong. Perhaps that highlights the manner in which the Bill was drawn up. It was introduced by the Premier and supported by certain sections of the ginger group of the Liberals, the very people who on another issue, several months ago, were

at one another's throat and ready to tear one another apart. But all of a sudden they have "made up" on something which is just as foul to the democratic rights of the people of the State. It is very alarming to see that the Premier has combined with those persons to upset the work and responsibilities of local government in this State. Certainly it is amazing to see this coming from a Country Party leader.

Knowing the dependency that people throughout the length and breadth of the State have on their local authorities, and knowing the way in which they look to their local government as being the form of government closest to them, and the form of government to which they have ready access, the Country Party Premier has combined with a small group of Liberals to take away the rights and responsibilities of local authorities to such an extent that, if it went to the extreme, the point could be reached where some local authorities would become merely collecting authorities for the precepts of the project boards and other boards set up within their areas. That is how much say they will have in what will go on in their areas.

No-one would deny, as the Leader of the Opposition said, that the time is opportune to have a look at the set-up of the Co-ordinator-General's Department, which was established at another time under different circumstances. I did not like the comment of the Premier and other honourable members opposite when the Bill was introduced that the Co-ordinator-General's Department would phase itself completely out as a construction authority. I am glad to see that under the provisions of the Bill the Co-ordinator-General's Department, if it so desires, can maintain itself as a construction authority.

I will go on record as saying from my own experience, and from having worked with various Government departments, that the Co-ordinator-General's Department is by far the best and most co-operative constructing authority of any Government department in this State. The work it has undertaken over the years has been of exceptionally high standard, and I pay a compliment to the staff from the Co-ordinator-General down. Mr. Barton has been a personal friend of mine for many years. I knew him before he undertook the job of Co-ordinator-General and, indeed, even before he came to Brisbane. I mention particularly Mr. Sid Schubert, Chief Engineer, Mr. Sheppard, Asst. Chief Engineer, and the late John Kindler who at one stage was Chief Engineer.

All those men set a very high standard for construction work in this State. The spirit of co-operation with which they have undertaken their work has made the department an outstanding construction authority. In recent years we have witnessed the dissipation of that great constructing authority, the Snowy Mountains Authority, but I should

not like to see the construction skill of officers of the Co-ordinator-General's Department completely set aside.

The Bill contains several strange principles. What strikes me as being particularly strange is the fact that the cart has been put before the horse in the setting-up and declaration of the regional areas. It is all very well to say that the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, declare any part of the State to be a region for the purposes of the Act, but what is there in the Bill as to the basis for a region? I think this is a very important omission. Some basis should be established first. Whether it be population, industry, transportation, the centring around a port authority or something else, a proper basis should first be established.

I referred in my introductory speech to what has been undertaken in the Mackay district where the first regional survey in the State is being undertaken. Indeed, I think it is the first in the Commonwealth. I believe this is a sensible way in which to start. I believe that we must first have an investigation, and, if the investigation reveals that established localities should be combined in a region, it should also reveal what should be the cut-off areas, and where problems of transportation are uniform, where they disagree, or where they may be more inter-related than is possible in other areas. The whole inter-relationship or infrastructure of an area has to be looked at before one can say, "This should be a region."

I think this Bill should be amended, firstly, to allow for a proper investigation of a region. Powers already exist, in clause 13 (2) of the Bill, for this to be done. Clause 13 (2) provides—

"The Co-ordinator-General shall, of his own motion or at the direction of the Minister, undertake and commission such investigations, prepare such plans, devise such ways and means, give such directions, and take such steps and measures, as he thinks necessary or desirable to secure the proper planning, preparation, execution, co-ordination, control and enforcement of a programme of works, planned developments, and environmental controls for the State and for areas over which the State claims jurisdiction."

The power is already in the Bill and I think that this particular principle should be properly established before an area is declared a region under clause 38. A proper investigation and study in depth should first be made, and stemming from this the region can be determined. This is only sensible and logical and, indeed, it is putting the horse in front of the cart so that he knows he can see in which direction he should go, or in our case, so that we will know where the cut-off points in a region will be, where the boundaries can be properly established and where matters of affinity within a region that bring various localities together

can be properly determined and established. After that is done the actual declaration can be made and the regional councils set up.

As has already been said by previous speakers, one of the problems in the setting up of regional councils is that the regional local bodies, such as local authorities, harbour boards, electricity boards, river trusts and other local boards, are not, in fact, to be represented. In the western areas the various rabbit boards, dingo fence authorities and so on are not to be represented. This is rather strange. There is no provision in the Bill for their representation. The principle laid down in the Bill is that the council shall consist of a chairman who, in each case, shall be the Co-ordinator-General or his delegate, and four or more other members who shall be appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister.

We all know what the representation will be. We all know the type of person in our own areas who is just busting to get onto this sort of body. They are people with party friends and so on and there are dictators in almost every area who like to poke their noses into everyone else's business, who like to be people of importance but responsible to no-one. These are the men who will be first in line in an attempt to get ministerial blessing and be appointed to regional councils. And the important point is that they are responsible to nobody but the Co-ordinator-General. Under the Bill as it stands they are not even responsible to Parliament. I believe that these regional councils should be properly set up on the basis of local population and local boards and bodies already in existence.

I find it rather strange that these councils, when established, with their multiple functions set out in the Bill, have no powers. They have functions to promote this, that or something else; to look at this, that or something else; to recommend this, that or something else, but they have no powers whatever. They are not given any right to take a vote on anything or any right to recommend. If they had representatives from local bodies the provision would make some sense. The Opposition wants to see some basis in the establishment of these councils, and that could be achieved by the appointment of local people responsible to the residents in their areas and with the right to make decisions. Of course, the Bill does not provide the regional councils with any power to make decisions or even with any direct contact with the local authorities.

Another disturbing feature of the Bill is that it does not provide any basis for objection by local authorities to recommendations made by the regional councils. A local authority is not able to say, for example, "We do not want such-and-such a thing done because we do not think it is good for the people who elected us as their rep-

resentatives." However, these selected members of the regional councils will have the power to make recommendations without any consideration whatever for the thoughts or feelings of the local authorities.

The part of the Bill that relates to State development areas also fails to provide such a basis for objection. This part of the Bill highlights the need for an in-depth study before any State development area is declared. Earlier I made the same remarks about the declaration of regions, and I repeat that a study should be made before the stage is reached of declaring a State development area. Under the provisions of the Bill the matter will be going backwards and forwards, but that can be obviated by a study such as I have mentioned.

Local authorities will not be given the right to either approve or reject proposals to declare State development areas. Nor will they be given the right to suggest any variations to a declaration. The whole matter will be handled by Order in Council. In fact, even the right of the local authority to be a rubber stamp is taken from it.

However, the final "crunch" is found in the provision that compels a local authority to pay for some work that it does not want to do. To say the least, this provision is a strange one. It means that a local authority cannot refuse to do the work, because if it did so the Treasurer has power to borrow money to carry out the work and compel the local authority concerned to repay him, even if it means going to the Supreme Court to make it pay the cost involved.

As the honourable member for Ipswich East has said, the "local" factor is being taken out of local government. The rights of the democratically elected representatives of the people are being taken away from them and being given to a body that will be responsible not to Parliament, but to the Co-ordinator-General and the Governor in Council.

Admittedly the Bill does provide that the Governor in Council may have regard to representations made by local authorities. But a Government of one political colour could dislike a local authority of another political colour and, purely for political purposes, completely override that local authority and force it into the position where it would be defeated at an election simply on an issue on which it had no say whatever.

Several local authorities may "jack-up", and if that happens a project board is formed. That board will have power to force the local authorities to pay for the work done or for any postponement of work. The Bill gives the Co-ordinator-General the right to say, for example, "We will not continue with this water scheme for the time being." With the escalation of costs, especially when a project is postponed for a time and then recommenced, the additional cost can be forced upon the local authorities and nobody else.

Under the Bill, the Co-ordinator-General is even entitled to adjust the cost of the work to be done by up to \$10,000. An additional borrowing of \$10,000 would mean a lot to some local authorities, yet that may become necessary under the terms of the Bill—without the issuing of an Order in Council. It might be said that such an alteration would apply only to a major dam structure worth \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, but it could also apply to a small water scheme in an isolated shire area. The honourable member for Tablelands has frequently referred to the cost of supplying water to Karumba. This is an essential project, but the whole of the cost will be placed on the local shire council, which cannot afford to meet it. That small local authority can be forced to meet any additional cost. We all know that, eventually, payment becomes a burden on the people themselves.

A principle is established in the Bill by which, if the Co-ordinator-General's Department establishes a project board to do certain work, although a local authority may feel that it is not competent to do it, or may want to default on it, it is responsible for paying for the work. The Bill merely states that the council "may", at the discretion of the Treasurer and on the recommendation of the Co-ordinator-General or the Governor in Council, receive a subsidy for such work.

I believe that the provision should be altered to make it mandatory that the council "shall" receive such subsidy. If the work that is done is work for which a local authority would normally receive a subsidy, there is no reason why a project board should not receive the same subsidy as the local authority would if it were in fact doing the work. It is important to realise that the persons within the area will have to meet the additional cost. If the people in, say, Boulia, Brisbane or Bundaberg are entitled to a subsidy and the work is undertaken by a project board, the subsidy should definitely apply.

I come now to another shocking principle in the Bill. If one reads it carefully in the light of what has been happening in the major developmental areas and the problems that various Government departments have met in undertaking major projects such as the Moura railway line, the Goonyella-Hay Point railway line, the Mt. Isa-Townsville railway line—perhaps the Greenvale railway line will provide another example in the future—one realises that many of the problems are interrelated with local authorities or other similar bodies in the areas, particularly when the projects affect major population centres.

To date, most of the projects have been fairly distant from major population centres, but some are now to come into being that will have a great effect on centres of major population that have been properly set up and town planned and are developing under the auspices of their own town plans. Yet

the Bill contains a principle under which every town plan in the State can be overridden. It says, "Notwithstanding the provision of any other Act". That means, for example, notwithstanding the provisions of the City of Brisbane Act, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Local Government Act. Irrespective of how any local government authority has implemented a system of town planning, regionalisation or zoning in its area, this provision is a complete over-riding. It establishes an entirely new principle that is very dangerous. It is the very type of principle that was used by the New South Wales Government in what was titled, I think, the Clutha Development Bill.

That Bill established a coal port at Coal-cliff, south of Sydney. Overnight, the people who had invested in homes in that beautiful area found themselves completely "detown-planned". That is a serious situation. It resulted in a loud outcry from conservationists and the surrounding home-owners, who found themselves alongside a potential major coal stockpile. Big protest meetings were held in the Sydney Town Hall, and a flood of letters were published in Sydney newspapers. There were headlines in the Sydney newspapers for several weeks. A similar provision is included in this Bill.

What is worse is that the Bill, as it stands, gives no right of appeal to the properly constituted Local Government Court, which citizens of this State normally have. Yet Government members still allege that there is something good in this Bill for every man, woman and child in the State. All men, women and children in the State should realise that they can be "detown-planned", not on the decision of Parliament but by the Governor in Council, by Order in Council. This principle must be altered before the Bill is passed.

**Mr. Aikens:** An Order in Council must be approved by this Parliament.

**Mr. CASEY:** The honourable member for Townsville South arrived in the Chamber only a short time ago. Perhaps he has not read the Bill. He would not have heard my earlier comments, or those of the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members. I have clearly pointed out that Orders in Council had to be tabled in this Parliament under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act of 1938, which was introduced by a Labor Government, whereas this Bill, which completely reorganises the Co-ordinator-General's Department, contains no such provision. While regulations have to be tabled in the House, Orders in Council do not have to be. The Opposition strongly and firmly believes that, because this fourth tier of government is being established and will be responsible only to the Co-ordinator-General and, through him, to the Governor in Council, those Orders in Council should

be tabled in this Parliament, which is the democratic institution of the people of this State.

I shall return to the problem of "detown-planning". This overrider can cut completely across the ethical safeguards which are normally the right of every person and of those administering such an Act. It will leave a nasty taste in everybody's mouth. I know, from my own experience, what is going on in my own area. I shall use the Hail Creek project as an example, although I am not working the parish pump in this regard. I regard my area as a region, not only as the eight square miles of my electorate. I believe that the right thing is being done by the local authorities in that area. They are responsible for the discussions with the Hail Creek consortium relative to the next major coal project in Queensland. That group would like to use Mackay Harbour as its port.

The Pioneer Shire Council, the responsible body in this case, has a town plan for that area. In addition, it has sent its senior consulting engineer, Mr. Geoff Nolan, to every coal-handling facility in Australia to see what the problems are and may be. He is looking at various details of operation and at design matters which relate to the stockpile areas at those places. As such, he is making recommendations to his council, which is receiving the support of thoughtful local people.

There are, however, some who have "shot off their mouths" on this matter without knowing the full facts. Others have voiced opinions without having regard to the facts. The council has not done that; it has gone about things in the correct way. It is collecting and collating facts, and looking at all aspects of the matter. It knows how a coal stockpile can be set up within its area without upsetting the environment of the people living near it and for whom it is responsible. It would be damnable if a central authority were to exercise overriding powers in the same bludgeoning way as the New South Wales Government did in the Clutha development.

There are many other points that I could mention, but most of them have been covered by previous speakers. I should like to say, however, that I believe that most of the new principles contained in the Bill could have been introduced by amending the Local Government Act. The Co-ordinator-General already has wide and sweeping powers. He has had them for some time, and while that office has been filled by men such as Charles Barton, Sir James Holt and Sir John Kemp, the Act has been interpreted wisely and well and to the benefit of the people of this State. But let us not make men of such high calibre the tools by means of which certain organisations that are not responsible electorally to the people can push their way in and get what they want.

My own area is expanding so rapidly that it has been estimated that by the year 2000 its population could be 100,000. I believe that people who are democratically elected at all levels to be responsible for the good of the people in their various areas should have their say. I therefore believe that the portion of the Bill that sets up what is in effect a fourth tier of government should be amended. If it is not, the Bill should be withdrawn and closer attention given to certain aspects of it.

It can easily be seen from the amount of lobbying that has been going on among Government members that this is rushed legislation. As I say, most of what it seeks to do could have been done by amending the Local Government Act or adjusting the boundaries of local authorities, which have caused some of the problems that have arisen in this State. The Government has not been willing to do that. Instead, to avoid offending some people, it has brought down this Bill. It is taking the processes of democracy from the men, women and children of this State, and these provisions should be amended.

**Mr. PORTER (Toowong)** (4.39 p.m.): It is very good to see that the Opposition supports the main principle of the Bill, which, in my view, is one of the most important measures to come before the House in a long time. I am surprised to find Opposition members so fearful and apprehensive of certain provisions of the Bill. Although they support it in principle, they tend to see so many niggers in so many woodpiles that eventually they reach the stage where they cannot see over the top of the woodpile and thus lose sight of principles. In fact, what the Bill proposes is so sensible in its elementary aspects that it is difficult to see why so much concern should be expressed by the Opposition.

The Bill provides, very simply, for machinery for planning, co-ordination and integration of development throughout the State, and it provides that machinery in terms of regional concepts. I should not imagine that anybody would have any quarrel with that, or would not agree that the time is long overdue for us to provide machinery of that type to ensure that Queensland does develop on a regional basis.

The Bill envisages that machinery will be provided that is quite flexible, and quite decentralised, and that will make available the assistance and advice needed by local government for proper regional development. It provides that the State may be broken up into what can be declared "State development areas". It provides also for establishing regional co-ordination councils and for constituting project boards that can construct and manage projects that are shared in common by local authorities in a regional area. So, in general terms, as I see it, the Bill aims at channelling public spending, both Government and local authority, into

the most desirable areas and the most desirable proposals—that is, for the people living in the region who have so many aspirations in common.

As far as I can make out from listening to honourable members opposite, they have not talked so much about what is in the Bill but have endeavoured to make a tremendous amount of what is not in the Bill. Wherever a matter of detail is not specified, they have thrown up their hands in horror and predicted the worst, as though the department and its officers have suddenly become dangerous lunatics who are out to cause catastrophe and disaster. This, of course, is the Department of the Co-ordinator General, which all honourable members in this House have hitherto regarded as a model of a good governmental agency. It is odd indeed, I believe, that honourable members opposite should suddenly decide that it has become a kind of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde which, the moment the Bill is implemented, will turn into some kind of raging maniac and destroy things that it has been attempting to protect and foster over many years.

The Bill, of course, is experimental. No-one would suggest for a moment that it is perfect; I certainly would not. It must be experimental in this day and age. It is doing something that is not only new for Queensland but, in many of its aspects, new for the whole of Australia. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat made a horrible story of the problems of the Clutha development in New South Wales, suggesting that there was some analogy between what the New South Wales Government had done in that instance and what the Bill provides. That, of course, is a load of rubbish. The Act covering the Clutha development was a particular Act passed by that Government and had nothing to do with its State planning agency. There is no reason to believe that if many mistakes have been perpetrated under the planning systems in other States, we may not have learnt something from those mistakes.

The Bill does not, as is constantly being said by honourable members opposite, destroy the present system of local government. It recognises that the State is not now, and has not been for some time, in my view—certainly the Bill says so quite plainly—composed of a whole host of small, isolated communities that can make domestic decisions recognising that these will be only local decisions and will have only a domestic effect. The Bill recognises that the day has passed when the State was composed of a set of small, isolated communities. Queensland, as far as I am concerned, is now a State composed of clearly discernible regions in which decisions of moment made by any local authority in a region must impinge on and have some effect on every other local authority in that region. That is the concept of the Bill.

**Mr. Houston:** How many regions do you foresee?

**Mr. PORTER:** I have no idea, and I do not believe it is my role to attempt to foresee the technicalities of what the Bill will produce. It expresses principles, and I believe that they are very good principles. I am quite sure that what flows from them will also be very good. The Bill provides a new infrastructure of government, an inter-leaving, as it were, of long-range, over-all planning providing, as I see it, new capacity for advice and expertise, and setting up broad guide-lines in concert with existing local authorities.

Of course, there is some power to ensure that in essential regional planning the recalcitrant one cannot deprive the many who agree of the benefits that will flow from over-all agreement. Of course there is, as there must be. But to believe that this is a club to belt local government out of existence is, I suggest, sheer nonsense in the very face of the obvious facts.

I believe that the passage of the Bill should be a first step towards a wholesale review of local government. For me, in this Bill there is no diminution of the local government role, but I should like to see—indeed the Government has already, as we know, taken certain steps in this regard with the university group looking at the matter now—at least a reconsideration of the role of local government in this State to determine what local authorities will require, what is their optimum viable size, what should be their sources of revenue, and whether there should be different types of revenue-producing capacities for various local authorities charged with different degrees of responsibility. For instance, I have in mind responsibility such as that of the Council of the City of Gold Coast, which has the enormous task of developing a tourist area. To try to do it out of rates and loan moneys alone has never been a very satisfactory answer to a very real problem. To me there can be differences in the ways in which various local authorities should be permitted to approach the problem of securing their finance.

I look on this Bill as a major move in bringing local government into the second part of the twentieth century. It is overdue, but I am delighted it is here. I believe that the next step should undoubtedly be a review of the system of local government to ensure that it fits in with what is proposed in terms of strategy and planning in this Bill that we are now considering. It is a first-rate Bill, and I am delighted that the Opposition will not oppose it, although it seems that it may play around with a few inconsequential amendments.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton South) (4.48 p.m.): The measure before the House has been described in many ways. The principles have been commended in certain respects and the dangers have been exposed. That is very important. Regardless of what the previous speaker has said, there are many dangers in the Bill, as the Leader of the

Opposition and other speakers on this side have outlined. I intend to continue in that vein a little later.

One aspect that has not been canvassed, however, is the fact that the Bill is really a further extension of public administration in this State. This is a very important point, and is one that we should look at because at the moment the public image of public administration is at a very low ebb. People look upon administration, whether it is called socialised industry, State-owned industry, bureaucracy or anything else, as being often inefficient, often strangled with red tape, often propagating services with inequalities and often parochial in the way it deals with the needs of people in the various areas.

A great deal is said about wastage and overlapping. Therefore, it was interesting for me to see that the aim of the Bill is to improve the over-all administration of the State. One must commend such an aim. One must agree that it is very good because it talks about co-ordination, planning, programming, regional development and environmental co-ordination. That is commendable, because it is in line with the thoughts in the minds of many public administrators who are introducing such modern administration methods as the P.P.B. system—the planning, programming budgeting scheme—which, as many honourable members know, has been used by the P.M.G. Department. It is necessary to consider these new methods if one wants efficient management and administration.

The principle underlying this Bill, therefore, sounds worth while, but we may ask if this is the real reason why the Government has introduced it. The A.L.P. has been advocating decentralisation and regional planning for many years, and the Government has been saying, "Yes, we will do it." It is rather strange that the Bill is introduced only a few months before a general election. However, leaving aside the election motive, we might look at another aspect of the matter.

As the Minister for Industrial Development entered the debate and had a fair amount to say, one cannot help but wonder whether this Bill is really something to bolster up his department. Is this Bill actually saying to the people of Queensland, "The Department of Industrial Development and the departments that ordinarily deal with co-ordination have not, in fact, been doing their job and we must do something about it"? It reminds me of the department that the Prime Minister of England set up when he was not satisfied with the Treasury Department. He formed a new department, the Department of Economic Development. This Bill has an analogy with that, because it is obvious that the Department of Industrial Development has not been fulfilling its promises. Therefore, can we really depend on anything being done even though the structure of the Bill is sound?

I commend the outline, or, one might say, the skeleton, of the Bill, but what is going to happen when it is put into practice? It speaks of the orderly arrangement and revision of the general programmes of work in the State; it speaks of trying to get an equitable proportioning of finances throughout the State, and of preventing the overlapping and duplication of services within the State. One might ask, first of all, if this is an admission by the Government that this has actually been happening. Have we not had an orderly arrangement of the programmes of work within the State? Has there been some inequality in the spending of the moneys within the State? Have we had duplicating and overlapping of the works of the various departments within the State?

**Mr. B. Wood:** Are you saying that there has been lack of co-ordination between, say, the Education Department and the Works Department?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Yes. We know that this happens. We know that the Education Department was closing schools down and weeks later the Works Department was moving in on those schools and building new tank stands. In other cases, new libraries were provided just before the schools were closed down. There has been overlapping and lack of co-ordination, as well as wastage, in the activities of the State.

I admit that the principles of the Bill are good. It is the skeleton blueprint of what one might say are the needs of this State for regional development and for the programming of work throughout the State. But how will it be put into practice? In this matter, I think we can only look back over the Government's performance. This is what we usually look to when making comparisons. If we are considering dealing with some business enterprise, we do not look to how it might work in the future; we look back at the service it has given and how efficient it has been. Therefore, I think it is very important that we look back to see what this Government has done in regional development and regional planning and programming. I would say that its record has been shocking, and if things happen in the future as they have in the past, this Bill in not worth the paper it is written on.

As one who fights for Central Queensland, I raise the case for Central Queensland. I believe that the booklet that I have here was the first ever published by the Department of Industrial Development on regional potential. It is headed, "Resources in Industry in Central Queensland." This was the booklet that the Minister for Industrial Development praised as showing what the Government had done and was doing, yet when we go through it we see just how little has in fact been done. The Minister praised the foresight, the forward thinking, the planning and programming of this Government, yet, according to this booklet, one of the most important features of Central Queensland is that its

industries are export oriented. These are the minerals, the coal, the meat and similar things for which we need an export trade. I intend to read to the House the very clear statements contained in this booklet.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the honourable member that although this debate is a fairly wide one, he will shortly have an opportunity of discussing the Estimates of the Department of Industrial Development.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, but what I have to say is very relevant. The Minister for Industrial Development spoke in this debate, and I am now referring to his comments.

The booklet states that, if the need ever arose, Port Alma, which, except for Sydney, has the deepest economically dredgable depth of any port on the eastern coast of Australia, could be developed to accommodate vessels of 120,000 tons. That statement was made in a booklet published by the department and, therefore, the Government. In view of that, it is interesting to look at the poor performance of the Government in promoting Port Alma.

First, the Government purposely refused to allow Port Alma to have any part of the wheat trade. I congratulate Gladstone on winning it; but in terms of regional development and equality of development everyone should get his fair share—and Port Alma certainly is not getting its fair share. Gladstone became the wheat port for Central Queensland.

Next, as a result of this Government's policy, even the meat-export trade has bypassed Port Alma, and Brisbane is becoming the main centre for Queensland's meat exports. All honourable members know that for years Port Alma has depended for its livelihood on the meat trade; yet this Government, which boasts about its policy of regional planning, regional development and forward thinking, has allowed Port Alma's meat trade to disappear.

Everyone is aware of the importance of coal to Central Queensland. However, in spite of the many deputations and requests to have coal shipped through Port Alma, the Government was prepared to suggest that a new port be established at Sabina Point. I believe that the Government's suggestion would have been implemented if it had not been for the efforts of certain civic and political leaders in Central Queensland. Mr. Dunn, who is the editor of the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin", and I took up the fight. In fact, Mr. Dunn accompanied me and addressed a meeting of waterside workers, to rally support against the proposal to ship coal through Sabina Point. Requests were made in Parliament to shelve the proposal, and fortunately it has been pigeon-holed. However, I believe the Government has plans in mind to establish another coal port in Central Queensland. Of course, this may

appeal to the Government as regional development, but in the true spirit of equality of development Port Alma should receive its fair share.

Recommendations have been made about the tremendous water potential of Central Queensland. The Bill is designed to co-ordinate this State's works programme and to develop its resources. Yet the Fitzroy Barrage, which, when completed, will have a capacity of 14,500 million gallons and will bring tremendous industrial development to Rockhampton and Central Queensland, was rejected by the Government. It turned a blind eye and forced the people of Rockhampton to carry the financial burden involved, just as it is doing with Port Alma. As well, schemes are envisaged for The Gap and Nathan Gorge, but, in spite of the tremendous potential, regional planning in Central Queensland is lacking.

Freight rates are of great importance in programming development in any area. For all the talk we have heard from the Government about decentralisation, Rockhampton and Central Queensland have once again received the short end of the stick. Even though cement is manufactured in Rockhampton, it is cheaper in Bundaberg and Mackay than in Rockhampton. Pineapples grown at Yeppoon sell cheaper in Brisbane than in Rockhampton, which is only 23 miles away. Because of this Government's policy of centralisation rather than decentralisation, many local industries have collapsed. Honourable members might have heard of the "Red-leaf" products of Denham Bros. Ltd., which commenced business in Brisbane but could not compete with the local manufactures here and has almost been destroyed in Rockhampton. This has occurred as a result of this Government's centralised policies.

Another industry that comes to mind is fishing. "The Morning Bulletin" of Thursday, 4 November, referred to the facilities provided for the Central Queensland fishing industry. The late member for Callide fought very hard on behalf of the industry in that part of the State. The honourable member for Rockhampton North and I have also been very vocal in fighting for the fishing industry and in trying to prevent the Japanese from encroaching on our near-coastal waters. The Bill is framed to propagate equitable expenditure. I point out that over the past 10 years as little as \$300 to \$400 has been spent on the Fish Board in Rockhampton. That is supposed to be equality of expenditure.

In this booklet, the fishing industry is said to have great potential. Last year, 500,000 lb. of prawns were caught in the area. This is surely an indication of the potential of the area. Rosslyn Bay has now become a very excellent mooring area for the fishing industry. But what is the sense in having a mooring area without the facilities to handle the product? Many

thousands of dollars must be spent in providing proper facilities for the fishing industry in Central Queensland. While talking about regional development and planning, let us look at the industries that have the potential to develop into something worth while. We are certainly not doing that under this legislation.

It is well known that if we wish to develop an area to make it viable and to make the industries in it profitable and worth while, we must ensure that people can commute between one point and another. I do not think many honourable members would be game to drive on the Capricorn Highway. They would be afraid of breaking an axle between Rockhampton and Emerald.

**Mr. Ahern:** I have driven over it.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Then the honourable member will know just how bad it is. It is terrible. The prevalence of accidents and fatalities on it make it imperative that something be done to improve it. Regardless of the cases that have been advanced, the deputations, and the requests made in this Chamber, we have been told that there is no money available for this work.

The Main Roads Department Estimates are, however, coming up for debate shortly, and I shall speak at length on the Capricorn Highway then.

If we are genuine in our talk about regional development, decentralisation and equality of expenditure, money must be made available. We have heard Government members talk about how important the mineral industries are, we have heard them "skite" about Blackwater and Goonyella, and we have been told of the tremendous development and revenue that these projects bring into Queensland. But what about the people who have to live at Blackwater, without the facilities of a hospital or a secondary school! A few months ago 99 children were travelling 40-odd miles by bus from Blackwater to Emerald to attend secondary school. I believe that the number next year will be about 160, but no move is being made to provide a secondary school at Blackwater. This legislation deals with regional development—it is thinking ahead—but we have been told that a high school cannot be built till 1973. I think the actual words in the Minister's letters were, "We cannot build a high school at Blackwater as the present numbers do not warrant it."

The Government has "skited" that, within a few years, the population of Blackwater will grow to 12,000. We know that in a couple of years there will be 5,000 people and that next year there could be 4,000, but the Premier and the Government are not prepared to provide for them the normal facilities that are taken for granted in city areas. That is not forward thinking, and it is certainly not development.

I now have some comment to make about the establishment of a fruit cannery in Central Queensland. Many years ago the late

member for Callide, with the support of other members in the area, including the former member for Rockhampton South—I have already said that I give credit where it is due—fought hard to get a cannery at Yeppoon. We believe that such a plant is essential to supplement the primary industries in the area. Even a few years ago about 30,000 tons of pineapples were produced each year in the Yeppoon area, which also produces 40 per cent of the State's total output of papaws. We know also that sugar is grown nearby and that this would present no real problem. We know that there is also labour and land available. In fact, all the requirements are there, yet the Government's decision was completely against the establishment of a cannery.

**Mr. Lickiss:** Did they have a cannery up there?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** There was a cannery a long time ago. I could spend a long time explaining why it did not work out, but it would not be relevant to this point. I am now talking about a completely different area. I am not talking about Rockhampton but about the establishment of a cannery at Yeppoon, where the products are grown. Surely we could follow the ideal in industry of handling the product from beginning to end. After all, that is what Gladstone is trying to do by developing the first product and thereafter trying to produce all the by-products. If such a system is adopted in the mining industry, it should also be applied to primary industry, particularly fruit-growing.

There is a strong case to have the proposal for a cannery in Yeppoon reviewed. It must be done immediately. I realise there is an employment problem in this area. A scallop industry, which is just starting up, is relieving some of the problem. But imagine what the establishment of a cannery would do. It would relieve the farmer of some of his costs. He would not be involved in the tremendous cost of transporting his product to Brisbane. It would create employment in the area. It would result in greater productivity in Central Queensland. However, all this has been overlooked, although we are told that this Government is undertaking forward planning.

**Mr. Bird:** Has an economic survey been carried out?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Yes, and it has been challenged by a dozen people in a dozen quarters. Unfortunately, no-one is prepared to listen to the challenges.

**Mr. Bird** interjected.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The late Mr. V. E. Jones, the former member for Callide, was a great advocate of this project and fought hard for it. He, the honourable member for Rockhampton North, the honourable member for Mackenzie and I have contested the views expressed on this project. But nothing

has been done because, in my view, the forces behind the Northgate Cannery were so great that the Government was not prepared to act towards decentralising this industry.

**Mr. Thackeray:** It was based on the shares in the Northgate Cannery.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** That is right. As the honourable member for Rockhampton North pointed out, it comes back to the shares in the Northgate Cannery. Regardless of the findings of the efficiency experts involved, the case was not accepted by the Government. That decision must be reviewed.

As I said at the outset, some of the principles in the legislation are dangerous.

One such principle overrides the rights of the individual. The Co-ordinator-General will have the right to occupy land for any length of time. He will be able to enter land, excavate it, erect workshops on it, or do anything he wants to. People who own land are fully aware of the trouble that is caused by timber-getters who go through their land. They knock down fences and fail to close gates after them, and cattle get out. Not all timber-getters do this—most of them are responsible people—but it does happen.

As I say, under the Bill the Government can move in and occupy land. I should like to be given the actual definition of the word "occupy". Does it mean that the Government can stay on the land for any length of time? The Government can also leave for a while and then return. It can do what it likes. This completely erodes the rights of the individual. It is one of the dangers contained in the Bill. It undermines the democratic rights of the people. Any person should have the right to prevent another, regardless of who he is, from coming onto his land and, rather than simply looking at his property, erecting a workshop, excavating, making roads, or doing whatever else he likes.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** You said earlier that the Bill was not worth the paper it is written on. Why are you raising this point?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Because it completely undermines the rights of the people.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** A while ago you said it was not worth the paper it is written on.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** If the Premier had been listening, he would have heard me say that unless it is carried out properly it is not worth the paper it is written on. My case was built on the past performance of the Government. Some provisions of the Bill, even if they are carried out properly, will erode the rights of the individual. They are a danger to the representative Government because they remove the right of the people to appeal to us. If they did appeal to us, what could we do? It will be lawful for the Co-ordinator-General to do this so what

can we, as members of Parliament, do to protect the people? Nothing can be done about it. The only way I can describe such a provision is that it is Hitlerism.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (5.9 p.m.): The Bill was hailed by the Press as being one of the major leaps forward by the State Government in regional planning and environmental control. Because of this, I felt I would be lucky to get an opportunity to speak to the Bill. I thought Country Party members would rush in to talk about regional planning, because it will involve country people to a greater extent than people in the already established industrial area of Brisbane. After listening to the debate all day and waiting in vain for the Country Party to send someone in to bat for the Premier, I can only conclude that the Premier's position is somewhat akin to that of Horatio when he kept the bridge. Although my memory is not as good as it might have been years ago, I recall that one of the lines of the dissertation on how Horatio kept the bridge went something like this: "Even the ranks of Tuscany scarce could raise a cheer". From the lack of performance by Country Party members in the Chamber today, I feel that the Premier has been left to hold the bridge, and even the ranks of the Country Party are so unenthusiastic that they "scarce could raise a cheer".

**Mr. Ahern:** I covered it all at the introductory stage.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am pleased to have the honourable member's own admission on that. Personally, I did not know he had spoken, and I sat right through the debate.

**Mr. Ahern:** You don't turn up sometimes.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am not going to enter into a dissertation on who remains in the Chamber longest, or who has the best attendance record. If, because of the insignificance of the honourable member's contribution, I missed it, I apologise.

Let us look at the performance of Government members in support of what was held up as a great leap forward by the Government in terms of regional planning and environmental control. The honourable member for Toowong descended from his ivory tower, and once again condescended to address the House in no uncertain manner for about 15 minutes. But what did he say? He complained about the Opposition not being concerned with what was in the Bill but with what we thought had been left out. So far as I am concerned, there is enough in the Bill to make me feel not only a great deal of concern but also a great deal of alarm, particularly when the remarks of the honourable member for Toowong are tied to those of the honourable member for Ithaca who paddled his canoe down Ithaca Creek. The honourable member for Ithaca said that he hoped the

Bill would go through in a hurry, because there would then be no more Cooloolas, no more Fraser Islands, and no more Tallebudgeras.

**Mr. Baldwin:** I'll say there won't be!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Of course there will not be. Again I return to the Premier's statement when, in hailing the Bill, he said that every man, woman and child would have the opportunity to co-operate in this great leap forward to regional planning. It would have to be a complete reversal of the form shown over the last 12 years for the Government, the Premier or any Minister, to invite the public to participate in any move for sensible planning of the environment. It is for this reason that many parts of the Bill cause me not only concern but alarm.

Before dealing with the principles of the Bill, I intend to accept the challenge of the Premier and the honourable member for Chatsworth on what I said at the introductory stage about land conservation measures and the Victorian legislation. The only quarrel that those two eminent gentlemen could have with me was that I said the Victorian Labor Party had supported the measure which had been opposed by the Country Party in Victoria, and in the very same terms that the Premier used when I spoke on the desirability of having a proper land conservation Bill as part of environmental and regional planning.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** You told me that the Opposition divided six times on it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes, of course it did. The honourable member can get all the cold comfort that he seeks from the fact that the Opposition in Victoria divided the Parliament on six occasions during the passage of that legislation. If the honourable member reads my speech at the introductory stage, he will find that I said that even though the Victorian Bill had imperfections, it was still the most advanced piece of land-use legislation on the Statute Book of any State.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** You said it was supported by the Labor Party.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The Labor Party in Victoria indicated that, even though it supported the Bill, it would be moving amendments during the Committee stage.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** A change of position!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** It is not a change of position. The honourable member need not worry. Many amendments will come from this side of the House at the Committee stage, even though we support the principle of regional planning.

I know that the honourable member for Chatsworth and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha have been sitting in the Chamber this afternoon waiting to hear what the honourable member for Salisbury had to

say so that they would have something to speak about later in the debate. I do not mind that. I take it as an honour that the tenor of my speeches in this House provides the lesser lights with material on which to make speeches. I do not care how long the honourable member for Chatsworth sits in the House. When I make my contribution to a debate, I make it without fear of contradiction. I am happy to rise in this Chamber and speak from my own convictions, because I know that time will prove me correct, as it has on so many occasions in the past. Whenever a major social issue has been raised in this Chamber and there has been a period of stalling on the part of the Government—issues such as Cooloolo, Fraser Island and Tallebudgera Creek; honourable members opposite can mention any others that they have in mind—my submissions have always been shown to be correct. I challenge any member of the Government to say that in those instances the Government had not belatedly to accept the advice of the shadow Minister for Conservation on the Opposition benches.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** Who is that?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The Premier asks who the shadow Minister for Conservation is. Let me ask him this question: Who is the Minister for Conservation?

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** You answer my question and I will answer yours.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Let the Premier answer my question. As I have said before—I say it again—the Minister for Conservation in the Queensland Parliament is so remote from conservation that any resemblance is purely coincidental. The Premier knows that. He knows that a political fraud and sham was perpetrated on the people of Queensland after he had disbanded the Conservation portfolio. I do not intend to waste my time arguing with the Premier on that matter.

**Mr. Davis:** He is asking himself who is Premier.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** It might not be a bad idea for him to do that, either. Only a few months ago the Premier was asking himself who might be Premier.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I shall return to the Bill and give the lesser lights in the House some material on which to keep the debate going.

If the Premier does not give me answers when he replies at this stage, he can bet his bottom dollar that I will rise in my place again at the Committee stage.

Skipping quickly through the Bill, I come to a principle that, to me, is little short of amazing and certainly causes me a great deal of concern. One of the clauses—I am not allowed to refer to it by number, but it is the

one following clause 106—gives the Governor in Council power, by proclamation published in the Gazette, to place under the control and management of the Co-ordinator-General any land reserved and set apart for a public purpose, any cemetery, park, foreshore or other land, and any building, structure, or other thing that has been provided for out of moneys appropriated by Parliament.

I want honourable members who say they are so satisfied with the legislation to read that clause and ascertain its full import. For obvious or other reasons the Bill does not contain a definition of "park". As it does not, it could be suggested that the clause, as it relates to parks, is wide open. It could well embrace a national park and a marine or habitat reserve. The clause also refers to the foreshore, but the definition of "foreshore" leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader what is meant by that word.

Let us examine the powers that the clause gives the Governor in Council in respect of certain areas. We know the shame of the Government over Cooloola, and we know that it still has not resolved that problem. When an area is designated as a development area, the clause I am referring to gives the Governor in Council power to manage reserves, parks, etc., and I am wondering whether because of the provisions of that clause we might see the sand miners going into the Cooloola area.

What would have happened if the Bill in its entirety had been in force before the second episode of the Tallebudgera affair? Again to the unending discredit of the Government, that is another problem that has not been solved. Under the powers conferred on the Governor in Council by the Bill, there would have been no question of the conservationists exerting pressure to have the expressway rerouted at Tallebudgera. Under the powers conferred on him the Governor in Council would have declared the area, and he would have put the freeway and the bridge across the marine habitat, and to hell with the public and the conservation movement generally. I am quite certain that the chrome-plated conservationists on the Government side have either not read the clause or have failed to realise the powers that will be placed in the hands of the Governor in Council to make such determinations.

The honourable member for Ithaca hails the Bill and wants to see it brought fully into operation. He is confident that there will be no more of the present out-of-date approach to the Mining Warden's Court to resolve environmental problems. He would be more concerned if he realised the import of the clause I have been referring to, and the enormous power it confers on the Governor in Council in respect of the control of reserves, etc. If those members of the Government who hailed the legislation as

being the "in" thing coupled what is contained in that clause with the fact that nowhere in the Bill is there any right of appeal, or any obligation on the Government to give public representation on the boards, or any machinery for the general public to lodge objections to any scheme, they would realise that, contrary to their present beliefs, there is going to be greater and greater confrontation between the various developmental companies and the conservation movement.

Having dealt with that aspect of the Bill, I want to go back to the principle that the Co-ordinator-General may hold an inquiry if he considers an inquiry should be held. Again it is not a question of the public having the right to be heard in any controversy. An inquiry will be held only if the Co-ordinator-General considers it should be held, and there is no guarantee that, even if one is held, the public will be able to present its case. There is no avenue whereby the public can, of its own volition, make a submission to the regional councils or, for that matter, to the Government.

It is because the State of Queensland is so far behind the other States in conservation generally that I am going to take up this challenge about Queensland leading Australia in this field. I repeat, anything worth while in this direction—you name it; we haven't got it.

**Mr. Hughes:** We have more national parks than any State in Australia.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The honourable member would have to be joking. He knows quite well that we have a smaller national park area than that of the little State of Tasmania, although it is trying to destroy Lake Pedder. We have .7 per cent of the area of Queensland in national parks and, if one gets down to area, we still have less than Tasmania.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** You draw a pretty long bow.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** When I get one made I will bring it over and plait it into the honourable member's curly hair.

This Bill not only provides for regional planning, or supposedly provides for regional planning, but also for environmental control. I noticed, with some degree of cynicism, that in the title of the Bill the environment part has been relegated to that covered by "Etc." It is designated the State and Regional Planning and Development, Etc., Bill. This Government thinks so much of environment that that subject forms part of the heading "Etc." I want to expand somewhat on this principle. Let us look at the provisions of the Bill which deal with the Environmental Control Council, which will have something like 19 representatives ranging through from the Treasury to the Electricity Commission and down to the Departments of Industrial Development, Transport, Housing Commission, and so on. According to the

Premier this will be the leading conservation State in Australia. That must be because the Premier himself planted 100 pine trees on his own estate and the Minister for Tourism has been running around Queensland planting a few trees and exhorting everyone else to plant a tree. However, at the rate brigalow is being cleared—and this work will soon extend into the wallum country—the Government will not be able to keep up with the rate of destruction, no matter how many trees are planted.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Don't forget the rain forests.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** When the Estimates for the Department of Industrial Development are being debated, I intend to deal with rain forests and surveys that have been made. The Government is only interested in the "quick quid". It is careful to conduct an economic study, but fails to conduct an ecological study. If anything has caused a scandal in Queensland—it would take at least half an hour to mention all of the things that have—it is the ludicrous suggestion to establish a wood-chip industry within a radius of 75 miles of Cairns in a rain forest. However, I shall have more to say on that at a later date.

To revert to the Environmental Control Council, I remind honourable members that it meets only twice a year. Of course, that is to be expected because it does not receive any encouragement from our "conservation-minded" Premier. I shall compare this Government's poor performance with the enlightened approach of its political counterpart in Victoria. I suppose the Premier can be excused for his performance because, whereas in Victoria the Liberal Party is the dominant power, in this State the Country Party is the leader in the coalition. Victoria is fortunate in that it does not have the dead hand of the Country Party in control.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** The Labor Party is in the doldrums throughout Australia.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Don't worry about that. The Labor Party is not in the doldrums. We are breathing down the honourable member's neck. We received 43 per cent of the votes for something like 16 seats fewer.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not know why he picks on me; I am only a little fellow.

In Victoria, with a Government of the same political kidney as this Government, the environmental protection body consists of an Environment Protection Authority, an Environment Protection Council and an Environment Protection Appeal Board. As I have said on at least a dozen occasions, in Queensland there is no avenue open to anybody—an individual, a local authority or any other organisation—to appeal against the decisions that will be made and acclaimed as the ultimate in regional planning.

**Mr. Blake:** It is not enlightened legislation but lightened legislation.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Not only that, it is also deficient. As a matter of fact, I go so far as to suggest that the whole sorry mess should be withdrawn and a sensible regional planning Bill drawn up in its place. I challenge the Government to do that, and, because I am not allowed to use the word "guts", to show us that it has intestinal fortitude.

**Mr. Hinze:** Tell us how you would draw it up.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The honourable member for South Coast wants to buy into this fight. After four years he has not been able to resolve the problem at Tallebudgera. If I had been a member of the committee that examined the problem, it would have been fixed up four years ago. I would not have allowed a Government department to become involved in a scheme that will do nothing other than wreck a marine habitat reserve. I would want to know why the Department of Harbours and Marine agreed to it in the first place.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Look at the cost involved to change it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** That is a good point. I would want to know why the department wanted to straighten Tallebudgera Creek. The honourable member for South Coast knows the reasons. The Government's record is shocking. Instead of making facetious interjections the honourable member should go outside and hang his head in shame.

The Victorian legislation covering membership of the Environment Protection Council provides—

"one shall be appointed by the Minister . . . submitted by the Victorian Chamber of Manufacturers;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister . . . submitted by the Victorian Trades Hall Council;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister of Water Supply from among the Commissioners of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission;

"one shall be the Engineer in Chief of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works;

"one shall be the Chief Health Officer;

"one shall be the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife;"

Of course, we have not a director of an integrated Fisheries and Wildlife Department so we could not have him on the council. The provision continues—

"one shall be a municipal councillor appointed on the nomination of the Minister for Local Government . . . submitted by the Municipal Association of Victoria;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister as representing the general public;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister for Fuel and Power from among the officers of the State Electricity Commission;

"one shall be the chairman of the Soil Conservation Authority;

"one shall be appointed . . . from among the officers of the Gas and Fuel Corporation;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister of Mines as a person with appropriate qualifications in environmental management;

"one shall be an engineer of the Ports and Harbours and Division of the Public Works Department nominated by the Minister of Public Works;

"one shall be appointed by the Minister on the nomination of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation as a qualified industrial waste chemist or industrial waste engineer residing in Victoria;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister of Agriculture;

"one shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister for Local Government as a qualified person engaged in town and country planning;"

**Mr. Hinze:** What council is this you are talking about?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am talking about the Environment Protection Council. Why does the honourable member not write to his Country Party mates in Victoria and become enlightened?

**Mr. Hinze:** There is a difference between that and a regional planning authority.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** This Bill provides for environmental control. You should be concerned about the Bill.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member please address his remarks to the Chair?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I did not mean that you should be concerned, Mr. Acting Speaker. I know that you are completely impartial and that you would not sit me down.

In upholding the decorum of this House, for which I am famous, I say to the honourable member for South Coast that he, of all members in this Chamber, should be most concerned about what is in the Bill because it gives power to the Governor in Council to direct local authorities to carry out work. What sort of a plight would the people of the Gold Coast be in if the Governor in Council told the local authority

that it should accept responsibility for maintaining the eroded beaches? How would he like to have to face the ratepayers of the Gold Coast if this was "plonked" on them?

**Mr. Hinze:** They have already told the local authority that.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Of course, and that is why nothing has been done. The honourable member knows that. He has been complaining about it far too long. He should be on his feet supporting what I am saying rather than sitting there letting "Horatio Petersen" hold the bridge this afternoon.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable knows quite well that, in referring to an honourable member, he should use the correct title.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am sorry, Mr. Acting Speaker. I will amend that to the "Honourable Horatio".

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will refer to the Premier in the correct manner.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I agree with you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I certainly would not want to upset you at this stage because I think I still have five or 10 minutes in which to speak.

Returning to what I was saying about environmental protection, I should like to refer to what I said at the introductory stage concerning land conservation matters. This Bill is totally deficient inasmuch as it has nothing in it relative to standing committees on the environment, and standing committees to assess area resources. It adopts the old approach of the Government that the Co-ordinator-General or the Governor in Council may set up a committee. There is no reference to setting up standing committees on pollution and no suggestion of setting up standing committees to carry out research into the resources of certain areas so that they may be developed properly. As a matter of fact, I am rather astounded to discover that under the Bill the Co-ordinator-General is given power to take land—admittedly under the Acquisition of Land Act—and, if the land is not used for the scheme he has in mind, the Governor in Council may divest the Crown of it. He can vest it in a Government department, a local authority, or a private individual. Had this principle been introduced by a Labor Government, it would be referred to as the heavy hand of socialism.

I thought that the time was long past for Governments or local authorities to have this unquestionable right to resume land. One would have thought that any enlightened legislation would set up a body to which a local authority or any other semi-governmental or governmental authority should prove conclusively why and for what purpose it required the land. It should have to prove that the resumption was in the

public interest. However, what has been the sorry plight of people who have been victims of resumptions either by local authorities or by governmental bodies? The resuming authority usually determines the value of the land and, in many instances, it is less than that set by the Valuer-General.

**Mr. Lane:** That is the case with the Brisbane City Council.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I know that the honourable member likes to bring the Brisbane City Council into all arguments. If it were not for the honourable member for Salisbury and the Brisbane City Council, he could not make a speech. I do not care. Irrespective of the political colour of the council things were never different. It is so long since there has been any opposition to the Labor Party in the Brisbane City Council that that is forgotten, but the same position prevailed under the Chandler administration.

**Mr. Lane:** You get better treatment from the Main Roads Department in regard to resumptions.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** As I said to the honourable member for Kurilpa, "You would have to be joking." In every case I have had to handle, I have finished up getting \$400 or \$800 more than the Main Roads Department offered. It does not matter whether the honourable member gets comfort from using Clem Jones and the Labor Council, because the position was no different under the C.M.O. and it would not be different under any other organisation. The law allows the resumption of land and, instead of an independent valuation being made, the resuming authority determines the valuation.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Are you criticising the council?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** If I have achieved nothing else, I have finally awakened the Minister. His colleagues accused me 10 minutes ago of criticising the council and he has suddenly realised it.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I could not hear you.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** From now to the end of my speech I shall use the microphone. I shall patiently explain it to the Minister again and, if he finds he cannot understand what I am saying, he can come down to my office where I have a blackboard, and I shall put it in black and white for him. In his performance the other day relative to Mon Repos beach, he blotted his copy book for all time. He did not know where Mon Repos beach was, let alone what was happening there.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Somebody has been fooling you.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** When Mr. Speaker ruled that because I was rude he would not allow the Minister to answer my question, I

saw the expression of relief come over the Minister's face. I expected a major collapse from him.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member confine himself to the measure before the House?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes, Mr. Acting Speaker, I shall do that.

Irrespective of the council or local authority concerned, or its political colour, the power of resumption is provided in the land laws of the State. The Bill perpetuates this situation. In fact, honourable members opposite probably saw on television last night Lang Hancock crying that Governments would not let him do this or that. He had the idea that he should have the unfettered right to mine anywhere. The Government has embodied the principle of resumption in the Bill. It can take land from any citizen, without having to use it for a developmental project of public interest. The Government can hand it out to its mates if it likes, after a suitable time.

**Mr. Sullivan:** You are living back in the days of Labor. It doesn't work that way now.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not know about that. I advise the Minister not to tempt me, or I might start talking about dealings in Comalco shares. No-one can convince me that Comalco gave shares to the Minister because he was good looking.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is engaging in quite a lengthy conversation. I wish he would return to the measure before the House.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I think that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, as an independent referee, would agree that I am capable of holding my own.

After being rudely interrupted by the Minister for Lands, let me now say that not only is the Government perpetuating outmoded legislation, but it is introducing the absolute power to take land, not necessarily for certain purposes in the public interest, and dispose of it to some other Government body, organisation, local authority, or person. I regard that clause as highly suspicious indeed. One can well envisage under this legislation the steam-rolling tactics of a Government that would take over David Fleay's fauna reserve, build a freeway through it, and dispose of the rest of the area to some other person.

The honourable member for Toowong said the Opposition complained not so much about what was in the Bill but what was not in it. I have touched on only a few of its major principles. Far from being a forward step in planning, there is food for thought that this legislation will lead to great confrontations not only with the conservation movement but with private persons whose land has been filched from them not in the

public interest but merely because the Co-ordinator-General has absolute power to resume land almost at will.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. DEAN** (Sandgate) (5.49 p.m.): Although many of the important facets of the Bill have been covered widely and competently by the Leader of the Opposition and other members on this side of the House, I feel impelled to make a contribution to the debate at this stage because of my concern for, and close association with, local authorities over many years.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** You will be the first one on your side to do it.

**Mr. DEAN:** I know we may be accused of tedious repetition, but I shall try to avoid that.

After studying the Bill over the past week and putting my own interpretation on its provisions, I believe more than ever that an ombudsman will be necessary when it is proclaimed. It seems to me that it will have a very restraining influence on the functions of local authority and local government organisations generally.

I have heard it said over the years—I am sure that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, and other honourable members have heard it, too—that in the very near future a decision will have to be made as to whether the State instrumentality—the Government in which we serve—will be superseded by a form of local government, or whether local government will be superseded by the State instrumentality. Many people far more competent than I am to express an opinion on the role of the State Government and local government in public administration have said that the two forms of government cannot run parallel indefinitely. The activities of many departments now overlap and interweave to the point of embarrassment, and usually it is the local authority that is embarrassed. Perhaps my feelings are stronger for local government than for any other administration, as I served in that sphere for many years and realise what an important role it plays in the everyday life of a citizen. Of all the levels of government, it is the closest to his daily life. Although it may not be in our time, some day a decision will have to be made between the State instrumentality and the local government instrumentality.

The Leader of the Opposition raised some very pertinent points relative to certain principles in the Bill. One point that he made was that the Bill could be the beginning of the replacement of shire councils with regional boards. One can certainly draw a very clear inference to that effect from the provisions of the Bill. I am sure that it would not happen under a Labor Government, but a Government of the same political persuasion as this one may seize the opportunity provided by the Bill to bring the activities of local councils to an end. I

should be very sorry to see that happen because, as I said earlier, the functions of local government are very close to the hearts of the people.

**Mr. Houston:** The honourable member for Toowong left no doubt that the Government intends to do away with local authorities.

**Mr. DEAN:** Perhaps his remarks could be construed in that way.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out also the very wide powers that the Co-ordinator-General will have. I do not intend to be derogatory in any way of the person who holds that very important position in the community; I have no doubt that he would do what he thought best for the community generally at the time. However, everyone makes mistakes, and even the Co-ordinator-General might do something that could have a very damaging and undemocratic effect on the community as a whole.

Shire councils are undoubtedly in a very precarious position at present. Over the past few months I have travelled the State rather extensively in company with some of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber. I have discussed closely with many local councillors the problems that their councils face, and I am satisfied that the Bill will not assist them to overcome these problems.

Of course, the provisions of the Bill could act the other way. In his wisdom, the Co-ordinator-General might decide to assist local authorities through his department and relieve them of the burden they are now carrying. He might allow them to function as was intended originally, that is, for the benefit of the people in all aspects of their daily life.

When we study the Bill, we can see where perhaps its drafting was not given sufficiently careful consideration. After listening to the various contributions today, I, too, feel that it would be wise to reconsider the Bill with a view to redrafting it in a fairer manner.

I agree with my leader and other honourable members on this side on the need for State and regional planning, as long as it is done in such a way that all sections of the State and all the people get a "fair go", with full consideration for their various interests. I am concerned about the wide powers vested in the Co-ordinator-General whereby he can authorise regional boards to procure land for certain purposes. The land may not subsequently be used for the purpose for which it was procured. We have all seen that sort of thing happen. It is undesirable that people's property should be acquired for a particular purpose and later resold to other interests. Such a practice is undemocratic. Irrespective of who does it, it should not be allowed.

Most countries have adopted a scheme of natural economic planning by central planning agencies to accelerate the pace of social and economic development. When we read

about what has taken place in some of the States of the United States of America it is obvious that their planning legislation must be very good. Its ramifications and influence on the community generally have resulted in marked development. The main idea of development in any community is that it should benefit the people by making their lives more worth living and give them those things that science and this modern age can provide.

Labor Governments of the past have been very conscious of the need for State planning, and have given a lot of thought to and had a lot of debate in this place on the implementation of legislation introduced for that purpose. From reading overseas publications, we learn that in some countries insufficient attention seems to have been paid to the role that local authorities play in the formulation and implementation of planning for the maximum development of the material and human resources of those countries. I have already touched briefly on that point. I do not need to name them, but in certain countries the legislation has not worked as its framers expected it to.

Local government depends to a considerable extent for its strength on economic development, which, in turn, can be greatly accelerated by the active participation of local authorities in the planning process. We believe in the concept of State and regional planning, and I think every responsible legislator and every responsible Government would believe in sensible planning that will create a desire in people to live in the place where they have settled or to which they have migrated. The many migrants who come to this country tell us of the shortcomings of the countries they have left, but, at the same time, they tell us about many of the forward-planning moves that have been made there as the result of sane and sensible planning legislation.

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

**Mr. DEAN:** The potential role of local authorities in the planning process is of great importance. Planning for economic and social development involves a series of steps, in each of which local authorities have a distinctive, but complementary, part to play. These stages are: the collection of information and research on resources and problems on the basis of which plans can be made; the determination of targets and the financial requirements for the different sectors; the programming of the various stages of work so that targets can be achieved within the scheduled time; the implementation of the plans; and finally, but most importantly, the evaluation of the whole aspect of planning in relation to the local authority district.

All local authorities can serve as sources of information for planning, both in regard to available resources and also to needs and priorities. Planning from below makes it more likely that State planning will be related

to the real needs of the people. A realistic State plan should largely be the amalgamation of regional, urban, district and village plans co-ordinated to make a unified whole rather than one framed by a State planning agency without reference to such a basic plan.

Equally, in programming, implementing and evaluating, popular participation through local authorities can be highly useful. Incidentally, we hoped that we would find many of the matters to which I am referring within the framework of this Bill, but, unfortunately, examination by members on this side failed to find many of the things we expected to be incorporated in the legislation. Popular participation will enable the exploitation of favourable social and economic conditions, and this brings to mind a reference I read in "The Courier-Mail" of 18 September last to an address by the Lord Mayor of Brisbane (Alderman Jones) to the National Public Relations convention in Canberra. He made much of the point to which I have just referred. The newspaper report reads—

"Policy makers in government should be more responsive to public wishes, Brisbane Lord Mayor (Alderman Jones) said here yesterday.

"He told the National Public Relations convention he believed in personal contact with the public by members of Government at all levels. The public should be allowed to form policies, but this did not mean that only popular decisions should be initiated.

"Those responsible for change should have flexibility of mind."

It carries some weight with me when the Lord Mayor of Brisbane says that those responsible for change should have flexibility of mind, and I thought it worth quoting from his speech to such a very important convention.

The Lord Mayor made a reference, of course, to my point that popular participation will enable the exploitation of favourable social and economic conditions, the rational allocation of available resources between different programmes of work, the fullest utilisation of the benefits of completed projects and the evaluation of progress in the accomplishment of the tasks set.

Since the objective of development planning is to raise the level of living of the people, it is important to secure their active interest and co-operation. Unfortunately, these days, both in Australia and overseas, people feel themselves pushed away from Government. To achieve real community effort, they should be playing a more active role in both local and State Government. That point was made by the Lord Mayor in his address to the convention in Canberra, to which I have just referred.

It has been said that State planning without a firm basis in local planning will lack realism. That point has been made

today by another Opposition member. Notice must be taken of local interests, and the requirements of a particular region must be considered before a board is established. All the lines of communication and interests of a particular area need to be taken into consideration. Local development planning without a central framework can be both wasteful and ineffective. How true that is. Unfortunately, from time to time it occurs.

**Mr. Hinze:** Why is it that Alderman Jones has been meeting all the contiguous local authorities for about five years?

**Mr. DEAN:** I do not intend to be sidetracked at this stage. No doubt the honourable member for South Coast will have the opportunity to make his own speech if he wishes to do so. The honourable member for Mackay has pointed out that there is plenty of material available for the honourable member for South Coast to deal with, especially his interests on the South Coast.

Local planning should be undertaken within the broad outlines of State plans. In other words, the two arms of government should work in close liaison. Central planning should deal with immediate and long-term State objectives, leaving plans and objectives of local significance to regional, urban, district and village local authorities.

Local authorities should be provided with the fullest information of State objectives. In other words, they should be made fully aware of what the State intends to do in the development of a certain area.

**Mr. Hinze:** Obviously you haven't read the Bill. That is exactly what it will be doing.

**Mr. DEAN:** I have read the Bill, and most of my ideas coincide with those of my leader and other members on this side of the Chamber who have studied it very closely. However, as I have already said, the honourable member for South Coast will have the opportunity of making his own speech later on.

There should be consultation of local authorities at all stages of the planning process so that there is co-ordination between levels in the formulation, programming and execution of development schemes.

Local authorities should also be free to make their own plans within the framework of the State plan. In other words, they should be free to use their own initiative and be autonomous within the framework of the State plan. They should be free to press for the acceptance of their plans as part of the State plan. That is of great importance, because the plans of local authorities should be an integral part of the State plan. It is necessary for local authorities, especially the larger ones such as city councils, to have their own five-year or six-year plans of development. There is no reason why that should not be so. Similarly, the larger rural local authorities should

frame their own plans of development. The State planning authority should help districts, villages and towns in formulating plans, for example, by providing model plans. That is not beyond the realm of possibility or, for that matter, probability. Unfortunately, the Bill will not do that and will not measure up to those requirements. Local authorities should be able to formulate their own development targets and press for the capital requirements involved.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out very strongly that the Bill should be instrumental in helping the small local authorities. There is no doubt that local authorities throughout Queensland will feel the full brunt of this legislation when it becomes law. Of course, the fact that it becomes law does not necessarily mean that it will be implemented, because there is a great deal of legislation on the Statute Book that is not enforced. Our liquor legislation provides an example of laws which, by no stretch of the imagination, are enforced. On that basis, there may be a ray of hope in the case of this legislation, although we do not want to rely on that. As I say, our fears may be groundless because the legislation may not be implemented. The local authorities may be placed in the position of not having their domestic arrangements upset because the legislation will not be implemented.

The planning staffs of local authorities should be adequately trained. The training of officials in planning should be organised, preferably under the guidance of the Department of Local Government. We believe that the Bill falls short in this matter. Senior planning personnel should be trained at the State level. In the case of senior personnel in the administrative and technical services, group training in planning of a few weeks' duration should also be provided, including combined exercises of the kind they are likely to encounter in their work. In view of the highly technical nature of their task, urban planners should have advanced training. Specialised training may also be required for local government staff concerned with planning related to public utilities, communications, the location of industries, and other technical fields. The honourable member for Mackay has referred to this matter in another way.

Urban-development planning is particularly important to meet the problems arising from the migration of people to towns, industrialisation and changes in the ways of living of the people. Planning should be undertaken not only to meet present needs but also to deal with problems posed by growth. It is especially important to undertake perspective planning in the context of urban development. The Lord Mayor of Brisbane, in his talks to various organisations, has frequently stressed that point very forcibly.

In fixing the boundaries of towns, in demarcating areas for industrial location and residential purposes, and in planning the network of communications, long-term future

needs must be taken into account. The problems of growing towns merit comparative study.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation, and conversation across the Chamber. I will not tolerate it.

**Mr. DEAN:** As in the case of urban authorities, planning by rural local authorities should be on a long-term basis and a proper solution found for the problem of urban-rural relationships.

It is important to co-ordinate the formulation and implementation of plans at town, village, district and regional levels. The activities of different departments of the State Government under State plans extend through field organisations to the actual operational level. There is need to co-ordinate the planning and execution of the projects of local authorities with those being carried out by technical services operating under the direction of their superior technical levels.

As I said earlier, there is no doubt that if this legislation is implemented, the ordinary citizen will certainly need a great deal of protection because of decisions that will greatly affect his mode of life and that of his family. An organisation of some kind will have to be established to protect him, to act as a buffer against this legislation and, in some cases, the bureaucratic attitude of certain people in public office. That remark does not apply generally to public servants. As a former public servant of many years' standing, I greatly admire public servants and the work they do. They are individuals, just as we in this Parliament are individuals, but they should not be vested with the full power of dictators. Some of them would probably outshine a few of the dictators of the past. I would say that 99 per cent of public servants in this State are loyal and conscientious, and fair-minded in their jobs. But there is always the person who, from time to time, does not do the right thing by John Citizen, who should have some organisation or individual whom he can approach and seek his just rights.

I indicated that I would not occupy the full time allowable in this debate. The principles of the Bill have been well covered. I realise that there are others who wish to speak. We will have an opportunity at the Committee stage to enlarge on and modify our thoughts and express views that we have not aired at this stage. I shall say no more until the individual clauses are debated.

**Mr. KAUS (Hawthorne) (7.32 p.m.):** I welcome the opportunity to speak to this motion. The Bill is designed to provide effective machinery for better planning and co-ordinating and better use of the State's resources. It seemed to me that every Opposition member who spoke at the introductory stage failed to understand the provisions of the Bill and merely pushed the parish pump

or jumped on his favourite hobby-horse, which, unlike Silver Knight, was merely a merry-go-round hack.

The main point I wish to debate concerns the functions, powers and objects of environmental control. Opposition speakers seemed to speak with forked tongues. They did not mention the development that has taken place in this State. When the honourable member for Rockhampton South was speaking, I mentioned that the Government had not shown bias in the matters he raised, and I cited the development of Gladstone. He expressed concern about Port Alma. The Government certainly is not biased because at the time of which he spoke the electorate of Rockhampton South was represented by a member of the Liberal Party.

Because of other parliamentary business, including committee work, I did not have the opportunity to speak on the environmental control legislation when it went through Parliament. No doubt this Bill is, in part, designed to both exploit and upgrade man's knowledge of the environment and, I hope, to control it. That knowledge is already extensive in many parts of the world and we are fortunate in that our growth and development are only in their early stages. We should avoid repeating the mistakes made in other countries.

The science and technology of environmental control have, despite many deficiencies, advanced to the point at which this country can direct its efforts towards protection of the environment. However, the crucial requirement is that sufficient energy and support be devoted to the task. In the past years, we have taken legal and administrative steps required to clean up the environment. I have in mind the Clean Air Act, and the Litter Bill passed last session. What is required after this Bill is passed is a period of concerted attention to the implementation of its provisions.

Existing scientific knowledge must be brought to bear on a wide scale on environmental problems. In short, the State's efforts to improve its environment should be concentrated for the present on the use of existing science and technology. Emphasis on existing knowledge, however, should not be allowed to obscure the fact that extensive fundamental research is required to elevate man's understanding of the environmental system, in all its myriad aspects, to a more nearly adequate level than exists today. The need is clear in ecology, analytical chemistry, the effects of pollutants, and in a number of other areas. This research should be started as soon as possible if it is to provide the fundamental knowledge required for the new technology that will be needed in the not-too-distant future.

It is clear, however, that this research should be focused sharply on those areas in which it will be truly effective. No-one can doubt that cleaning up the air, earth and water demands the best efforts of many

people with a variety of trainings. The environment is a global system of almost infinite complexity, and any attempt to manage and control that system must involve not only the pertinent science and technology but the law, sociology, politics and economics as well.

To begin with, the environment is in large measure impure because society demands the benefits of technology, and the practice of technology often generates pollutants. The individual acts against pollution, if he acts at all, in accordance with his own self-interest. This is as true of the man in the street as it is of the legal person called a corporation, or any Government agency. People may complain that companies make detergents, but how many families have switched from synthetic detergents to soap? Companies may criticise the actions of pollution-control officials, but how many companies have acted to abate pollution without some inducement in addition to a simple desire not to pollute, be it improved public relations, the possibility of profit, or the threat of legal action? Self-interest is, of course, old to the affairs of men and society, and society deals with it generally, mostly for the better, by striking a balance called the law. Hence the reason generally for the Bills that I have mentioned, and this Bill.

In the long run, the cost of pollution and its control will be borne by the public in taxes, and in the prices paid for the products of technology. Cost, moreover, is probably the most powerful factor that the nation must deal with in the near-term future. The cost of controlling pollution by the internal combustion engine alone has been estimated at hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Is this from the "Redland Bay Times"?

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I again appeal to the honourable member for Salisbury to restrain himself.

**Mr. KAUS:** It is always possible that scientists and engineers will learn to recycle or dispose of some waste at a profit. However, that does not seem likely to happen soon on a broad basis. If it is not a money profit, what is to be gained by investing huge sums on environmental control?

**Mr. Sherrington:** You tell us.

**Mr. KAUS:** If the honourable member listens, I will tell him. Better health is one benefit. It is true that the relationships between human health and pollutants are often tenuous today, and these relationships must be studied systematically at a fundamental level. It is equally true, however, that our population will increase, that our urban areas will expand, and that our ability to contaminate the environment will continue to flourish. The honourable member for Salisbury referred earlier to parks. I will come to them later.

In addition to promoting better health, the money spent on managing the environment buys cleaner laundry in the back yard, longer life for the paint on houses, and less corrosion and breakdown of electrical and other equipment. It also buys cleaner lakes and rivers for recreation. It buys relief from annoyance—a speck of ash in one's eye; unpleasant odours. It buys nature as it ought to be, although it must be recognised that a modern industrial civilisation and a pristine environment cannot co-exist.

As I mentioned earlier, our urban areas will expand, and this is something that worries me. As we all know, the development in the cities and mining areas of the State has been tremendous since Country-Liberal Governments have been in office. What I have to say applies everywhere in the State, and no doubt the Bill will cover it. Opposition members, of course, walk around with their eyes closed. One sees development wherever one goes. We certainly saw development at Goonyella during our recent visit. It is obvious also at Gladstone, Blackwater and many other places.

After driving round some of the growing areas, I am of the opinion that we will have to watch future planning, especially in some of the most beautiful and productive agricultural areas close to the city. The wrong type of growth could develop in some of the bay areas, and the ignorance, apathy and enthusiasm for growth that could change these areas for the worse must be carefully avoided. If it is not, one could be met at every turn by development in hideous contrast to the serenity offered to us by parks, forest areas, mountains, rolling farmland, rivers, bays, and the ocean. I should say that honourable members would be unanimous in believing that good planning has to begin with some kind of multi-purpose regional approach. In my opinion, the only opposition to regional planning would be from local authorities, which might envisage conflict with their interests.

What we have to watch for is the concept of "home rule", or, as we know it here with the Brisbane City Council, "hidden rule".

I suggest that each governmental function should be assigned to the lowest Government entity qualified to perform it. Such things as street cleaning, parking and the enforcement of housing regulations are, and no doubt should be, performed by the local authority; but other services such as waste disposal, air and water pollution, mass transit and the provision of open space must be handled on a regional basis. In some areas I have visited one disadvantaged group comprises those who are dependent upon public transport. The level of service and the demand for public transport have followed each other downward with the rise in car ownership and use. From what I read in the newspapers last week, I think that private owners of cars now represent 63 per cent of the population. Those who cannot afford a car or, because of youth, age or disability, cannot

drive are gradually becoming much worse off. Land for housing is increasing in price in many areas. The owners of existing houses are not affected, but the owners of land available for development reap handsome profits.

As I said before, in planning and in environment the situation in large cities is quite different from that in rural areas or country towns. The environment tends to become polluted as a result of large-scale concentration of human activities. Pollution can take the form of waste materials, noise, motor vehicles, traffic congestion, or even people themselves as privacy becomes more of a problem and recreation areas become increasingly remote.

The honourable member for Salisbury mentioned the fact that we have a shortage of parks and breathing space for people in the new urban areas. This is the responsibility of local authorities. People in urban areas that have been developed in recent times are still waiting for the development of parks and playing areas for their children. Mum and Dad would like to walk in the park and play with their children, and the children would love some breathing space near home such as a football or cricket field, or an area where they can play basketball, softball or baseball. The developers or the local authority should be made to develop parks or playing fields, or just breathing space, for people who live in urban areas. Most of them have to travel miles to a playing area, which is a shocking state of affairs.

I am not one of those who hold that the effects of pollution are rapidly making cities impossible to live in. However, in some respects cities are becoming worse, and standards of living are declining. The questions that face urban communities are: To what extent are they prepared to suffer the consequences of urban growth? Are they inevitable consequences, anyway, and what sacrifices are they prepared to make in order to have them reduced?

Some of the effects of pollution can be reduced by the provision of services such as sewerage collection and treatment, parks and other recreation areas, and increased road capacity. Unfortunately these and most other urban services suffer from shortage of resources. Water restrictions in time of drought would be expected. No public transport is available in some areas. They have to make do with private services using out-of-date equipment that cannot provide comfortable peak-hour travel. Except in rare instances, public libraries are not a significant asset, and many other social and cultural services fall far below the standards that are accepted overseas. Almost all urban services are the responsibility of the local authority or State Government, and both complain continually of shortages of revenue and loan funds.

As it is not my practice to ramble on for 40 minutes on parochial matters, as some Opposition members do, I shall conclude with

these words: everyone is in favour of conservation and everyone is opposed to pollution, but everyone wants somebody else to pay the bill.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Logan) (7.50 p.m.): I must compliment the aspiring candidate for the new Redlands electorate on the best read "first-reading" speech at a second-reading stage that I have ever heard from him. I could see from here that it is nicely and neatly typed, which probably explains why it is difficult for me to get some of my electorate letters typed.

**Mr. Rae** interjected.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** The Minister for Local Government knows very well that I speak quickly and have plenty of notes, but they are handwritten. I wish I had the luxury of a typist, as honourable members opposite have.

I will refer the House briefly to what I said at the introductory stage, gauged on the very short speech by the Premier when introducing this Bill, which is the most important piece of legislation to come before the House—in my short time here, anyway. After studying the Bill, I must reiterate the worst fears that I dealt with to some extent in the short 10 minutes at my disposal during the introductory stage—by consent, for the sake of the beauty sleep of honourable members opposite.

I said that one of the problems illustrated was the terrible position into which this State Government has put local government by failing to upgrade, update and re-equip it to the extent that it is now forced to bring down legislation such as this. When it should be evolving in the direction of doing away with the expensive luxury of State Government, it is devolving in the direction of tying up local government and putting itself on top—and looking after the sectional interests honourable members opposite have always held dearest to their hearts.

The main point that I can see showing through the provisions of the Bill as I have read them is the setting up of a giant infrastructure to use the money of the people of this State to finance the schemes of overseas companies—at the expense of the ratepayer and the taxpayer of this State.

No doubt, Mr. Acting Speaker, you have seen two very interesting news items, one in the "Telegraph" of 6 October and another shortly afterwards in "The Australian", stating that the Japanese were making definite statements on their investments here, and how this Government should be organised to enable them to get the best out of those investments.

It is no coincidence that this legislation has come before the House after the Japanese have cried to high heaven about the non-existent danger to continuity of coal supplies. They have never yet had to stop their industry through lack of coal or other minerals from Australia. This, of course,

is the cunning part of their plan that the Government has put into operation for them. It is seen in the ramifications of this, the greatest monstrosity for the setting up of a bureaucracy that has ever come before this House. At best, as far as I can see, it will follow the Government's usual pattern of boarding up the real progress of this State behind this infrastructure of carefully selected and appointed boards. Sinecures for sycophants, pets and preferred persons and organisations is what will, at best, result from this legislation.

One cannot help agreeing with honourable members opposite in their criticism of the entire lack of co-ordination—I would even go so far as to say deliberate confusion—among Government departments. That assertion does not have to be proved to anyone here who has had to sort out some awful messes for his constituents.

**Mr. Murray:** Another Liberal plot!

**Mr. BALDWIN:** The honourable member is wrong there. This is an overseas plot, and honourable members opposite are caught up in it. They are part of it. The honourable member is only one tooth on the gear—and a pretty worn tooth at that.

In three terms of mismanagement by this sectionalist Government the State debt has trebled, and if this Bill is implemented in the terms outlined the present debt will be doubled in the next single term of office—that is, if the people of Queensland are unlucky enough to have to put up with this Government during that term.

At worst, this Bill as it stands will, in the hands of this sectionalist Government, allow further foreign inroads into our resources and economy. At best, it will allow this Government to set up a system—an infrastructure, as mentioned by the honourable member for Toowong. This is the second point on which I am in agreement with him. The first one on which he and I agree is that this Bill is the most important piece of legislation to come before Parliament for many years. I think he inadvertently interposed that the Bill will create an infrastructure for the continuation of certain sections of this Government and its pets in raping the wealth of this State. The over-all effect on the economy is quite evident to anyone closely associated with the salary and wage-earners, the small farmers and the small businessmen. No wonder the Government imposed daylight saving on them. It will exact from the people on the land, especially those in the dairying industry, an extra two hours' work each day. I would not mind betting that the breweries will get rid of the 4,500,000 bottles of beer that they had in store in the expectation of price rises in the Federal Budget. With daylight saving, with nothing better to do at the end of his day's work, the worker will have a few drinks. If the Labor Party had supported daylight saving, it might also have \$100,000 in its election "kick".

Industrial development and the ownership of this State's export products bear special scrutiny, especially in the light of legislation such as this. It is no coincidence that the Bill is being introduced and orientated to achieve further development of those few remaining industries that earn export surpluses for people other than those of this State. I admit that they provide employment of a very low grade. I refer to the mineral industries and other industries closely associated with them.

I do not believe that this sectionalist Government will orientate the Bill to the benefit of the workers or of the primary industries, which it has massacred so callously in its failure to look after its own misled supporters. The export opportunities for minerals are high; but what are the export opportunities for this State's primary products, and what are the opportunities for using some of its surplus foodstuffs to the benefit of the starving people of the world? Why is it that the mining industry cannot be made to sink some of its resources into upgrading the living standard of the farmers who are still on the land and those who have left it?

Why is the Government pouring so much of its wealth into the implementation of these proposals? Personally, I do not think the Government will implement the Bill for some time. Instead, it will use it to enhance its image in an election crisis. With the Press to help it, it will make the Bill look good and will conceal the many just and valid criticisms that have been levelled today by members of the Opposition. They will not see the light of day unless members on this side of the Chamber go to the expense of publishing circulars setting out what we have said. And we will do it, too.

**Mr. Hughes:** Why don't you just table it?

**Mr. BALDWIN.** The honourable member has been tabled from the shoulders up for a long time.

We will have to look again at the difference in the port facilities made available at great cost to the taxpayers for the mineral companies and those made available for our primary-produce export companies. We should also look at the big port complex in Brisbane which could carry three times the present volume of trade if it were properly managed and proper opportunities were given to the city workers. What a difference there is between the deep-water ports used for the export of minerals and the ports of Cairns, Brisbane and Port Alma. The contrast is shockingly clear, as also is the plight in which this legislation will leave the people of the State.

What is required for the upgrading of our primary industries? This is something that cannot be disregarded in a Bill of this magnitude, breadth, depth and importance. They need better transport facilities in every way, and fairer treatment as well. They

should be given better concessions than those that the Government is prepared to give by way of indirect taxation to the mineral companies, from which we get nothing other than hard work and the privilege of paying off houses over 20 and 30 years and doing without educational facilities for our children, such as the honourable member for Rockhampton South referred to in his speech.

Production in some primary industries, especially of dairy products and grain—meat is fast catching up—is at a stage of superfluity. This is happening at a time of a decreasing population in our country areas and starvation of our near-northern neighbours.

We must always look at the totality of the situation. If the Government had devoted to the betterment of primary industry the same service as it says it intends to devote to the betterment of the mineral industries, population in the country areas would increase. The clear fact is that the Country Party is losing its supporters as a result of its own ineptitude and failure to plan and upgrade. To counteract this, it is now planning to move its political influence into the mineral field and closely associated occupations. I do not know how close it will go to running foul of its bedmates of mesalliance, the Liberal Party, but a good name to be used in the future would be the "Liberal-Mineral-Country Party". With such a title, the Government might just scratch along with a few more votes.

The possible effect of this Bill on local government has been canvassed by members on this side with complete justification. I have taken pains to consult some members of local government in my electorate, who view this legislation with grave concern. It is not that they do not want to see development, or that they fear, as has been falsely said by honourable members opposite, that they may be put out of business, or anything like that. They fear, and rightly so, that they will be made the facade—the dumb hod-carriers for this legislation; that they will see finance, which is already short, diverted from the needs of the ratepayers and the taxpayers in their shires at the dictates of a body set up arbitrarily (and so filled with blanks in the legislation that the United Nations could be driven through it sideways), and imposed upon them with the idea not of uplifting them but of further downgrading them. I know very well that the Government does not intend to do away with local government. That would be stupid, and Government members are not as stupid as that.

**Mr. Sherrington:** They are not far from it.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** No. They come horribly close to it.

The Government intends to retain local governments as a "blind" for the scheme that it is about to foist on the people of the State. Those in local government will

collect the contumely of the public when the thing blows up. As the honourable member for Salisbury said this afternoon, the Government intends to use every trick of the trade in co-ordinating the other departments to extend this giant network over the entire State.

The honourable member for Toowong, as usual, made a very interesting speech. However, he and I are 180 degrees out of phase. Along with him, I agree with the importance of this legislation and I agree that the Government will not put local authorities out of business. Of course, our reasons are diametrically opposed. The honourable member pointed out that we have many isolated shire councils scattered throughout Queensland. How right he was. But whose fault is this? As I pointed out previously, the legislation dealing with rezoning and increasing the number of electorates sounded the death-knell of this State Government. That was a high treble. But this Bill, if the Government is still in office to implement it, will sound the death-knell of the State Government in the big bass boom of the funeral dirge, because so many local authorities which are thinking of opting out will opt out and leave the Government to carry the whole filthy can of garbage to its own grave. And good on them! The Government cannot see it, but this Bill will sound the death-knell of State government. It is a good thing that State Governments should go, but not this way. They should not go down in a welter from which it will be hard to raise a democratic structure based on the needs of the people in local authorities at a high level.

The shadow Minister for Local Government (Mr. Dean) said that local authorities are not sufficiently upgraded, yet they have more and more responsibility foisted upon them by this Government in an attempt to raise an infrastructure that will support it in office in this State. They are, of course, overweighing the foundation and the building will crumble beneath them.

I shall refer to the effect of the Bill on the Logan electorate alone. Other honourable members have tried to assess the effect on their electorates, and I have the right to do this despite what some of our opponents say. I have to look at the possible effects on the Logan electorate. I cannot see anything in this Bill to suggest that it will improve the position of the people in the Logan electorate or any of the electorates on the periphery of the metropolis. These are the fast-growing population areas of the State. Their population density, which is so great, has been built on a basis laid down in the Government's bad surveys of these areas where, in this modern era, 22-perch, 24-perch and 28-perch allotments are being cut out of so-called modern developments right under the eye of the local authorities. I have previously brought this matter to the notice of the House.

What can regional development do about this? How will it take these allotments back from the very people who are supporting the introduction of this kind of legislation and re-subdivide and reorganise them along better lines for higher quality living?

The Government is caught between the teeth of the gears and will be crushed, which is what it deserves. It should have put up its fight for Queensland 10 years ago, that is, if it had anything to fight with then. It has left it too late. It gained office in 1957 not by its own efforts, but by a sad train of historical events sown by some of its supporters.

I could not go past this legislation without looking at certain important aspects centred on the Logan electorate that will affect the whole of the south-east of Queensland—the Moreton region and west to Warrego—and the Northern Rivers district of New South Wales. On examining the Bill, I see that there is room for the envisaged planning committees and project boards to devote themselves to the problem of updating the port facilities of Brisbane to handle bulk cargoes and containerised freight, thus cutting the costs that are killing primary industry, especially grain-growing. There is room for committees and boards to move into that area, but I am willing to bet that they will not do so. This area of activity should, for the benefit of nearly 1,500,000 people, be one of the first to be surveyed by a committee.

The provision of a deep-water bulk-loading and container terminal for the cheap movement of millions of tons of foodstuffs is very necessary at this stage of the development of South-east Queensland. Such a project, if carried through to the first stage in the next two years, would provide the means of resurrecting much of primary industry, and upgrading and securing export markets. It would provide employment for thousands of additional workers on the waterfront, and in associated industries. Apart from the cost of the initial feasibility survey, the Government would have to give nothing more than permission for the project.

Millions of dollars are available from Australian companies and investors in the shipping industry who want to see a quicker turn-around of ships in South-east Queensland. Of course, not all shipping companies are in favour of this. A couple of large companies want to hold back the port of Brisbane, and they have done that, for their own purposes, for decades. If they want to stick in the Brisbane River, let them. There is still much demand by shipping able to use the river facilities, anyway, and with some gain to Queensland's future economy. But it is not sufficient gain to ensure the return of prosperity to the huge regions that I have mentioned and that depend on the efficiency of the port of Brisbane. The potential of the whole of South-east Queensland and Northern New South Wales will not be anywhere

near fully realised if those areas are relegated to the role of suppliers of services for the major benefit of overseas-dominated organisations.

Methods of transport, as a consideration in regional planning, have been mentioned by honourable members on this side of the House, and in areas such as Logan, Murrumba and Ipswich efficient transport for workers and the provision of services are matters of prime importance. There can be no excuse for failing to use the resources of such a potentially wealthy region in this direction. We hope to see this done, and, of course, we will see that it is done when we are in office, which will be soon.

As I said at the introductory stage, even though this legislation has the potential to be dangerous in the Government's hands, it has the potential to give to the economy of Queensland a great boost in the hands of a Labor Government that has at heart the welfare of every section of the State.

**Mr. Lickiss:** Therefore you must agree it is good legislation.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I have never denied that the principles are good. I have pointed out some of its aspects that I think are bad. I have pointed to the big gaps in it, and how I think they could be filled to the detriment of the mass of the people of this State. If the honourable member did not hear me say that, I am not going to say it again.

Regional planning in the huge area of South Queensland is almost irrelevant without the inclusion of a project of port development such as I have outlined. Mention is made in the Bill of rights over foreshores and bodies of water. As I said earlier, I doubt whether that provision will be used for the benefit of the people of South-east Queensland.

New considerations must also enter into matters of such importance as this. The right of the individual to some constant viability and control over his own property must always be considered. At present, under a system built up with the assistance of other legislation such as the Acquisition of Land Act and Acts pertaining to irrigation and water supply, the Co-ordinator-General's Department has wide powers, and in that respect there does not seem to be much opposition from the shire councils.

We have heard much of the good that the legislation will do. I tell the House now that I see nothing in it to prevent situations from occurring similar to a couple I know of, which involve Main Roads resumptions and dam survey work and possible resumptions in the Logan electorate at the moment. Perhaps I should say that the situations are worse because the land is not being resumed at this stage by the Main Roads Department. I have heard various rumours, but I have not received any definite information, despite the frequency with which I have written, about the time that will elapse before certain land

will be used for freeway or other road purposes. All I am told is that the taking of the land now is a boon to the taxpayers because it prevents their having to pay more dearly for the land when it is actually required.

That is a plausible argument; it is apparently a just argument. But what of the people who are bought out at lower than market value, whose future expectation in their land—they know what the expectation is—is destroyed? Have they not some rights? Should the individual be sacrificed for posterity? Should not our present structure enable us to bear the sacrifice generally for posterity, instead of heaping the burden on the shoulders of individuals in difficult circumstances? If the Bill will eliminate action of that type, then I see some good in it. However, I do not see any possibility of that happening. In fact, as other honourable members on this side of the House have said, I see possibilities of even worse things happening—arbitrary decisions and arbitrary takeovers for even longer periods, which would be manifestly unjust to the individuals concerned. The frightening feature of it is that it is unnecessary.

I am sure that some honourable members will recall that, not long after I entered the House, I made a plea on behalf of the people caught up in the Wolffdene Dam project. Their properties are frozen. Even though the land has not been taken, even though the project has not received final approval, everyone knows about it and no-one will buy their land. If they go ahead and improve the land, they do not know whether they are improving it for five, 10 or 20 years.

**Mr. Hinze:** You are not going to blame the Bill for that, are you?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I am not trying to.

**Mr. Hinze:** Well, what are you complaining about?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I am not complaining. I am stating a fact. I am making a comparison between the present situation and what I see in the Bill. The Bill has been presented to us as a marvellous piece of legislation that will set up progressive machinery. I am trying to present a case to the Premier and I hope that he will answer it. I hope that he will be able to say, "Mr. Baldwin, you are wrong. When the Bill becomes law, that sort of thing won't happen." That is what I am saying, and I am sure the honourable member for South Coast would not deny me the right to make that plea on behalf of those who find themselves tied to their blocks of land. I asked long ago that, when land was going to be taken, the owners be bought out and given a chance either to lease back or get out and re-establish themselves.

**Mr. Hinze:** What did Clem do?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I am not concerned about Clem. This Bill will include Clem; it is aimed at him—as if I don't know that.

This infantile attitude of using one ill to justify another does not wash any dirt off the whole situation at all.

**Mr. Hinze** interjected.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** The honourable member ought to read the election policies and see who backs whom, and he would answer his own questions. I am not here to do that tonight. I am here to look at the possible dangers in the Bill to people whom I know personally, who are good hard workers, who are farmers and who are my constituents. I do not care a damn whether they vote for me or not; I am here to look after their interests. I could even put names before the House, but my time is running out. The Minister concerned knows from my correspondence to whom I am referring when I speak about apparent miscarriages of justice and loopholes in the law. I am concerned to see that any overriding legislation of such enormous importance as this Bill will close the loopholes, but as I see the Bill it does not. As honourable members on this side have indicated, with Orders in Council not being tabled the possibility of exploiting the loopholes against the small man—the householder, the farmer, the small businessman—is even greater.

I agree with the honourable member for Toowoong about the setting up of an infrastructure. Under the Bill the Government will set up an infrastructure of paid propagandists, because the machinery provided indicates how it intends to appoint, select and constitute the boards. I am not talking about the worth of the individual but the worth of the legislation. No matter what kind of legislation is introduced—whether it is blanket legislation or legislation filled with loopholes or legislation even a little outdated—in the final analysis with a democratic structure the worth of the legislation and how it is implemented depend on the quality of the individual. But when the quality of the individual is trammelled and surrounded by the infrastructure envisaged under the Bill, nothing will get done. Because of the way the legislation is framed, even heads of departments could not do any good for the ordinary man.

I fear that the Bill will be used for window-dressing. I fear that it will do a very expensive nothing in the direction at which it purports to be aiming but do a very expensive something for the Government of the State. No honourable member on this side can accept such a situation. I hope that the various newspapers throughout the State will carefully consider the contributions made by honourable members on this side, and point out to the public the dangers of the Bill. I hope that I am wrong in what I have said. I hope that I have been merely looking for niggers in a woodpile. I should hate to think that I was right and that this legislation is going to be imposed on the people of the State with the drastic consequences that appear to me to be possible when I look at the totality

of the situation, including the inroads of the Japanese who were once our enemies, the Americans and other overseas companies.

This possibility is more evident when one looks at the terrific outflow of wealth from this State, which in the last 10 years has been 2½ times greater than the actual rise in the prosperity of its people. It is on those facts that I base my arguments and my fears, and every member on this side of the House will fight for the amendments to be brought forward in order to try to block up these loopholes and make the legislation a bit safer. There will then be some chance of realising the full potential of its principles.

**Mr. HINZE** (South Coast) (8.26 p.m.): I did not intend to take part in this debate and I do so now mainly because somebody mentioned today that no Country Party members had participated. Because of the gross inaccuracies we have heard from honourable members opposite, I feel obliged to occupy a few minutes of the time of the House to correct them.

Queensland has 130 local authorities and in no other State does local government receive the recognition it gets in Queensland. I heard a cock-and-bull story today from the honourable member for Mackay about a fourth arm of government. Obviously, we are trying to do something for local government. I have sat in what is called a contiguous local authority meeting in the Brisbane City Hall and, as chairman of the Albert Shire Council for nine years and a member for 15, I have heard the A.L.P. Lord Mayor propounding the arguments put forward today on behalf of the Government and asking for a regional planning authority. All Opposition members know this as well as I do. They know that their own Lord Mayor subscribes 100 per cent to the contents of this Bill.

**Mr. Houston:** Rubbish!

**Mr. HINZE:** The honourable member can say "rubbish" or whatever he likes, but I invite him to go and ask the Lord Mayor.

**Mr. Bennett** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** The honourable member for South Brisbane was a member of local government, as was the honourable member for Sandgate. I cannot think of any other member on that side who was, but those two members know as well as I do that there comes a time in local government when matters have to be considered in conjunction with neighbouring local authorities. This is what the A.L.P. Lord Mayor has been doing for 10 years. The honourable member for Ipswich West also attended the meetings I mentioned and she knows that what I am saying is correct. If members of the Labor Party were "fair dinkum" about this matter, they would admit that they subscribe to the principles of the Bill and are merely trying to make some sort of an argument out of it.

**Mr. Houston:** There is a great difference between the principles of the Bill and the wording of the provisions. It is a dictatorial Bill.

**Mr. HINZE:** Dictatorial, my foot! Honourable members opposite have talked today about a land resumption Act and about resuming land, but the powers are already there for local government and they know it. Opposition members say that we are giving to the Co-ordinator-General certain powers, but they know that the powers are already there. Their own Lord Mayor has those powers, but they apparently object to the Government giving them to the Co-ordinator-General of Queensland.

**Mr. Houston:** Do you believe that the Government should have power to tell a local authority it must not undertake a certain project?

**Mr. HINZE:** As Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member would have to be naive. This Queensland Government gives local government greater recognition than that given by any other Government in Australia. We recognise the rights of 130 local authorities and, when we start to set up these regional planning authorities, whom do honourable members opposite think we will put on them? Obviously, we will put on these regional planning committees the local government representatives themselves.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Houghton): Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** They're a bunch of mugs.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for South Coast has referred to members on this side of the Chamber as a bunch of mugs.

**Mr. HINZE:** They would have to be.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. HINZE:** I will not upset members of the Opposition any further. They are very thin skinned, and, like Murphy's dog, they can give it but cannot take it.

The position is simply this: the Albert Shire Council buys its water from the City of Gold Coast, even though the dam is built in the Albert Shire. A similar situation arises near Brisbane. I know a little bit about this matter because I obtained water from Clem Jones, Lord Mayor of the city of Brisbane, for the people of Woodridge. Brisbane is surrounded by a green belt in which no further development is allowed, but in the Albert Shire it was decided to proceed with residential development. It is that type of conflict that calls for regional planning. Anyone who has had anything at all to do with local government will accept what I am saying as correct. All the Bill sets out to do is to resolve that type

of conflict. The honourable member for Mackay and my good friend the honourable member for Salisbury—

**Mr. Sherrington:** Don't refer to me as your good friend.

**Mr. HINZE:** A moment ago I called members of the Opposition a lot of mugs, and he did not like that either. He spoke about environmental control. I have never heard remarks so far removed from matters covered by a Bill as those of the honourable member for Salisbury. There is nothing in the Bill about environmental control, and tonight we are not interested in it.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Didn't you read the Bill?

**Mr. HINZE:** Environmental control is only a very minor part of the Bill. We are considering regional planning, and the purpose of the Bill is to allow local authorities to get together and also to permit the Government to set up a regional planning authority.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Salisbury will refrain from persistent interjections otherwise I will deal with him. I warn him and, as well, the honourable member for Rockhampton South.

**Mr. HINZE:** The Bill refers to water supply, transportation and allied matters. The honourable member for Logan spoke about his electorate. The Leslie Harrison Dam has been built in the Redland Shire, yet its total catchment area is in the Albert Shire. The people in the Redland Shire said to those in the Albert Shire, "You cannot have a piggery in this area, and you cannot do this and that." The whole purpose of the Bill and regional planning is to overcome that type of situation.

I do not wish to take up any more time of the House. If I spoke for two hours I could not get the message through to members of the Opposition. The Bill has been sought for a long time. The Lord Mayor of the city of Brisbane backs it to the hilt; I think it is an excellent Bill; and the sooner it is introduced the better.

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (8.34 p.m.): I am amazed that the House should have to put up with such diatribes as those delivered from time to time by the honourable member for South Coast. He has made it obvious to all that he has not read the Bill and is not aware of its principles or the powers it confers. He certainly has not dealt with the correlation of planning between local authorities and regional planning. The only tangible subject on which he touched is the piggery in a certain catchment area. At a time when a great controversy arose about the water in that catchment area, a photograph appeared in the Press and we were able to distinguish the honourable member for South Coast only because he was wearing a hat.

As my leader and other colleagues have pointed out, the real trouble with regional planning is that the man in the country is fast becoming a forgotten member of the community. Whilst the principle in the Bill is said to be the correlation of planning throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, a study of it makes it obvious that that objective will not be attained. The real difficulty at present is the correlation of planning in the country areas of Queensland.

Many Government speakers devoted some time to maligning the Brisbane City Council, and particularly the Lord Mayor, Alderman Clem Jones.

**Mr. Hughes:** You did—and I did too—over Musgrave Park.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The honourable member for Kurilpa has acted like a dilettante in the ranks of the Government over the cross-river railway connection. It is only because of my sincere efforts over a long period that, at long last, something has been achieved. He has been singularly silent, in both Brisbane City Council and State Government spheres, even on that major and important matter affecting the city of Brisbane. But for representations and submissions by me from time to time, and evidence I have advanced as far back as when I was an alderman in the Brisbane City Council, and as Vice-Mayor, we would not be getting the cross-river rail connection. I have been rather disappointed that the honourable member for Kurilpa does not seem to have been interested in supporting my endeavours. However, the people know who has been responsible.

As I say, many Government members, for cheap political reasons, have directed criticism at the Brisbane City Council. In my estimation, many commendations could be made of the efforts of the present administration of the Brisbane City Council. As a former alderman, I do not hesitate to say that there is a certain amount of constructive criticism that could be offered. This evening I do not propose to dwell on the efforts of the Brisbane City Council because I believe that it, being a rather resourceful instrumentality and having great strength and power in the statute law applying to it, is well able to look after itself. But the struggling, dying local government authorities in country areas need some form of succour. It seems that Government country representatives either fail to understand that or have not the guts to say something on behalf of the country shires. They prefer to spend their time in this Parliament castigating the Brisbane City Council, whose activities have virtually nothing to do with country shires. What have we heard from Country Party members concerning the efforts of their public representatives to re-awaken local authorities in areas? As the honourable member for Salisbury said, we have heard absolutely nothing.

I said earlier that the people in the country are being forgotten by this Government and their Country Party representatives, who are only interested in who is to be elected as Whip tomorrow. Most of them are now out lobbying, trying to further their own selfish, individual interests while their local authorities are left lamenting. Tonight, I am the only spokesman in this Parliament for people in the country.

**A Government Member** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Houghton): Order!

**Mr. BENNETT:** You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, being a very intelligent and tolerant member of this Parliament, with an understanding of the Opposition, are well in line for election as party Whip. If you care to seek my support I am quite sure that, as your campaign director, I will get you elected at the party meeting tomorrow.

Nothing is being done for the small businessman in Queensland's inland towns. It is time that, in our planning, we gave some consideration to this point. Much has been said in this debate about what can be done with planning and, while the principle is no doubt sincere, the application of the verbiage in the Bill will plunge planning in Queensland further into chaos and confusion. We will be in a completely chaotic state if we endeavour to follow the principles and precepts set out in the Bill. The distinguished Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, Mr. Gough Whitlam—

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** He will remain there, too.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Only until the next election. Of course, he cannot take over the Government by force, although the people would like him to do that at the moment. He must wait for an election before he can do it. When the honourable member for Windsor is replaced by Mr. Raymund Smith, who is being sacked from the Law Reform Commission, he will be looking for a planning job, probably on the Environmental Control Council.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. BENNETT:** In that planning we will be dealing with the Prime Minister and his good lady, and we will be looking at all planning through split skirts, which seem to be the main item of publicity we are getting overseas—and that is not national planning.

The Federal Leader of the Opposition said—

“Country towns, from a commercial viewpoint, are not so much victims of a rural crisis but of a dogged refusal of Governments and local authorities to get together and promote large rural regional centres.”

What does this Bill do to promote large rural regional centres?

**Mr. Aiken:** Nothing.

**Mr. BENNETT:** As the honourable member for Warrego says, it does nothing. It contains no provision for so doing. It is termed a regional planning Bill, but what can be done under it to promote large rural regional centres? The policy as announced by the Federal Government, and supported by the Premier and this Government, has been to keep every small town alive. Considered, thoughtful and intelligent planning in this modern day and age says that that cannot be done economically or successfully in a practical way. The policy of keeping every small town alive, no matter how small it is, has had the result, under the policy of this Government and its Federal counterpart, of ensuring that numerous towns are dying together. Instead of developing large, economically sound regional centres, this Government, in its political endeavours to safeguard its election interests and in its endeavours to keep these small towns alive because of favouritism and friendships, has succeeded only in ensuring the death of large numbers of small towns. This is why there is a wholesale drift to the city.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** What about the closure and amalgamation of sawmills? This has definitely forced many little towns to die.

**Mr. BENNETT:** That is so. Talking about sawmills, I could tell the House about the unwholesome results of a certain sawmill on the Near North Coast in which the honourable member for Kurilpa had an interest at one stage. I do not think he has an interest in it any longer. However, I shall not deal with little sawmills at the moment.

A quarter of a century ago small towns were desirable and really necessary because we were living in the days of the horse and buggy. In these times, in order to get businessmen, farmers and graziers into rural areas, and provide employment opportunities in the country, there must be some form of united effort. There is an old saying, “United we stand, divided we fall.” If people in small country centres do not get the community effort and camaraderie that they need in social, economic and spiritual matters, they must, as they are doing, go to the wall.

The Bill reminds me of the Invasion of Privacy Bill—good in name, excellent in principle, but dastardly in the application of its clauses. People cannot be “planned” into the country; it has to be made sufficiently attractive for them to want to go there. Job opportunities have to be provided in country areas. One cannot go to schools at breaking-up functions and say, as one used to be able to say, “Go west, young man. Get out into the country, young girl. The fresh air there is beautiful, and environmental control will prevent any problems from arising.” People have to be given some encouragement to go to country areas. But what can they be told now? All that one can say is, “Unless your parents are particularly wealthy and can provide you with

pocket money and the wherewithal to live in the country, you will starve. If you want to earn a living, you will have to stay in the city."

Thanks to the inactivity of this Government and the Federal Government, unemployment in January, February and March next year will reach a record level. Figures recently produced by the Commonwealth Statistician show that the cost of living in Queensland is among the highest of all States, whilst job opportunities in Queensland are becoming fewer and fewer. Despite the information that I obtained from the official figures of the Commonwealth Statistician, I was glibly turned aside from my serious and substantial questioning of the Treasurer by being told that my premises were false. In other words, the Treasurer doubted the authenticity of figures that I had taken from the report of the Commonwealth Statistician.

There will be no job opportunities in the country, and what is the use of planning unless there are people to plan for? Can anybody from a country area say that planning will cause a wholesale exodus from the city to the country? Of course not. The honourable member for Logan, who was one of the recent speakers on this side of the House, pointed out that the Bill is purely a piece of window-dressing designed to mislead and deceive the people during the election campaign next year. I challenge, and invite, the Premier to tell the House in what way the Bill will assist country areas. It is all very well to say, "Under regional planning we will have angle parking throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. That will look nice."

**Mr. Chitchen:** That is a local authority matter, and you know it.

**Mr. Hughes:** I don't think you really know what is in the Bill.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The honourable member for Kurilpa is perhaps reading a little ahead of my speech. I was about to deal with local authorities, which the Bill is designed to strangle. I have certainly read it, and it is aimed at giving the Co-ordinator-General, with the power that he will obtain from Cabinet, the opportunity of strangling any local authority that will not toe the line. That is clearly written in the various clauses of the Bill. I am amazed and disquieted by the fact that the Co-ordinator-General will not be able to raise a little finger without the approval and approbation of Cabinet. I am fearful of the so-called independent instrumentalities that owe their appointment to Cabinet, without reference to Parliament. To appreciate that feeling, one has only to refer to the appointment of chairmen of the Railways Appeal Board. In the last decade, there have been two chairmen of that board who have been absolutely fair and impartial, and they were both sacked within six months of

their appointment, with the dishonest explanation that the magistrates were appointed on a roster system. Of course, Mr. Wolfgang, a stipendiary magistrate who had, to say the least, a strong inclination to please Cabinet and the Minister for Transport, stayed there till he retired—a period of almost six years.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I have a great deal of anxiety about the fact that the guts of the Bill, which should cover the appointment of the Co-ordinator-General, have been plucked out because his appointment is subject to the whims and dictates of Cabinet. It can appoint him for a specific term and sack him at any time it likes. If that is in fact the position, I am very disappointed. If a man shows sufficient integrity and ability to be Co-ordinator-General, and if his position is to be regarded as a quasi-judicial one and he is to be allowed to act impartially and objectively, why should he be subject to Cabinet approval from time to time, thereby ensuring that he will get the axe if he does not please Cabinet? In my opinion, that is the core of the trouble in the Bill. It is the root of the evil. Unless we are careful, we will have very subservient men appointed to the position of Co-ordinator-General. If they are prepared to abide by the dictates of their own conscience, as Frank Hickey was, they will get the sack.

**Mr. Hinze:** That is a reflection on Charles Barton.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The Bill has not been approved, and the Co-ordinator-General has not yet been appointed under it. There is a specific method by which he can be appointed, and he must have certain qualifications, none of which have been laid down in any previous legislation. So I am not talking about any particular individual; I do not know whom the Government presently has in mind for the position.

In order to attract people to country areas by means of regional planning, the Government of New South Wales has spent no less than \$25,000,000 in subsidies for the establishment of industries in those areas. What has the Government of Queensland done? What does it propose to do under the Bill to attract industry to country areas? What subsidies will it offer? It is all very well for the Government to say, "We have opened up Goonyella." Several mineral fields and coal mines have been exploited at the expense of the public. What has the Government done to attract industry to the country areas of this State?

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Salisbury is not in his usual place in the Chamber. He is not permitted to interject from other than his usual place.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It is unfortunate that the interjection came from the wrong seat, because it was rather apposite. I was speaking about starvation and attracting people to country areas, and about graziers and farmers being forced off the land. A week or two ago a vulgar picnic was held at which a certain number of people gorged themselves and drank their fill for the whole week-end. Following that drunken orgy, the Premier is shortly to officially open the "Surfair" units. I was not happy about the advertisement that that orgy gave Queensland and Australia at a time when Pakistani refugees—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will either return to the principles of the Bill or resume his seat.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I was dealing with the \$25,000,000 in subsidies made available by the Government of New South Wales to attract industry to country areas in that State. I invite the Premier to say what he is doing along similar lines to develop country areas in Queensland.

**Mr. Hughes** interjected.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Kurilpa is not in his usual place in the Chamber.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Another method of doing something about regional planning and keeping people in country areas—one does not need to be an expert regional planner to understand the purport of it—is to reduce freight rates. I point out, too, that opportunities for tertiary education are lacking in country areas.

I am satisfied that it is undesirable for the Co-ordinator-General or any other authority to be in a position to manipulate local government, for which the Bill makes provision.

**Mr. Hinze:** Don't you like the Co-ordinator-General?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am not talking about the present Co-ordinator-General. I am talking in an objective fashion about the office that is being created under the Bill.

The Co-ordinator-General will be given power to conduct inquiries in accordance with the Commissions of Inquiry Act. I am wondering whether these inquiries will be manipulated and corrupted in the same way as other commissions of inquiry that have been held in this State. I also wonder whether we will have long, drawn-out, tenuous inquiries like the one into the Great Barrier Reef. We all know what should be done with the Great Barrier Reef. Intelligent members on this side have suggested what the Government should do to protect the Great Barrier Reef, but all we have had is an expensive investigation and inquiry that has been dragging on for well over 12 months—and it will certainly continue until after Christmas.

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. F. P. Moore** interjected.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! While I am on my feet, the honourable member for Mourilyan will restrain himself. I appeal to honourable members on both sides of the Chamber to discontinue crossfiring. It is most disconcerting to the honourable member who is addressing the Chamber.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It really troubles me, Mr. Acting Speaker. I thank you for your protection. I am being badgered all round.

I conclude my reference to the current royal commission into the Great Barrier Reef by saying that quite possibly it will go down in history as a great public scandal for the amount that it will have cost in comparison with the results. I venture to say that, as they did last year, the commissioners will take a long vacation for Christmas.

According to the Bill, the programme of works cannot be determined and decided upon by the Co-ordinator-General. He can make a recommendation to Cabinet, but without Cabinet approval and approbation the programme of works cannot be implemented. I can imagine just what types of work will be done and where they will be done, for election purposes, from time to time. After Cabinet approval, the Co-ordinator-General has the right to make minor rearrangements and amendments to the programme provided the cost does not exceed \$10,000.

As a lawyer, I cannot let the occasion pass without dealing with the principles of law as they are written into the Bill for the enforcement of its provisions. If there are to be the necessary powers to enforce the principles of the Bill, such as decentralisation—it is not there, of course, but I suggest that it should be there—we have to consider the various legal provisions. While making that reference to decentralisation, let me point out that we on this side can proudly say that our efforts in Government, without any regional planning Bill, were tremendous.

I could well ask, with pride: who planned the Burdekin River scheme, the Tinaroo Falls Dam, the Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme? Labor Governments! Who guaranteed the mine at Mt. Isa in the tough days when we wanted industry in the country? A Labor Government. All that this Government does is take the cream and ask Mount Isa Mines to subsidise the universities. It was also a Labor Government that guaranteed the Tableland Tin Dredging Company at Mt. Garnet. Despite the fact that Mr. Tom Hiley, as he was then, was a director, we did not display any smallness of attitude or pettiness of mind. We, as a Government, are always prepared to think and act big, and to do the right thing.

If a citizen is knocked down by a milk cart, there is no limitation on the amount of damages he is entitled to receive,

dependent on the injuries he has sustained. But if a Government instrumentality knocks down the same individual and the Co-ordinator-General is at fault through his agents or servants, there is a limited liability. I have always been opposed to this principle. The persons most able to pay damages are public corporations, Government instrumentalities and those who are protected by insurance schemes such as the Co-ordinator-General should be. But what do we find? If an unfortunate workman, loyal and devoted in the service of the Co-ordinator-General, is injured in the course of his employment, there is limited liability that does not apply to any other defendant in Queensland unless, of course, like the Co-ordinator-General, it is a governmental or semi-governmental instrumentality.

In the case of injury to property, a person is required to give notice in writing within a limited time, and in relation to injury to his person he is obliged to give notice of a claim within one month. Very often, owing to various exigencies and anomalies or because of his injury, or perhaps because he has not the wherewithal and resources to seek proper legal advice but waits until he returns to his employment and is earning wages before making inquiries from a legal man as to his rights, the month passes and he is thus put out of court.

I do not think there should be such protection for any governmental instrumentality, corporation, individual or institution. I certainly agree with the time limitation under the Limitation of Actions Act which says, in effect, that in claims of this nature the writ must be issued or proceedings commenced within a period of three years. Such a period gives the ordinary person ample opportunity to launch his claim.

I venture to say that even a member of Parliament, in any action he may care to bring, would allow a month to slip by without noticing the time passing, and he would be amazed—in fact, he would be disgusted, disappointed and dejected—if he was faced with the defence, “You are out of time because you did not serve your notice of claim within one month.” I think it is an artificial barrier of protection to big instrumentalities that should not reside in any public legislation or statute.

I do not see why an ordinary individual, who may be without resources, should be ruled out of court because within the first month he lacks the funds to seek legal advice or perhaps thinks it is unnecessary to do so. He might have a good claim for several thousand dollars. He might be permanently injured—he might have suffered brain damage—but because he has not served his notice of claim within one month he could, subject to some exceptions, be denied justice. And they have to be good exceptions. He has to show reasonable cause for not serving the notice within one month.

Why should such a man have imposed upon him that uncertain obligation of having to prove reasonable cause for not having served notice of claim? I do not see why a man who has genuinely suffered injury should be required to do that. In any case, I do not know that anybody becomes galvanised in these matters within such a short period of limitation.

I remember in my earlier years as an alderman of the Brisbane City Council that I had tremendous difficulty in trying to prevent the inconvenience caused by smoke and soot emitted by a smoke-stack at Hancock and Gore's sawmill in the South Brisbane-Woolloongabba area. At that time, when the company was making colossal profits from the retail sale of timber, I tried to get it to install an efficient smoke-stack that would arrest the soot. It proved to be an extremely difficult matter, and a number of years elapsed before it was resolved. This Bill gives someone the right to prosecute a company such as that, but being an opulent company it would regard a maximum penalty of \$500 as a mere bagatelle and a cheap licence fee for the right to operate with an inadequate smoke-stack. Possibly a new one would cost a few hundred thousand dollars.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** The Clean Air Act covers that.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Like this Bill, the Clean Air Act does nothing. What has it done since it was passed? Absolutely nothing. The body that was set up to control air pollution lacks both the resources and the staff to do it effectively. The only successful attempt to provide clean air in Brisbane was mine to remove trains from Woolloongabba. And it was not under the provisions of the Clean Air Act that I was able to have them removed.

The mode of prosecution is to be under the Justices Act. That means that all offences under this Act will be regarded as simple offences and will be dealt with in a summary manner. If some industry or institution is perpetuating a public injury on a wide section of the community in a city or, for that matter, in a country town, and is thereby undermining the health and welfare of the community, it is to be regarded as having committed only a simple offence that must be dealt with in a summary manner before a magistrate. The maximum penalty that can be imposed on the offender is \$500.

In the light of the penalties that can be imposed under the Health Act on a person who is found in possession of drugs—he can be imprisoned and/or fined as much as \$1,000 or, in certain circumstances, \$10,000—is it fair and just to impose such a small fine on a company that disregards the health and welfare of the community at large and, as well, thumbs its nose at the local authority and tells the Co-ordinator-General to go to hell? In view of the

problems that beset the community from time to time, is a fine of \$500 adequate to meet all eventualities?

Anyone who is injured as a result of the operations of the Co-ordinator-General will have his claim heard by a judge without a jury. I concede that in legislation of a similar nature concerning claims for personal injury, previous Labor Governments in Queensland have eliminated the necessity to refer such claims to a jury. By the same token, Labor Governments in other States—in particular, New South Wales—have retained the civil jury system in claims of this nature.

I know that there are arguments in favour of the elimination of juries in actions of this nature, but there are certainly arguments in favour of their retention. I was wondering if, in framing this legislation, the Government followed slavishly the principles of legislation introduced by past Governments in this State, or if it satisfied itself of the wisdom and necessity of continuing to dispense with the services of a jury in matters of this nature.

This legislation will not, cannot, and should not, affect in any substantial way the operations of the Brisbane City Council, which in many ways is well able to look after itself instead of having to be guided by this Government.

**Mr. Hughes:** It could help the council in redevelopment where it does not have authority to redevelop, provided it is planned in co-operation—

**Mr. BENNETT:** It is extraordinary that a former alderman for Yeronga should say that the Brisbane City Council has not power to develop. Apparently he has not read the town plan legislation.

**Mr. Hughes:** I am talking about redevelopment by way of resuming and selling for private purposes.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BENNETT:** I agree with you Mr. Acting Speaker. The honourable member is talking through his hat.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Kurilpa is not in his usual place in the Chamber. He knows the rule applying to interjections.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Country areas and, to a lesser extent, provincial cities are well able to cater for the welfare of their rate-payers. I am really concerned that this Bill does nothing for country towns which, under a sincere Bill of this nature, bona fide in its operations, should be gaining strength so that they can shoulder their burdens and responsibilities with the assistance of Government subsidies and, through a planned scheme, attract people back to the country. It is useless to say that it is good to live in the country. People must want to go there, or they will not

leave the city. We see young people breaking their necks to attend the university. For a minor percentage of them it is their down-right moral, intellectual and physical ruination, but they still want to go there because it is the "in" thing to do. They go there even though it may destroy their lives. We must create an atmosphere, through planning, whereby young people will want to go to the country because of the job opportunities there and the method and manner of living.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (9.30 p.m.): At the introductory stage members of the Opposition displayed some astonishing attitudes and made some astounding remarks. I should have thought that, as they have had the advantage of studying the Bill, they would have been able to put in better perspective many of the matters on which they appeared earlier to be very confused. But apparently that is not so. In a preview of the tactics to be used by the A.L.P., the Leader of the Opposition said that the effect of this Bill would be to create a third arm of government, but we have also heard Opposition members talking about a fourth arm of government. In addition, we learned that the attack would be concentrated on the compulsory aspects of the legislation.

Let me examine a few of these points. Some quite interesting remarks have been made. The Leader of the Opposition said that this Bill would make the Co-ordinator-General a very powerful and influential individual in the community, whereas the honourable member for South Brisbane said that it would lessen his status in the community. The honourable member for Logan summed up the situation pretty well when he said that this would be very good legislation in the hands of an A.L.P. Government but not in the hands of this Government. If this is the type of legislation Opposition members want to see enacted in this House, and it is legislation which is acceptable to them, they have very little to complain about.

We have seen a good deal of shadow-sparring. Opposition members said they were in favour of regional planning and then, by foresight or an ability to do a little crystal-gazing, they raised matters designed to create fear in the minds of the people. Let me say at the start that this is purely development legislation. The Leader of the Opposition, in examining the Bill, caught onto this business of civil strife and the ability of the Co-ordinator-General to take or acquire land in a developmental area in times of civil strife, and he immediately tried to read into this that it is one way in which we could have a form of state of emergency. For a start, the whole tenor of the Bill would not allow that. He confused it with the Transport Act, which is wide in its scope and permits a state of emergency to be declared. However, there is no mention

of a state of emergency in this Bill. Quite frankly, the proposition put up by the Leader of the Opposition astounded most honourable members and will astound most people outside.

If he wants to get down to detail, it is rather immaterial whether this particular provision stands or not. The idea behind legislation is that it should be comprehensive, and should cover not only what is likely to occur now but something that might occur in the future, and, in addition, ensure that the Government will not be powerless to act if such a happening should occur. The purpose of the insertion of the phrase "civil strife" was to cater for the after-effects of such action and for this reason it was rightly placed in the Bill. It might never be used.

The other "shocking" principle that seemed to really cause a great deal of consternation in the ranks opposite was that a local authority could be required to carry out certain works and, if it did not do so, action could be taken to enforce the order. It is passing strange that that specific provision was enacted in the original Co-ordinator-General legislation by none other than Mr. Forgan Smith, the Labor Premier of Queensland, in 1938.

I shall now deal with the honourable member for Mackay. He claimed great wisdom in what he would do to introduce regional planning. One of the conditions of this measure, being Queensland legislation, is that it can be implemented within an area proclaimed by and under the control of the Government of Queensland. If the honourable gentleman knew as much as he professes to know about local government, he would realise that local government does not have control over the whole of Queensland. It has control over the area above the high-water mark, so how would he deal with areas out to the three-mile limit or, if the High Court varied this, the 12-mile limit? That shows how ridiculous is his suggestion to amend the Local Government Act to fulfil this requirement. These are the thrusts and parries that seem to have been going on all day.

It was interesting to hear the criticism of the Minister for Industrial Development. The honourable member for Rockhampton South suggested that he probably entered the debate because his department was not living up to its reputation. Indeed, the Minister for Industrial Development had the wisdom and foresight to see that one programme of research would serve the purposes of all Government departments. He felt that it was unnecessary to have overlapping, and I think all honourable members would agree with that.

**Mr. Davis:** Whom are you up to now?

**Mr. LICKISS:** The House can rest assured that I would not waste time on the honourable member for Brisbane. He is incapable

of making a contribution. If he did make one, it would not be worth commenting on, anyway.

Let me now deal with the question, if I interpreted it correctly, of the so-called third tier of government. On the one hand, Opposition members say that they are in favour of regional planning. To be more precise, the honourable member for Logan said that this would be good legislation in the hands of Opposition members. If the Government has done anything intentionally in this legislation, it has endeavoured to avoid any feeling that there is a third level of government.

**Mr. Houston:** What are the three you are referring to?

**Mr. LICKISS:** Probably the three that the Leader of the Opposition referred to, but not the four levels to which some of his colleagues referred. If Opposition members could only straighten out their own thoughts, we might know better where they are going. The Leader of the Opposition certainly does not know.

Let us face the facts as they relate to levels of government. I think it should be made abundantly clear that there are two levels of government possessing sovereign powers in Australia. There is the level created by the Federal Constitution, which is the Commonwealth Government, and there are the sovereign powers retained by the States. The powers that remain the prerogative of the State Government are those not contained in the Federal Constitution, and they are many and varied. The State Government, in its wisdom, recognising the desirability of having a form of local government, set up local authorities with delegated powers from the State Government, to serve the people in their respective areas. Indeed, it seems to have passed unnoticed that the Treasurer announced the other day that certain sums of money would be provided for an in-depth study of local government to ensure that its present, or updated, concept was adequate to fulfil the role of local government in regional planning.

**Mr. Hughes:** That didn't include Brisbane, though, did it?

**Mr. LICKISS:** For this purpose, it did not include Brisbane at this stage. Governments, in their wisdom (I am not being party political here), have set up local government because not only is it worth while but it is most desirable and the form of government closest to the people.

It has been said that by the Bill local authorities will in some way be restricted. It may not have occurred to honourable members opposite that in fact local authorities are being given more rights than they now have.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. LICKISS:** Very well, let us examine it further. Honourable members opposite have such a shallow depth of thought on

these matters that they do not realise what in fact the Government is doing. Up till the present, a local authority has had a say only within its boundaries. If local authorities in future participate in regional considerations, they will have a say not only in what happens within their own boundaries but also in what happens in their regions.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: The Leader of the Opposition will want to bow out now; obviously he wants to beat a retreat.

Mr. Houston: That will be the day when I retreat from you.

Mr. LICKISS: He obviously wants to beat a retreat.

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to contain himself. He has been somewhat provoked, but I ask him to contain himself.

Mr. Houston: I certainly will, but the Premier provoked me.

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LICKISS: Certain moves have been made to get contiguous shires to act together, and the honourable member for Ipswich West commented on experience in that field and also on the desirability of regional planning. It is interesting to note that nine years ago, when it was suggested that regional planning should be undertaken in Queensland and the need for it was explained, the present Lord Mayor of Brisbane said that it was unnecessary, that a system of contiguous shires was working remarkably well. The then Town Clerk, Mr. J. C. Slaughter, who is recognised as a person with wide experience in the field of local government, agreed with the Lord Mayor.

It is passing strange that the Lord Mayor has now acknowledged that what then appeared to be working satisfactorily is not in fact what is most desirable, and over the last few years he has constantly advocated a system of regional planning. Mr. Slaughter recently retired as City Adviser. In reminiscing, he said that one of the things that the city and the State required was a system of regional planning.

Mr. Hughes: Mrs. Jordan will support that.

Mr. LICKISS: I am sure that honourable members who have made a study of this subject—I have in mind particularly the honourable member for South Coast and the honourable member for Ipswich West—will acknowledge the need for regional planning.

I come now to the claims of unnecessary restrictions on local authorities and the suggestion that we are taking away some of their powers. In the main, we are giving them greater authority than they had before. We are giving them an opportunity to play a role in the region in which their particular

local authority is located and to participate in a system of planning as between shires. If it is conceded that it is desirable to co-ordinate on a regional basis, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to explain to me how that result could be achieved if the power of co-ordination and enforcement of co-ordination is taken away from the Co-ordinator-General, who, of course, will declare regions only after very careful in-depth studies.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. I am put in a very embarrassing position, Mr. Acting Speaker. The honourable member has challenged me to explain to him now how something could be done. I should like to do that. May I do it?

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LICKISS: The honourable member will have plenty of opportunity to explain in the Committee stage. The Bill contains many clauses, and he has 20 minutes on each clause. He can explain it to me then. I am rather looking forward to finding out, after all the thunder has subsided, what metal will come out of all of the airy-fairy talk and conflicting ideas that we have heard from the Opposition today.

I shall be interested also to see the strength of the amendments that the Opposition puts forward. I believe that there are some in the offing.

Mr. Houston: You have seen them.

Mr. LICKISS: I shall be interested to see what transpires. I expect that all we will see when the Opposition produces its amendments will be a damp fizzer.

The honourable member for Sandgate said that the Bill had many shortcomings and virtually condemned it. He disagreed violently, of course, with the honourable member for Logan, who said—I think this is worth repeating—that it would be very good legislation in the hands of the Opposition members but not so good in the hands of the Government. Having said that there were many things about which he was concerned, he went on to outline what should be in the Bill. If he had read the provisions of the Bill he would know that they very largely coincide with what he suggests should be incorporated in it. When the Bill is examined in detail, I hope that he will speak on some of those matters.

I dislike coming back to the honourable member for Logan all the time. He made the very profound statement that there was nothing in the Bill that would help the Redland Shire in his area. One of the great problems that will face a section of Queensland in the future is how the population within the South-east Queensland complex can be adequately accommodated, and how we will be able to preserve human values and the value of life within a desirable environment. He is one of those members whose

electorates about the boundaries of Greater Brisbane. Quite frankly, if he cannot see what is happening in his own shire, which could be vastly improved by a better system of co-ordination between his shire, adjoining shires and Greater Brisbane, he obviously goes around his electorate with his eyes closed.

**Mr. Baldwin:** You have made a mistake there, but I won't interrupt you by taking a point of order.

**Mr. LICKISS:** The honourable member can correct me later. I made some notes when the honourable member was speaking.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What were you making notes for?

**Mr. LICKISS:** I will come back to the honourable member for Salisbury.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You are supposed to be the expert, but you have done nothing but talk about what we have said. You have not said anything of your own yet.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Sherrington:** You said nothing—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Salisbury has already been warned. I do not want to have to ask him to retire from the Chamber.

**Mr. LICKISS:** That is quite amusing coming from the honourable member for Salisbury. All he did was read a speech he made on the legislation providing for the establishment of the Environmental Control Council. In fact, that Act has been included in toto in the Bill. We had to weather that speech again. But the honourable member's attitude is quite significant. He talks about conservation, the environment and human values in relation to the environment, but he appears to have a sort of split personality or a split policy. He has one policy when it comes to areas such as Cooloola—and I respect him for his views—but like Lord Nelson he turns a blind eye when he looks at Greater Brisbane. What does he do about public parks in Brisbane? He stands idly by when—

**Mr. Sherrington:** Wait a minute, you listen to me.

**Mr. LICKISS:** You had your go, now you can listen to me.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LICKISS:** He stands idly by while sporting fields and park lands are enclosed by the Brisbane City Council.

**Mr. Sherrington:** It just shows how far—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LICKISS:** I have not heard him being very vocal or seen him reported in the Press on that matter. He stands idly by and watches playing fields that have been used by young children being enclosed for sporting bodies.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Name them.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I can name them.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Name them, then.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LICKISS:** Perry Park is one.

**Mr. Sherrington:** How long ago? When was that ever used—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I have been more than tolerant with the honourable member for Salisbury. As he has been warned and rewarned, I now ask him to retire from the Chamber under Standing Order 123A.

Whereupon the honourable member for Salisbury withdrew from the Chamber.

**Mr. LICKISS:** Did the honourable member take any exception to the selling of the Mt. Gravatt showgrounds to Myers? That was an area that had been used for public activity and public recreation over the years. I make the point that I am not against that sort of action. But if grounds are going to be enclosed, let the Brisbane City Council enclose grounds further out.

I want to relate what is happening now to what is being done in planning in the Greater Brisbane area. I refer to residential "B" and "C" areas which are mainly inner city areas where we can expect high density population. On a conservative estimate, in these areas when they are fully developed, there might be an additional 500,000 to 600,000 residents. Relative to the zoning of this area, I ask: What has the honourable member for Salisbury done to have open spaces provided? Where is his strong advocacy on this issue?

**Mr. Houston:** He has done more than you have.

**Mr. LICKISS:** Because it affects the Brisbane City Council. If he has done it, I give him due credit, but he would have done it under the covers, and he has not made out of it the political capital that he has tried to make out of this Government's actions relative to certain areas.

**Mr. Miller:** It has not been made public, if he has.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I agree. We on this side are not against enclosed playing grounds, but we say that there is a planning space for them and I think that the honourable member for Salisbury ought to start looking inwards to his own city council as well as outwards at what is happening in the rest of the State.

I think I have drawn the attention of the House to some of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in which he tried to read some rather sinister motives into this Bill.

Another matter raised by honourable members opposite was the ability of the Co-ordinator-General to take land. This

is "bad". In fact, attention was drawn to his ability to take land under the Land Acquisition Act. It is not so long ago—and we are talking now about the use of power—that the Brisbane City Council took land from a person in my electorate and that person did not even know it had been taken. It was because of that incident that the Government moved to pass fresh legislation and repeal the existing legislation—the Land Acquisition Act. Under the old State Development and Public Works Organisation Act, if my memory serves me correctly, provision was inserted for the taking of land for certain purposes. Similar provision existed in the City of Brisbane Development Act. But the Opposition, being unable to attack the general principles of this Bill, are now looking at some details and saying that it is bad to do this or that or the other thing. They are merely shadow-sparring.

I compliment the Premier on the introduction of this legislation. It provides the wherewithal to introduce regional planning into Queensland for the first time. This does not mean that the whole of the State will suddenly be divided into regions. This Bill does not deal only with the regional concept; it also deals with the areas which the Co-ordinator-General or the Government decide, in their wisdom, are not at this stage ripe for declaration as regions. This Bill has a role to play other than mere regional planning. What we said at the introductory stage was that the Co-ordinator-General's department had the ability to look at itself and the ability to look forward to what could be the future role of the Co-ordinator-General. I think that out of these considerations has come a very worthwhile piece of legislation.

Although it has been said before, I believe that other States, where they have failed or have met difficulties, will look at this legislation and copy all or part of it. If we look further afield, we see problems in Geelong at the moment in terms of regional planning. The problems there have got beyond the authorities because they have not the wherewithal to completely fund the type of development. What we have done is to tie the various projects to the works programme and in that way we have given the legislation teeth.

As to the "sinister" matter of taking away power from the local authorities by forcing them to pay bills they may not want to pay or to go into projects they may not want to undertake, I said before that this was introduced into the original Act by the then Premier, Mr. Forgan Smith. Since 1938 under both Labor Governments and this Government the section has never been used.

**Mr. Houston:** They had the right of appeal.

**Mr. LICKISS:** There is a right of appeal in this legislation, too; but apparently the Leader of the Opposition has not read that

far yet. I believe that a minimum of legislative action has been taken; nevertheless the Bill will have teeth. It would be foolish in the extreme to put up legislation whose spirit could not be implemented by the Government. It is interesting to note that, although the Bill has been in circulation for some time, not one objection has been raised to its contents. I have received a number of phone calls from country residents as well as from people in the city and in planning circles. I mention particularly the attitude of Professor Gareth Roberts, who is Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and a master of city design in his own right. He has passed some very complimentary remarks about the Bill. As well, I have had discussions with other planners who, unlike members of the Opposition, do know something about planning, and they can see great merit in the legislation.

As I said at the commencement of my speech, we will not be judged on this legislation by the Opposition; we will be judged by the people outside. I face the people outside with a great deal of confidence. It is probably only sour grapes when members of the Opposition criticise this legislation. They did not believe that we would be capable of introducing it within our type of politics. We have preserved the free-enterprise system and have introduced regional planning. Although members of the Opposition snigger and laugh, I believe that they are completely confused. The Bill will be of great benefit to Queensland in the future and I look forward to arguing the various clauses with members opposite at the Committee stage. As well, I look forward to the results of the loud "bangs" that have been going off in the Chamber today to see just what type of bullets their "guns" are capable of firing. I commend the Bill.

**Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (9.43 p.m.):** We have just witnessed a demonstration by the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha of how he will act if ever he is fortunate enough to become a Minister of the Crown.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Unfortunate.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Fortunate for him, but unfortunate perhaps for his Government and, no doubt, the people of Queensland. He took upon himself the duties of the Premier and his advisory staff in answering the arguments put forward by members of the Opposition. In the main, I suggest that he was rather usurping the Premier's function in this Chamber.

Over the years the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has been in limbo, and he is now emerging in the belief that he should do something to justify his claim to the probable vacancy in Cabinet. Tonight he has endeavoured to illustrate his ability. By the way, he has left the Chamber and rather suddenly. He said that ' generally approved of the Bill. reads its long title would at least approve of that. It reads, "To Provide for State

and Regional Planning and Development through a co-ordinated system of Public Works Organization, for Environmental Controls, and for related purposes." That is admirable. Nobody could deny that the wording of that title is essential to the development of Queensland.

However, the Bill is outlined in words, and words have meanings. When they are placed before us they may be interpreted by us in different ways. That would not necessarily apply to the Bill as a whole, but it would certainly apply to sections of it. We hold debates here so that these issues can be raised. No-one should be condemned, least of all by a back-bencher, as foolish, childish or senile because he advances arguments, seeks assurances, or puts forward suggestions for improvement.

When the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha raised the issue relative to the Leader of the Opposition seizing on the matter of civil strife, he was himself searching for some means of hitting back at an honourable gentleman who had spent hours and days studying the Bill, and who came into this House today, after a discussion with his fellow members in caucus, with the aim of putting forward constructive criticism of this legislation. It was entirely wrong of the honourable member to speak as he did.

Dealing with his point that the Leader of the Opposition seized on the acquisition of land in a State development area for the purpose of dealing satisfactorily with civil strife, why should not the Leader of the Opposition ask that question, when the honourable member who is criticising him stated that there was power under the State Transport Act to declare a state of emergency? If that is a valid statement by the honourable member, why is it necessary to reintroduce that power in this Bill, under another department altogether?

**Mr. LICKISS:** I rise to a point of order and ask the honourable member to quote me correctly. I said that this was a specialised Bill, but the State Transport Act was wide enough to cater for states of emergency. I should like to be quoted correctly.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Barcoo to accept the statement of the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I accept the honourable member's statement, but I asked why it was necessary for the honourable member to say that the Leader of the Opposition was at fault when he admits that the Transport Act contains emergency powers. Why is it necessary, therefore, to include emergency powers in this Bill?

**Mr. Lickiss:** I will explain it to you afterwards.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** It is not a case of explaining it to me afterwards. I am replying to the honourable member's criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, which I thought was rather out of place.

Surely it is logical to argue that if a state of emergency can be declared under the State Transport Act, that in itself is sufficient. Why has that provision to be reiterated in a State development area? It is not necessary. The whole thing has become out of focus when a member of this House cannot raise a logical query on a Bill without being criticised. We are the Opposition; we are the side to offer constructive criticism. This is the side of the House that has to worry out the information so that the Bill, when ratified, will have a common-sense basis of application. It will have that basis simply because it was torn to pieces by the Opposition before being approved by the House.

This is very important, and is one of my principal reasons for rising. I remind the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha that in 1967, when we discussed the Acquisition of Land Act, I said, "We will see this again in two years' time." We did. In 1969 we amended that Act. At the end of that debate I said to the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha, "I will see you again in two years' time." Two years have elapsed, and here we are. The Acquisition of Land Act is referred to strongly in this Bill in the special powers incidental to planned development. The Acquisition of Land Act sets out the guidelines for the Co-ordinator-General in the planned development of this State. Yet, under this Bill, we are setting up another set of rules for the acquisition of land relative to the declaration of development areas and the programming of development schemes.

**Mr. Lickiss:** Under the Acquisition of Land Act—

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am aware of the provisions of the Acquisition of Land Act. The honourable member does not need to inform me of them. I should like him to let me finish what I am saying. I do not want to accept his interjection, because the Bill sets up another set of rules for the acquisition of land. When we passed the Acquisition of Land Act in 1967, both sides of the Chamber thought we had achieved some sense of justice in the acquisition of land. As I say, in 1969 that Act was amended to our satisfaction. We knew that, with experience, some facets would have to be amended. We were very proud because we thought that justice was being brought into the type of work carried out by Government departments which is often odious to individuals or groups in the community. We were pleased when we were able to break down the statute bar to a minimum application. We were pleased about the notifications of resumption. We provided, under section 41 of the Act, that if the authority which had resumed that

land or on whose behalf the land was resumed did not use the land within seven years, the person from whom it had been resumed had priority of purchase and the Valuer-General would set the valuation on the deal.

When this Bill provides a second set of rules or laws relating to the acquisition of land, surely any sensible person would want to know the reason, particularly when the State Transport Act contains the power to declare a state of emergency. To any thinking person concerned with civil liberties, the statement that the Co-ordinator-General cannot be called to question is rather frightening.

**Mr. Low:** Which Government inserted the powers into the State Transport Act?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I could not say. It was probably a Labor Government. However, it does not matter what previous Governments did. Surely, if we think what they did was wrong, we have the right to say so and amend their legislation. If we did not have this right, there would be no progress in this State.

**An Opposition Member:** We might as well go home.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Yes, we might just as well. Otherwise, all we would have to do would be to stick to the old rules and that would be the end of it.

This is one of the principal reasons why I rose tonight. These documents contain words, and words have meanings. It is the interpretation of those words that is most important. I regret that the honourable member for South Brisbane is not present, because I would have liked him to hear what I am saying. This is most important, and I believe that the powers set out for use in respect of a development area are really not necessary at all, particularly as they conflict with the provisions of the Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1969. I know that there are times of emergency, and we still have on the Statute Book, and have recently used, those very same emergency powers.

I shall not delay the House very long, but there are one or two points that I should mention that are surely of great concern. One concerns the objectives of comprehensive programmes of works. Comprehensive programmes of works are ideal, and when one reads the words, "the development of the State on an equitable basis" one is very proud and happy that the Government has this generous and fine ambition. But one then sees the words, "adequate and proper consideration being given to matters of environment, social conditions and regional potential". Those are words that worry me. We have often heard the Treasurer say that he hates the word "potential". I dislike it, too, and I dislike it very much in this Bill because if a region of this State has no potential, God help it.

**Mr. Porter:** Don't you think that is a specious criticism?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Not at all. Immediately reference is made to such a region, the Government will say, "Yes, we have it in mind, but it has a low priority." In this State, unfortunately, as western members will undoubtedly agree, there is a lamentable lack of potential. The cry from people in the West is that they are neglected, and the words to which I have referred in the Bill indicate that they will continue to be neglected. This is not good phraseology to encourage people to believe that the Governments intends to treat all people equitably. Let it not be forgotten that the word "equitable" is used.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** You don't think of that in relation to one vote, one value, do you?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I have been diverted by a reference to the principle of one vote, one value. I have in mind the fact that an electoral redistribution is now being carried out. I wonder how the members of this House are to be allocated to districts. Will they be fitted in with regional planning and development, or are they to be allocated to the various parts of the State in a way that suits the convenience of the Government? Are they to be taken by the commission, with no arguments on redistribution put to it by the A.L.P., and allotted throughout the State on that basis? Not at all.

I think it will be found that some strange and weird things will come out of this legislation. Certain development areas in the State will be represented by three members; some will be represented by one member; perhaps some others will not have any representation at all. Let me take an obvious area such as the Nogoa Valley. Part of the Nogoa Valley will be in the Roma area; another part will be in a different area. It will be rather interesting for the member of this Assembly who has to tiptoe from one region to another. He will find that, in one region, he has to say that black is black and, when he goes to the other region, that black is white.

**A Government Member** interjected.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I heard an interjection relative to representation. The A.L.P. has not tried to coerce the commission that is dealing with electoral redistribution. It has not done anything in that direction. It certainly has not run around making suggestions. Anyone who approaches the question in a common-sense way will see that parliamentary representation must have some association with State planning and regional development.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Is this an introductory speech you are making?

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will decide whether or not the honourable member for Barcoo is in order.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** The question of potential development has been raised. Westerners and mid-westerners find talk of regional development of that type rather disconcerting. Because of their present financial position and their fears for the future, they will lack both development and interest.

I have taken an interest in regional development, and I have noted that from time to time interested people have made efforts, apparently on a voluntary basis, to obtain such development. One could call the New State Movement a step in that direction, but it has not gone very far. Divorcing ourselves from that question for the moment, we all know that certain regions in Australia are very interested in regional development. Anyone who has been around for a while knows that an endeavour is being made to set up a Darling River Basin regional scheme. I have spoken to the people concerned. Although they are imbued with enthusiasm, they have not yet got the scheme off the ground. In order to do so, they must have the general consensus of the people with them. When they have that, they have also to obtain the general consensus of the local bodies.

Regional schemes very often contain serious anomalies. Subjects such as water supplies, and the rivers themselves and their value to the people along their banks, can be questions for serious consideration. A cost-benefit analysis is far beyond the means of the volunteers. They may be able to go some distance in that respect, but until they are recognised by a Government or Governments, State or Federal, and assisted, the prohibitive cost will make it very difficult for them to get the scheme off the ground. They have to consider also the attitude of Governments to their efforts.

In developing regions in a State like Queensland, which is part of a continent, anomalies must develop along the border. This will create a very big problem for any Co-ordinator-General and his officers. Interests in the Darling River Basin scheme are common to two States. From time to time interstate jealousies will arise as a result of conflicting interests. I realise the difficulties that lie ahead. Within the State there will be difficulties in regionalising certain areas because of the opinions of local citizens. I read into the Bill these gestures of authority and harsh words.

**Mr. Lee:** It depends on how you read them.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am quite able to read and understand. I know the difference between dictatorship and authoritarianism on the one hand, and justice, fair play and honesty on the other. When I read the words of the Bill I can see that a strong line is being taken.

**Mr. Lee:** You said it was harsh.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** It is harsh. If it is a strong line it can be harsh.

In quite a number of instances a strong line is being taken so that the State, if it so desires, can wield its power. I do not approve of that. If we were adopting the Acquisition of Land Act as the basic principle of acquisition throughout the Bill I should say that justice was being done, and was obviously being done. Certain provisions will cause a great deal of resentment. In the future there will be a feeling of resentment against what the Government of the day may regard as a plan of progress.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (10.8 p.m.), in reply: At this late hour I do not think it is necessary to reply to the various speakers at length. However, neither the honourable member for Barcoo nor the honourable member for Warrego should allege neglect of the inland, having in mind, as I interjected a while ago, that their own party and their own organisation will not support the principle of one vote, one value. They were quite prepared to take from the inland the representation to which we say it is entitled.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** What I say is correct.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** You read the record.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is the policy of the A.L.P. They cannot accuse us on the one hand of taking away representation, and then, on the other, say that areas in the inland will not receive any benefit from the Bill and so on.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** I used the word "potential".

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member, in effect, implied what I have said.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** No. You are imagining it.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am not imagining anything in relation to A.L.P. policy, or about the principle of one vote, one value.

It has been very interesting to listen to the various Opposition speakers. Some want the Bill, while some do not. Some say it is not effective, while others say it is far too effective or too drastic. There has been no real co-ordination in the Opposition's presentation, so that the various contributions from that side have sounded very hollow and insincere.

In their approach to the Bill, honourable members opposite have endeavoured to interpret it as a snide exercise in gaining imaginary ends. They have been looking at ways and means by which an exceptional situation could arise. They have been trying to imagine that all sorts of things are going to happen because of the Bill. They forget that it is directed towards the development of Queensland, and that every provision in it must be read and administered within its context.

Opposition members are not prepared to allow the legislation to be administered by people who are competent to achieve its objective. Rather do they seek to bind them by what may appear at the moment to be desirable provisions. This is not the best or the proper approach. The object of the Bill is to set a foundation or a general scheme on which the Co-ordinator-General and his staff, acting in co-operation with local authorities and other local bodies, can build so that the State will grow and develop. Their administration must be so flexible as to take account of circumstances as they arise. It cannot lay down the hundred-and-one rules and regulations that honourable members have been suggesting.

It is for this very reason that such detail has not been written into the Bill. It has to be flexible; there has to be some degree of movement within a Bill of this nature. I know honourable members opposite would like to lay down hard-and-fast rules, like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, which altereth not, but we have to realise that we are in a growing State with an expanding economy and that these are changing times. This is why the Bill has been made flexible and is not loaded with all these suggested provisions.

The Opposition claims that the Co-ordinator-General is being erected as a barrier between the Government and local authorities. This is far from the truth; it is simply a fanciful notion, and exhibits a failure to understand the nature of the role of the Co-ordinator-General.

The honourable member for South Brisbane, who spoke about the Co-ordinator-General, obviously has not read the Bill. I invite him to study clause 4 (2). I know he has been busy today with his other activities in court and probably did not have a chance to read the Bill over the week-end, but if he does study it he will see the answer to what he said so much about and quite obviously did not understand.

**Mr. Bennett:** Why can't you tell the truth sometimes instead of always being a pious hypocrite?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I will tell the truth. The truth is that the honourable member just did not know what he was talking about. The Bill sets out quite clearly who the Co-ordinator-General is and his occupation, and so on. It is there for the honourable member to read. If he can find the time tonight, he will learn something.

The honourable member also raised the question of claims for damages being decided by a jury. He, as well as the Government, is aware of the reasons for excluding juries from claims against the Government or insurance companies, as in motor vehicle cases. That is why the provision covering juries is included in the Bill. Juries are

notorious for awarding excessive damages if they know that public moneys or insurance moneys are available to meet them.

This Bill further emphasises the role of co-ordination by means of regional co-ordination councils, project boards, and so on. Co-ordination will be achieved by involving local authorities to the fullest extent. That is all we seek to do. We seek to encourage them.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Brisbane knows the correct way to address a member of this Assembly. I ask him to observe it.

**Mr. Davis:** I haven't said a word.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Brisbane will not interrupt while I am telling him to use the correct method of addressing a member of this Assembly. He knows the correct method, and I ask him to observe it.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Legislation elsewhere covering regional planning has often tended to formulate a detailed approach to the problem. However, with the passage of time and because of the changing world in which we live, these detailed provisions have often become outmoded. That is why the Bill has been made flexible, and is the reason for what one might call a broad approach to the legislation.

Opposition members have mentioned the right of appeal. The Bill provides for objection by local bodies to the Minister. He must take the matter to the Governor in Council, who may then appoint a commission of inquiry to consider the objection. If this is not sufficient for the Opposition, what does it seek? Is it an appeal to a court? If so, it is strangely out of place in relation to this Bill, which is concerned with matters of policy and administration and not with questions of legality, which are the particular concern of the courts.

Many of the matters raised by Opposition members seemed to be quite out of context. I must refute the criticism levelled by the honourable member for South Brisbane at the Great Barrier Reef Royal Commission. I was rather concerned at his sarcastic remarks and criticism of the members of the commission. They were entirely out of place, and I am surprised that as a legal man he should have adopted such a critical attitude. The members of the commission are all men of high integrity and great ability and skill. They have been appointed by both the Commonwealth and the State Governments.

**Mr. Bennett:** It will go down in history as the longest inquiry ever.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Obviously, evidence is being presented continually to the commission on what is a very vital and important issue.

**Mr. Bennett:** It will be as unsuccessful as the National Hotel inquiry.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for South Brisbane to discontinue interjecting.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Wouldn't you think that as a legal man he would tell us what he thinks about the Q.C.E.?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is another question.

**Mr. Bennett:** Just because Mr. Acting Speaker got "stuck into" me, you are getting personal. You know I cannot answer you back.

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I only wanted to reprimand the honourable member for South Brisbane for his comments about the members of the commission, as they have no opportunity to reply to them. They are carrying out their responsibilities with a high degree of skill, fairness and impartiality.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Why didn't he get "stuck into" the Q.C.E.? They can hit back at him.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I do not think the honourable member for South Brisbane would be happy to do that.

Time and time again members of the Opposition emphasised their assertion that local authorities are being undermined by the Bill and that the Government is unsympathetic towards them. Such a claim is completely wrong and untrue. Since this Government has been in office we have given \$157,000,000 to local authorities by way of subsidy. As well, they have received large grants and help in the payment of rates. We have done things that other State Governments do not do for their local authorities. We have been entirely sympathetic towards them. I do not think anyone has travelled around the State more than I have in meeting local authorities in the inland areas.

**Mr. Bennett:** What subsidy have you given to country industry?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** We have given all the encouragement we can to local authorities in assisting them to maintain employment, and also to assist country industry.

The honourable member for Warrego spoke at great length, and in sarcastic terms, about the Government's attitude to inland areas. He said that this and that should be done, and that money should be found for a great number of things. The honourable member for Rockhampton South also said that money must be found for this and that. It is the easiest thing in the world to make comments of that type and to ask, "Why don't you do this and that? Why don't you direct industry to Rockhampton and the West?" The honourable member knows that as a private-enterprise Government we do

not direct industries to any particular place, whether it be Rockhampton or some other part of the State.

**Mr. Wright:** What is the idea of regional development?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The idea is not to direct industry to a place where it does not want to go, but to give every opportunity and encouragement to industry, and to do the planning and preparation that is necessary to enable it to start up in a particular area in the best possible way.

The honourable member for Warrego said we should take action to peg prices. Tomorrow I will answer his question in relation to price control of primary products. He must know that the prices for wool and other primary products are now at their lowest ebb, and therefore should be the last to suggest that the Government ought to smarten itself up and impose price control on these commodities. In some respects I was staggered by his remarks, but in other ways I was not. Perhaps the trouble arises through his complete misunderstanding of the position. I will answer his query when I reply to his question tomorrow.

The honourable member for South Coast gave a forceful outline of the Government's attitude to this issue, and presented a practical example of the Government's thinking in relation to regional planning.

The member for Mt. Coot-tha covered many of the points raised by honourable members opposite, and outlined the basis of the Bills provisions. He countered many of the submissions made by honourable members opposite, and pointed out how completely beside the point they were in the way they spoke.

In reply to the honourable member for Ithaca on the power of the Co-ordinator-General to take material from certain areas, I assure him that it is not intended to interfere in any way with marine habitats or national parks. That is quite obvious, and I give the honourable member that assurance.

The honourable member also sought representation of the Queensland Conservation Council on the Environmental Control Council. Provision is made for the setting up of advisory committees. It is proposed to approach interested organisations with a view to the formation of an advisory committee that will be able to make representations and submissions to the Environmental Control Council.

The honourable member also asked about plans of development areas and regions. These plans will be available at reasonable cost to interested parties. With reference to representation on the regional co-ordination councils, I assure the honourable member that, in general, membership will be composed of persons who are directly involved within the various regions. For obvious reasons, it would be inappropriate

for me to particularise the persons, or categories of persons, likely to be included on these councils. It will be the objective to include representatives from within the area who are best suited to tackle the task involved. That is obvious, and such appointments will be made after careful consideration.

I could continue at considerable length to deal with the matters raised, but it could then be said that we are trying to have "two bob" each way.

**Mr. Houston:** Don't talk in gambling terms.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** If the honourable members wants me to enter into a debate and outline how ridiculous some of the Opposition's suggestions were, and how some Opposition members say the measure is all right, while some say it is too drastic and others that it is not drastic enough, I will do so. But where do we go from there? If he takes the time to summarise everything that his colleagues have said today, he will find a strange conglomeration, for and against—this way and that. However, that is their prerogative. If they care to adopt that attitude and make such statements as they have today, that is their business.

Motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Houghton, Redcliffe, in the chair)

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Commencement of Act—

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (10.26 p.m.): I do not propose to speak at any length on this clause. However, for the purpose of answering and correcting the inaccurate and horribly misinformed statements made by the Premier relative to later clauses, I have to refer to the clauses as we meet them. Clause 2 reads—

"This Act shall come into operation on a date appointed by the Governor by Proclamation published in the Gazette."

We well know from hard experience that that means what it says. In practical essence it means that it will come into operation when Cabinet sees fit. We know of legislation that has gone through this House and has never been proclaimed. We know of legislation that has partly gone through this House and could never be proclaimed. I cite the Electoral Districts Bill which was thrown into the waste-paper basket earlier this year and the Bill of Rights legislation and other legislation.

This Act, and the appointments to be made under it, will come into operation after it is proclaimed. It might never be proclaimed. If, by some mischance, this Government is returned next year—and I do not think it will be—it might be 12 months before this Act is proclaimed. If the Government is not returned at the next election, we will not proclaim it. Nevertheless, a good deal could happen to the office of the Co-ordinator-General before this Act is proclaimed because

this Government is noted for its procrastination and the Bill does not say when the Act will come into operation.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—Repeals and savings—

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (10.28 p.m.): To follow up my argument and to clearly prove in black and white and by hard, convincing argument that the Premier's reply was completely untruthful, let me point out that clause 4 (2)—the Premier drew my attention to this clause, and it is easy to pick out one clause—provides—

"The person who immediately before the date of commencement of this Act holds the office of Co-ordinator-General of Public Works for the purposes of the repealed Acts shall continue to hold, subject to the terms of his appointment, the office of Co-ordinator-General for the purposes of this Act."

That is, at the date of the commencement of this Act. We, as parliamentarians, do not know the date of commencement of this Act. We do not know who will be Co-ordinator-General when the Act does commence, if it commences. I am entitled to argue on the basis that, when the Act is commenced, we do not know who might hold the office of Co-ordinator-General.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (10.29 p.m.): I use this clause to reply to a couple of general statements made by the Premier. I regret that he saw fit to come into the Chamber and speak about matters he had not heard debated. It is obvious he had to rely on an adviser to tell him what was said.

The first matter I refer to relates to the existing law. Ministers of the Crown come and go, and it is not sufficient to say, "My interpretation of the Bill is so-and-so. Therefore there is no need to have that in the legislation." When replying to the honourable member for Ithaca, the Premier said, "It is all right because I say it is all right." Only a short time ago the Premier saved himself by using his own vote. The Premier could go, as Premier, tomorrow, as a result of action within his party.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** So could you.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right. I am a realist. Let the Premier be a realist, too.

**An Opposition Member:** Rumour is strong at present.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right. The honourable member for Ithaca mentioned certain questions that were raised by me, not with the same examples but in the same context. The whole point is that matters have to be set out quite clearly so that there is one interpretation, and one only, irrespective of who is the Minister, who is the Co-ordinator-General, and who fill other

positions in the Public Service. The Bill is not only flexible; in some cases it gives no guide-lines. As I proceed through other clauses, I shall show that the Bill is wide open and contains no guide-lines at all. We could therefore get a ridiculous position similar to that in the Police Force where the Minister says one thing, the Commissioner says something else, and a spokesman for I do not know whom says, "They are both silly. This is the answer." It is not good enough to have legislation that allows this so-called flexibility. It is quite ridiculous to have a clause that really provides no-guide lines at all.

Mention was also made of subsidies under the present legislation. It is quite obvious that the Premier did not want to enter an argument on percentages of subsidies. As the honourable member for Ipswich East and others said, the rate of subsidy as a percentage has continued to decrease over the years that the Government has been in office.

**Mr. Lee:** If it was not for us, Clem would have "died" long ago.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not know what assistance the Government has given to the Lord Mayor, but it is obvious from the way that many of the honourable member's colleagues spoke that they have a complete phobia about the Brisbane City Council. They are frightened of it. They know that it is doing a wonderful job for Brisbane, and they worry because they cannot find anything to criticise legitimately.

The Premier said that different members presented different stories. That is not true. Opposition members interpret the Bill as they see it. I make it clear that no directions are given about speaking on this side of the Chamber. Opposition members speak as they see things, and as often as they want to on any matter. They are not like Government members who get up like parrots just to get into the act.

**Mr. Lee:** That is so funny it is laughable.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Whereas the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha is trying to get into Cabinet by saying a lot of words, the honourable member for Yeronga is hoping to get into it by saying nothing.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton):** Order!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** All I want to do at this stage is refute the statements made by the Premier, and to say that there is a solid attitude to the Bill on this side of the Chamber. When all our speeches are analysed, it will be found that we have been consistently critical of the Bill because we believe that in several of its aspects it will be dictatorial in its application to local authorities. This is the matter that we will further explain as we proceed through the clauses.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—Appointment of Co-ordinator-General—

**Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (10.34 p.m.):** I refer to clause 7 to pursue my argument in logical fashion so that readers of "Hansard" will be able to see who is telling the truth in this matter. The clause reads—

"The Governor in Council, may, by commission under his hand and the Public Seal of the State, appoint a person to hold the office of Co-ordinator-General.

"The appointee shall be paid, during his tenure of office, a salary at such rate as the Governor in Council determines from time to time."

In other words, he is appointed at the will of Cabinet for the period for which Cabinet sees fit, and he can be sacked at any time, as Frank Hickey was sacked as a magistrate.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—Tenure of appointment under ss. 7 and 8—

**Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (10.35 p.m.):** Just to lay the Premier properly flat on this point, I point out that the wording of clause 9 specifically, precisely and without doubt proves my point. It says—

"Subject to this section, the appointee to the office referred to in section 7 (the Co-ordinator-General) or in section 8 of this Act shall hold his office for the period fixed by the Governor in Council and specified in the instrument whereby he is appointed but shall be eligible for re-appointment . . ."

In other words, he holds the office at the will of the Cabinet for the term nominated in his appointment. Of course, when an appointing authority such as the Governor in Council has power to appoint, it also has power to withdraw the appointment. No doubt it will do so, as it did with Frank Hickey, S.M., and Mr. O'Connor, S.M.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (10.36 p.m.):** It was interesting to hear the honourable member for South Brisbane and the Leader of the Opposition speak on the clause dealing with the position of Co-ordinator-General. One would expect them to know that that provision is in the present Act and that it is the basis on which the Co-ordinator-General is appointed. Obviously they do not, so for their edification I will inform them that that is so and that it is the usual procedure.

**Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (10.37 p.m.):** What a petty, puerile, futile argument. The naivety of the Premier never ceases to amaze me. I have not for one moment dealt with the present terms of appointment of the Co-ordinator-General. I am dealing with a new office which is to be

known as Co-ordinator-General, the occupant of which will have powers far different from those of the present Co-ordinator-General. The Bill gives him power to make recommendations to Cabinet, but it gives him little power of discretion if Cabinet disapproves. It deals also with his authority over local government, which the present Co-ordinator-General does not enjoy. I reiterate that I am dealing with the Co-ordinator-General as he will be under the new Act, not as he is under the existing Act. The Co-ordinator-General, if Cabinet sees fit, will be able to exercise a great deal of authority over the Brisbane City Council that the present Co-ordinator-General cannot exercise under existing legislation.

It is futile for the Premier to say that the Co-ordinator-General is being appointed in this fashion under the existing Act. A new Co-ordinator-General is to be appointed. He is to be dressed in new clothes and ceremonial regalia and given different powers and authorities. That is what I am dealing with. I hope that the Premier will be better advised in the future.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—Termination of appointment under ss. 7 and 8—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (10.38 p.m.): Clause 10 relates to the termination of appointment, and I should like the Premier to explain to me the meaning of subsection (1) (b), which reads—

“If he engages in any trade or business save as a member of a body corporate that consists of more than 20 persons”.

**Mr. Hughes:** No private company; it must be a public company.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is correct. I am glad to see that one member of the Government has some idea of company law. However, here we have a man who will be the most powerful figure in the State and who will co-ordinate all its development. He will be on a high salary. If the present salary is any indication, his salary will be far in excess of that of the Premier of the State. As the honourable member for South Brisbane said, the new appointee will have additional powers and duties, so it is likely that his salary will be very high. I do not deny him the right to a high salary, but I point out that we are giving him the right to take an active interest in a public company.

**Mr. Hughes:** It could be for purposes of consultation.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It could be for any purpose, but let us take the bad purpose. The bad purpose is something that we should not like to think our Co-ordinator-General would be associated with. But I can go back over history and show instances of people coming up with a wrong decision. Let me tell the Premier quite clearly that I am not referring to the present occupant of the office of

Co-ordinator-General. What I am saying is that once the provision is in the Act, it may be there for a long time. The last Act operated from 1938 to 1971, which is a lengthy period. The Bill is laying it down that the Co-ordinator-General can have an interest in a public company. There is nothing to stop his having a 70 or 80 per cent interest in it. After all, he can buy up shares in a public company.

**An Opposition Member** interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** He could be in many of them. He could buy shares in a company that was run down, knowing full well that eventually it could come good because of some development that was going to take place in the future. The Co-ordinator-General should be paid a salary sufficiently large to ensure that he would not need to be a member of such a company. If he wants to invest his money, that is all right, but there are plenty of opportunities for investment in the debentures of semi-government bodies and other authorities.

**Mr. Hughes:** You would not deny him the right to own shares in a public company.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No, but I should like the clause to be framed so that there is no chance of his becoming a dominating or a massive shareholder, which the Bill does allow.

**Mr. Hughes:** His decisions affect other shareholders.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am not speaking of decisions or their effect; I am urging what I believe is fundamentally right and honest in legislation. I suppose that the Cabinet is arguing, “Most of us Cabinet Ministers have shares in companies and are doing pretty well out of them, and we did not do too badly when Comalco decided to show its pleasure at what has happened in the past, and what it hopes will happen in the future, so I suppose, if it is good enough for us as Cabinet Ministers, it is good enough to give the same right to one of our top public servants.”

**An Opposition Member:** Where is it going to end?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am suggesting to the Government that it is not good enough for the Opposition. I want the Premier to give us the reason for it.

**An Opposition Member:** It is nothing new.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Incidentally, it is something new. It is not in the old Act because I happen to know it well. It is something that no Labor Government would have stood for. Cabinet Ministers or top public servants would never have been allowed to hold shares in companies that had dealings with the Crown. Here we are writing into the Bill the very right to do that. As my colleague asked by interjection, if it applies to Cabinet Ministers and top public servants, how far

down the line will it go? I bet the Government would not let the little fellow at the bottom participate, the man who could afford only a few shares worth a couple of "bob". If he tried to, he would be sacked overnight. I leave the matter for the Premier to explain.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Logan) (10.44 p.m.): I rise to support my leader in his very necessary trenchant criticism. It is obvious to all honourable members who have looked at the clause carefully and thought about it that the Co-ordinator-General or his deputy could possibly end up as a member of a board of a company of which Cabinet Ministers were also members. To add injury to that insult, clause 10 (1) (g) takes away from the Co-ordinator-General any profit. I suppose that is the hypocritical sugar-coating to make it look honest. I have no alternative but to interpret the whole unholy clause as making the Co-ordinator-General and whoever might be unlucky enough to be his deputy Aunt Sallies for Government members who accept shares in a company, as they admit they have done.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (10.45 p.m.): The honourable members who have spoken have raised a point about which they say they are concerned. Obviously, the purpose of this is not to deprive any person who may be the Co-ordinator-General now or in the future of the right to invest his money in a particular company. I think this is fair enough in many respects.

**Mr. B. Wood:** You just want to back up your own policy; that's all.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member for Cook is pretty smartly dressed and he is trying to be pretty smart in his attitude here tonight.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** (Mr. Houghton): Order!

**Mr. B. Wood:** I do not mind if he will answer the question.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I will please myself how and when I answer honourable members on that side of the Committee. If the honourable member stands up and speaks I will answer him. The provision gives the necessary protection relative to holding a dominant position for which payment is received. This would, of course, exclude the Co-ordinator-General from participating as a member of a board. On the other hand, it allows the Co-ordinator-General to invest in a company which is so far removed from his work or activity as to have no influence or bearing on him. I am sure the honourable member appreciates exactly what is meant.

**Mr. HUGHES** (Kurilpa) (10.47 p.m.): I have some sympathy for the views expressed by the Opposition in this matter, because the Co-ordinator-General will have great powers and justice must not only be done

but be seen to be done. To be certain that there is no misinterpretation of this matter in the future, I wish to state, relative to the Premier's interpretation of this clause, that I have no objection to the Co-ordinator-General holding shares in public companies. I think he has every right to do so.

Subclause (g) of clause 10 quite clearly sets out that the Co-ordinator-General is deemed to have vacated his office if he is party to any agreement from which he might receive some profit. There is no question relative to agreements. But could the Co-ordinator-General be employed, even though he is an employee of the Crown, by an organisation involved in town planning? It might be development, subdivision, mining or anything else. Could such an organisation call upon the Co-ordinator-General to be a consultant and pay him a fee for certain advice, or could he in fact sit as a member of the board of a company and receive director's fees, forgetting any salary or any other aspect of remuneration? Could he be invited and be qualified under this part of Clause 10 to sit on the board of a public company? Incidentally, it does not have to be a listed public company. It could be an unlisted public company. The only qualification here is that it must have 20 members.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Yes, but it does not necessarily mean that it must be a listed company. It could be an unlisted public company; it could not be a private company or a firm. On that basis could he be a member of a company whose affairs are not known to the public generally and whose documents—balance sheet and profit and loss account—are not handed to the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs and are therefore secret? Such an organisation could in fact be doing things from which it could derive benefit as a result of the activities of the committee headed by the Co-ordinator-General.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton South) (10.49 p.m.): I also wish to speak in support of the Leader of the Opposition. I believe this is a very dangerous clause. Two of the basic tenets of Public Service employment have always been anonymity and neutrality—not only political neutrality but also economic neutrality. I believe this clause completely erodes this principle. It is a dangerous one and I believe it should be changed.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (10.50 p.m.): Clause 10 (a) sets out quite clearly—

"if he engages in remunerative employment save the duties of the office to which he is so appointed or of any office which he holds by reason of his holding that appointment;"

The whole matter is covered in that sub-clause.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Logan) (10.51 p.m.): That is not the main point. The Premier is artful and skilful at skipping around main points. The point is that a Government employee possessing great power and high capacity, with a wide source of information at his command and with many services under his control, can sit on these boards and carry out the instruction of other members of the boards.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** I take it that members of the Opposition are saying they want this to apply to every public servant in Government departments.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** Here is another example of dragging red herrings across the trail. It does not alter my claim that this provision sets a dangerous precedent. At the second-reading stage I staked my whole argument on this aspect. It is full of sinister possibilities, and the most sinister of all is the fragmentation of Government responsibility and the raising of the portcullis so that private enterprise can participate directly in the formation of Government policy in the name of the Public Service, at the same time making one man responsible for it. This is the most terrible thing that could be put on any public servant. He could be shot down by anyone at all at any time if he diverted one inch from the path laid out before him.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (10.52 p.m.): Some conflict seems to have arisen in the arguments put forward by members of the Opposition. Firstly, the Leader of the Opposition highlighted clause 10 (b) and dealt with it in isolation. The honourable member for Logan then appeared in some way to conflict with what his leader was advocating.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Not at all; I just raised another matter.

**Mr. LICKISS:** That is interesting. Clause 10 must be dealt with in its context. It appears from what members of the Opposition have said—I agree with the Premier that this would apply to all top public servants—that the person appointed could not do anything other than put his money into some sort of loan.

**Mr. Baldwin** interjected.

**Mr. LICKISS:** Some people have the ability to accrue funds whereas others just seem to lack the ability.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! I remind honourable members on my left that they will have the opportunity of speaking and I will not tolerate persistent interjections. If they want to speak they may rise when given the opportunity to do so.

**Mr. LICKISS:** It means that a person holding the office of Co-ordinator-General—this also extends to the Deputy Co-ordinator-General—cannot receive remuneration. If he does he is deemed to have vacated his position.

**Mr. Bennett:** If he is employed.

**Mr. LICKISS:** The point is not whether he is employed but whether he receives remuneration.

**Mr. Bennett:** Rubbish!

**Mr. LICKISS:** If he receives director's fees, surely that is remuneration.

**Mr. Hughes:** It is for tax purposes.

**Mr. LICKISS:** That is right. A man who is a director and receives remuneration for his directorship is taxed on it.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He could decline to accept the remuneration.

**Mr. LICKISS:** The Co-ordinator-General or his deputy cannot be put in an ivory tower and be made the subject of special conditions that do not apply to other senior members of the Public Service.

As Opposition members have raised this point I should like to know precisely what they believe should be the rights and obligations of servants of the Crown generally, or at what "chop-off" level they want to be able to say, "Below this level you can do it, but above it you cannot." Let them make that clear to the public; that is the burning issue. In other words, they have again entangled themselves and I should like to hear from them what their policy would be.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (10.56 p.m.): I am glad that, at long last, the Government has admitted that all the realistic views, and all the honesty and sincerity come from this side of the Chamber. Let there be no doubt where the Opposition stands with regard to share issues and the holding of shares in companies that have dealings with the Crown and from which remuneration can be derived, and in destitute, "broke" companies that can be raised to profitable basis, and in companies that can be run down to the stage that receivers are about to be called in, but can be lifted up when certain people buy shares in them. We are completely opposed to all these things. Let there be no doubt that no Labor Cabinet Minister will hold shares in companies dealing with the Crown. The honourable member and other Government members support that practice. I should like to know how many Cabinet Ministers hold shares, and how many shares they hold. I should also like to know how they buy such wonderful, costly things. At an appropriate time, I will be asking a question on this matter.

With regard to public servants, there is a limit, which is reached when we come to the man who cannot be challenged—the man at

the top. Is the honourable member telling me that there is any public servant over the Co-ordinator-General? Why should this provision be included? I ask the honourable member to tell me of one other Bill that allows a top public servant to hold shares in companies. Name one! The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has been doing all the challenging. If he has such great knowledge, I ask him to name one. He cannot, of course. I ask the Premier to let us know what he and his Cabinet colleagues hold in the way of shares in companies that could have dealings with the Crown.

We expected this to be done for public servants, because public servants were included in the Comalco dealings. I did not attack them in Parliament, because they are public servants, but I believe that it was wrong of them to take the shares. We will find that this is but the start of legislative action which will be taken time and again to encourage top public servants to hold shares in companies that have dealings with the Crown. I repeat the significant phrase, "that have dealings with the Crown."

I remember a very important case in the history of this State involving a dispute at Mount Isa. A learned judge who was asked to hear the case—I forget his name and I do not wish to name the wrong person—said, "I cannot hear it because my wife has shares in Mount Isa Mines." He did not hold the shares, but his wife did. The point is that a Supreme Court judge refused to hear a case because his wife had shares in Mount Isa Mines, and the dispute concerned Mount Isa Mines. I do not know how many shares his wife held, but they certainly would not have been significant compared with the over-all company shareholding. The number that she held would probably be infinitesimal compared with the number of shares in the company.

In this instance, the Government is providing that, so long as this officer is the 21st person in a company, it is all right. He could hold 5 per cent of the shares and, if he wanted to, he or his family could hold a greater percentage of the shares. I am not having a "shot" at the Co-ordinator-General, but this is a wrong principle to embody in the Bill. I do not care how much argument the Premier puts forward; it is wrong in concept and that part of the clause should be removed.

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (11 p.m.): I am entirely in accord with my leader in his submissions on this clause. The principle being written into the Bill is completely alien to the concept of British jurisprudence and fair play in democratic instrumentalities.

We must legislate on the understanding that people are only human beings and are subject to human frailties. We are legislating not for the existing Co-ordinator-General but for any Co-ordinator-General who might hold office in the future. I do not make any

apology for saying that, though they are in the minority, we have had some bad eggs in the Public Service over a period of years. Let us face reality; such people are found in all walks of life.

**Mr. Houston:** The Victorian Police Force is an example.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The Victorian Police Force—and the Queensland Police Force and other sectors of Queensland public life over a period of years. As I have said, they are minor exceptions.

If, after saving for 20 years, a man becomes Co-ordinator-General and has all his eggs in one basket—in a public company that is going to the wall—and he stands to lose his money, it will certainly be a strong temptation to him to see that the company gets a life-giving contract with the Government, even if it is at the expense of the taxpayers of Queensland. It is only human nature for him to want to do that. Where there is a strong temptation of that nature, there will always be the individual who will succumb to it. That is why Parliament must legislate to avoid that sort of thing.

This will put the Co-ordinator-General in an embarrassing position. It might so happen that the contract that he wishes to make is in the interests of the State as well as in his own personal interests. This would undermine public respect for our democratic instrumentalities and his office as a public man. As the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha said earlier in the debate, "Justice must seem to be done."

Unfortunately, because the Premier has blackened his hands, he does not come into this argument with a clean soul. He who seeks equity must do equity. He does not come in with clean hands because he has negotiated Government contracts in which he has had an interest as a private individual. He believes that that type of conduct is justified. He is like the person who claims that stealing or taking other people's property is simply scrounging. That is a euphemistic term used to satisfy his own uneasy conscience. Because he has engaged in this questionable and unethical conduct as Premier of this State, he believes he should extend the opportunities of personal gain to those who hold high office under appointment by him as Premier, or by Cabinet, so that they will condone and understand that he and his Cabinet Ministers can seek to make personal gain from their positions as Cabinet Ministers.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton South) (11.4 p.m.): I rise to comment on the statements of the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha and his interest in what one might call a demarcation line at which the top echelon of public servants can participate in private money-making ventures. This is a very important factor. I raise the point that, in times gone by, the Government or the Cabinet was the policy-making body, and public servants were the administrators or executive

authority. But times have changed and it is now the public servants who are playing the major part in policy-making matters. This is the crux of the situation. If public servants, because of today's complexities, are allowed to take part in policy-making matters, they must adhere to the neutrality that I previously mentioned. They must be completely neutral, politically and economically.

I feel that this is something that is found throughout the world. Yesterday I was reading a book by F. A. Nigro, one of the world's leading exponents of public administration. He stresses the problems of public administration, and says that the public image is being damaged and destroyed by public servants. There are fears of dishonesty, abuse and unethical behaviour. He says that public servants can override laws, and he returns to the very important point that public servants must be made accountable to Parliament and to Cabinet. He goes on to say that provisions against private gain from employment must be inserted in statutes. This is the vital point, and I think that answers the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha. It stresses the important point raised by the Leader of the Opposition concerning top members of the Public Service who not only administer policy but also help to make it. I feel that this provision should be looked at very closely and changed.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Logan) (11.6 p.m.): Unfortunately, I have to take up the challenge in answer to a personal remark by the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha, and also to develop for the last time the line that I have been taking. It was interesting to see how the honourable member jumped in to take advantage of my quite honest statement that I had no money, and to use that statement in an attempt to measure my ability. That is the standard by which he judges everyone. His ethic is not based on Christian tenets.

If the honourable member thinks that I would compare my ability with that of a specialist such as the Co-ordinator-General, he is even more unable to judge the worth of various human beings than I thought was possible for any member of this Assembly. I am amazed that a man of his apparent ability, measured in money, would ask such a question when it is apparent that the Co-ordinator-General is a top public servant, with all the information and resources at his command. No person or company should have any more right to his knowledge on a board than I would, or Joe Blow would in writing to his local member and taking his chance on whether the member made his request public. We must all be equal in this matter. Otherwise, where is democracy?

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.8 p.m.): The issue of whether the Co-ordinator-General should or should

not be permitted to hold shares in public companies raises the question of how far down the ladder this restriction should go.

**Mr. Wright:** I explained that to you. Policy-making public servants should not hold shares. There's a start.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** This covers a very wide range of public servants. Honourable members opposite have made it quite clear that no public servant, particularly those at the top, should hold shares in any company.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I rise to a point of order. I do not know whether the Premier is trying to make an election speech out of this. I deny that, on behalf of the Opposition, I have spoken about anyone except the two public servants associated with this Bill. Others will be dealt with as the occasion demands.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I ask the Leader of the Opposition why he picks on one man in the whole sphere of Government activity and responsibility, when there are hundreds of men in Government departments holding positions of trust. It is as clear as daylight that honourable members opposite are making a special case of the appointment of the Co-ordinator-General. It is common knowledge that this is a stronger clause than similar clauses in other legislation covering public servants.

**Mr. Houston:** Which ones?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** For example, the Act under which the Commissioner of Main Roads is appointed does not prevent him from holding shares in private companies. The Commissioner for Railways is in a similar position. As I said, this clause is stronger than clauses in other legislation applying to public servants who hold positions of great responsibility.

**Mr. Houston:** Do they hold shares in public companies?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I do not know the private business of public servants. I do not go round asking them whether they have shares in public companies. I know that some honourable members have shares in various mining companies.

**Mr. Houston:** But they do not get the confidential information that the Co-ordinator-General will have at his disposal. That is the difference.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** An honourable member opposite said a moment ago that members on that side of the House do not hold shares in any company.

**Mr. Houston:** You are always reading something that is not there into what is said. If you want to name somebody, name him out in the street.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition tried to paint a picture showing that members of the Opposition do not invest their money in any company.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order!

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** If the honourable member wishes to raise the subject of Ministers' shareholdings, I have made it plain again and again that if any Minister happens to have shares in a company with which the Government has business, he will disclose his interest in that company. That has always been known; honourable members opposite certainly know it.

This clause does not apply to other highly placed Government servants. I think that answers very clearly the imputations and suggestions of honourable members opposite against the present Co-ordinator-General, or any other Co-ordinator-General who may be appointed in the future.

Question—That clause 10, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

**AYES, 31**

Ahern	Lonergan
Alison	Low
Armstrong	McKechnie
Bird	Moore, R. E.
Bjelke-Petersen	Murray
Campbell	Porter
Chinchen	Rae
Herbert	Row
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Sullivan
Hewitt, W. D.	Tomkins
Hodges	Tooth
Hughes	Wharton
Kaus	
Knox	
Lane	<b>Tellers:</b>
Lee	Miller
Lickiss	Newbery

**NOES, 27**

Aiken	Marginson
Baldwin	Melloy
Bennett	Moore, F. P.
Bromley	Newton
Casey	O'Donnell
Davis	Thackeray
Dean	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Harris	Wright
Houston	
Inch	<b>Tellers:</b>
Jensen	Blake
Jones, R.	Wood, P.
Jordan	
	<b>PAIRS:</b>
Delamothe	Bousen
Fletcher	Lloyd
Hungerford	Sherrington

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 11 and 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—Functions and duties of Co-ordinator-General—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.21 p.m.): I speak to this clause mainly because I want to use it as a basis for some of the other clauses upon which I wish to speak. I do not want a doubt left in anybody's mind as to exactly what powers the Co-ordinator-General will

have under this legislation. Some honourable members are saying that he has not very many powers; that he has not the power of direction; and that he has not the power to tell a local authority what to do.

The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha suggested that because he had received numerous phone calls praising the Bill, it must be a wonderful Bill. Of course, he received his phone calls after the people had read in the Press a report of the Bill's contents.

**Mr. B. Wood:** The Government handed out that report.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Of course. I wonder how many of the people who phoned the honourable member actually studied the Bill.

**Mr. Lickiss:** Quite a few of them.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Then I commend them on studying the Bill, but not on their judgment. Surely if they had studied it they would know, as I do, that local authorities are on the wrong end of the stick. As I said earlier, it is very clear that the honourable member is advocating his party's policy, which is the abolition of many country local authorities. This is part of his policy, as announced from time to time. He wants regions controlled by stooges of the Government.

**Mr. Low:** Oh, cut it out!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** What I say is right. Does the honourable member know Liberal Party policy? I will warrant that he does; he is more interested in Liberal matters than in Country Party matters. He knows that the ginger group has always advocated that there are far too many local authorities. The honourable member for Toowong made it very clear in his speech that local authorities would be looked at. In fact, the Government has already allocated money to set up a committee to study the matter of local authorities, certainly with the idea of reducing their number.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Boundaries are not mentioned in the terms of reference.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** You do not have to mention boundaries in order to investigate local authorities and decide that there are far too many of them. Surely the honourable member knows what some of his colleagues have said from time to time.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** I know that the honourable member for Toowong would like to see more local authorities.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Particularly in Brisbane.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Yes.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right. Let us have it recorded that members of the ginger group want the present Brisbane City Council split up so that some of them can become shire chairmen. I know that that is the attitude of the ginger group.

Now let us have recorded for those who read "Hansard" exactly what are the functions and duties of the Co-ordinator-General.

Clause 13 provides—

"(1) The Co-ordinator-General shall have such functions and shall perform such duties as are assigned to him by this Act or by Order in Council made under this Act or by or under any other Act.

"(2) The Co-ordinator-General shall, of his own motion or at the direction of the Minister, undertake and commission such investigations, prepare such plans, devise such ways and means, give such directions, and take such steps and measures, as he thinks necessary or desirable to secure the proper planning, preparation, execution, co-ordination, control and enforcement of a programme of works, planned developments, and environmental controls for the State and for areas over which the State claims jurisdiction.

"(3) The Co-ordinator-General shall furnish to the Minister such recommendations as he thinks fit to make concerning any matter that arises out of or is connected with the performance by him of his functions and duties assigned to him by or under this Act or that may assist in the proper administration of this Act."

Subclause (2) is the vital one. It sets out that the Co-ordinator-General shall, of his own motion, do such things to secure the control and enforcement of any programme that he may initiate. That means that he has the power to force such a programme onto anyone covered by the Bill, including local authorities. That is why I claim that the Bill empowers the Co-ordinator-General to force a local authority to do his bidding, either by his initiation or, as the Bill says, of his own motion or at the direction of the Minister.

**Mr. Wright:** It is a dictatorship.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is correct. I have no doubt that the people who rang the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha read the Press report that this Bill would co-ordinate the efforts of local authorities and the Government; that it was a Bill of mutual co-operation and mutual co-ordination. From my knowledge of the English language, I suggest that if I am charged with the responsibility of controlling and enforcing something, someone who does not co-operate with me will have it forced upon him.

**Mr. Lane:** We know what you would do. This is a case of what the Co-ordinator-General would do.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Government members should not forget that the Labor Party will be administering this Act, and I assure them, and the people of Queensland, that we will

amend it to ensure that there is co-operation between our Government and the local authorities.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Co-operation is a two-way process.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Of course it is.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** Between the Right and Left wings.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** A bird without two wings cannot fly, and I know that the Premier would not like to be in his aeroplane if one of the wings fell off. If he was in it when that happened, we would certainly be having some by-elections.

**Mr. Sullivan:** You would like to be on the Left wing.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Perhaps the Minister, as a candidate for the position of Deputy Leader of the Country Party, has some special rights, but he does not have the right to mime his Premier. He should let his Premier get on with the job. At least he is doing a good job on his own.

**Mr. Low:** Will you sell the aeroplane when you become Premier?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I like some of the honourable member's words, but I do not like others.

This clause sets out clearly the tremendous duties and responsibilities of the Co-ordinator-General.

**Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (11.30 p.m.):** I am indeed pleased that the Leader of the Opposition made the statements that he did. He said that it is Liberal Party policy to destroy local authority and replace it with a system of regions. I think he may have got his lines a little mixed, because the Liberal Party believes that a viable and strong system of local government is essential to the proper government of the State.

The Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for South Brisbane are somewhat mixed up. The former stressed the tremendous powers of the Co-ordinator-General, whilst the latter said he was shocked to see how the powers of the Co-ordinator-General were being whittled away.

**Mr. Bennett:** What a lot of rot you talk.

**Mr. LICKISS:** It is a pity for the honourable member that I have a reasonably good memory.

The Leader of the Opposition is somewhat confused. It is well known that Labor's policy, as advocated by Calwell some years ago, was that Australia should have 57 regions.

**Mr. Houston:** And Arthur Moore said we would have more unemployment.

**Mr. LICKISS:** To take it a little further, did not Mr. Dedman say that people who owned their own houses became little capitalists. Keep going, and I will join you.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! I remind honourable members on both sides of the Chamber that I will not tolerate continued interjections. I will be forced to name any honourable member who persists with interjections. Every member is entitled to speak, but he must rise in his place to do so.

**Mr. LICKISS:** We can see the confusion that exists among honourable members opposite. It is a fact that Mr. Calwell advocated 57 States of Australia. Indeed, the honourable member for Logan said in his speech that he hoped to see the end of State Governments.

Where does the Opposition stand? Does it want States or not? It talks about abolishing the position of Governor, so consequently it will abolish the States. It is really saying that it wants a centralised form of government, with 57 dependent regions being directed by the central Government. That, in fact, is the Opposition's policy.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the clause under consideration.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I am coming back to the clause. The honourable gentleman accused the Liberal Party of being opposed to local authorities. It is a pity that I do not have the Liberal Party's policy here. It is freely available, and no doubt the honourable member has it in his records.

**Mr. Houston:** I quoted from it.

**Mr. LICKISS:** The honourable gentleman did not quote from it.

**Mr. Houston:** Of course I did.

**Mr. LICKISS:** Obviously he did not—or he has another failing in that he cannot read correctly.

I make the point that far from the Liberal Party wanting other than a very strong system of local government, the Labor Party is on record, through its former Federal Leader, Mr. Calwell, as saying that it wants 57 States for Australia. In other words, it wants administrative regions without any sovereign powers, being dictated to by the central Government.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 14 and 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—Co-operation with Co-ordinator-General—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.34 p.m.): So that there will be no doubt in the mind of anyone who reads "Hansard", I want to place on record

exactly what the Bill provides. Let the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha, or the shadow Premier—however he likes to designate himself—indicate what is meant by this clause. It reads—

"Co-operation with Co-ordinator-General. (1) Subject to this section, it is the duty of—

"(i) a local body and, where it is a corporation, of every person who comprises it, . . ."

Surely if a duty is involved in relation to doing something, there is a compulsion to do it. Otherwise, it does not become a duty.

Later, the same clause says—

"to co-operate with the Co-ordinator-General in the performance by him of the functions and duties of the Co-ordinator-General."

I have already pointed out what the duties are. They are quite extensive. This clause lays down that it is the duty of the local authority to co-operate and co-ordinate. A later clause lays down that if it does not do that, there will be a fine of \$25 a day on every person concerned and \$500 a day on the local authority. They are pretty big incentives to ensure that the duty is carried out.

I pointed out earlier that this Bill is directed against local authorities in the performance of their duties. It also gives the Governor in Council, through the Co-ordinator-General, the authority to veto a local government decision to do something it wants to do, or to force the local authority to do something it does not want to do. That is all tied up in this clause, which prescribes the duties of the various bodies.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton South) (11.36 p.m.): I agree with the Leader of the Opposition on this very important clause. It allows the State Government to dominate the authority of local bodies. We must look at the problem of local government. All honourable members realise that eventually some changes will be made. Problems have resulted from the growth of urbanisation, which is leaving a depressed area in the rural sector. Local governments cannot meet their commitments. Therefore, there is a need for regional planning and for co-ordination of local authorities.

This is a world-wide problem. Many different programmes and alternatives have been tried, including this one, where the Government or the authority has forced the councils in question to abide by its rulings. The American Government tried to annex the various local authorities. This did not work, mainly because of parochialism. Their names were changed and they were given metropolitan and country status. Again this did not work. However, a theme of voluntary co-operation did work. I hope that is the intention of this Bill. The most successful way of obtaining co-operation was the implementation of the federation scheme,

under which was established a greater council with surrounding bodies. This was done by co-operation.

In Toronto, one main city council was established with 12 municipalities surrounding it. Each of these bodies co-operated democratically. They were not told by some constitutional body to do as they were told, as is provided in this clause. They co-operated voluntarily because it was in their interests to do so. There were no constitutional or statutory measures under which they were forced to abide by the rules laid down by some national or State authority. They were prepared to co-operate because it was in their interests to do so. Forced co-operation does not work.

In England, in 1969, the Maud-Mallaby Royal Commission recommended many changes in local government. According to the August edition of the *Local Government Gazette*, this will be changed and the different boroughs will be changed. Again this is being done by co-operation, not by force. They are co-operating and are willing to do this.

It is a sad aspect of this Bill that we should have the domination of a local authority by the State Government. There are sufficient safeguards at present in the control that the Minister for Local Government has over local authorities. It is important for local authorities to be able to act in their own interests. This clause emphasises that it is the duty of these bodies to co-operate in this way.

Subclause 2 reads—

“Without limit to the duty imposed by subsection (1) of this section a person subject thereto—

“(a) shall consult with and make his services available to the Co-ordinator-General . . .”

It does not say he shall do that if he so desires; it stipulates that he has to. One wonders what will happen if the project is not desired by the local authority. What happens if finance is not available? If a council has been preparing another project for three years, does it shelve it because this clause prescribes that it is its duty to comply with the wishes of the Co-ordinator-General? I believe that this is wrong. The powers and authority of local government are being usurped, and I must concur with the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (11.41 p.m.): It is significant that this clause was derived from sections 11, 14 and 15 of the existing legislation. It seems passing strange that the Opposition is now starting to weep tears of blood over something that has been part of legislation administered by the Opposition party when it was in government, and by the present Government since it has been in office. This is the sort of thing to which one becomes accustomed when listening to cries of woe from the Opposition. Something

that has in substance been in the legislation for many years suddenly becomes a horrible attack on local authorities. I highlight this point to indicate how “fair dinkum” the Opposition is in its fears for local government.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.42 p.m.): The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha is smart in twisting words and explanations. I said at the outset that we would not be opposing this clause. I said that I wanted to explain, and have included in “Hansard”, what was in the clause. We have been told about phone callers who congratulated the Government on the great co-operation that the Bill was going to ensure. The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha used the word “co-operation”, and signified that it was to be a matter of mateship and getting together. The honourable member deliberately told us in his speeches that there was going to be an attitude of mateship as distinct from what there has been previously.

The point I make is that what is being done now is exactly the same as was done previously. It was not mateship at all; it was a direction. The great difference between this clause and the present Act is to be found in these words. “Before the making of any such order as aforesaid, the Governor in Council may have regard to any representations which any local body concerned may submit.” There is nothing about that in the Bill. There is no let-out, and no escape clause for local authorities to do something else.

I am not concerned about opposing this clause. What I am doing is making sure that it is clearly understood that there is no mateship involved. In other words, I am refuting the suggestion that the purpose of the Bill is to bring about mateship. The purpose is actually the contrary; it is dictatorship.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (11.43 p.m.): I think the honourable member will recall that I had nothing but praise for the present legislation. All I said was that the Department of the Co-ordinator-General had looked inward and outward and determined what it felt was the proper role that it should play in the remaining part of this century and beyond it. I think that they were the precise words that I used. When there is talk about twisting words, I think the Leader of the Opposition is quite capable of doing that, as he has indicated by his reply to what I said previously.

**Mr. Bennett:** He twisted your tail.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I do not think he could do that, and the honourable member for South Brisbane would not even be a starter.

The situation is that a regional planning Bill has been brought down, and I stressed that it would be based on co-operation and co-ordination. I also said that the Bill contained the necessary provisions to enable this to be done. I pose this question: If

it is possible to come to an arrangement with six shires and the seventh, for some reason, stands out, how can co-ordination be achieved? Does the whole scheme fall flat on its face?

**Mr. Houston:** You are the Government.

**Mr. LICKISS:** In view of the nonsensical reply of the Leader of the Opposition, I think I have at least made my point.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 19, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—Services of technical advisers—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.45 p.m.): Again I wish to make sure that everyone is clear as to what the Bill contains. Clause 20 reads—

“The Co-ordinator-General may obtain or retain the advice or services of such technical advisers as he considers necessary for the proper performance by him of his functions and duties and the proper exercise by him of his powers.

“Remuneration in respect of such advice or services shall be such as is approved by the Minister.”

Until recently the Co-ordinator-General's Department had a very effective, loyal and capable work-force and was able to undertake a great deal of work within its own compass. In the south, honourable members have seen the Snowy Mountains Authority, a successful constructing authority—in my view, perhaps the greatest constructing authority in the world—which was started by a Labor Government, gradually broken up under Liberal-Country Party Governments until it virtually does not exist. We have an organisation in Queensland today—

**Mr. Lee:** What is wrong with that?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** There is nothing wrong with that.

**Mr. Lee:** You are rubbishing them.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Again the honourable member does not know the difference. He does not even know a good racehorse from a bad one.

**Mr. Bennett:** He even buys poor bulls.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! I again warn honourable members. I ask the honourable member for South Brisbane to refrain from persistent interjections and allow the honourable member to continue his speech.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I wish to make the Opposition's position clear. Honourable members on this side of the Chamber believe that there is nothing wrong in seeking advice and assistance from outside, but we believe that it should not be sought at the expense of the Government's own organisation. We have seen the staff of the Works Department whittled down to a very small number over the years. Anyone who is associated with

State high schools, in particular, or primary schools knows that, under Labor, if one wanted something done at a school, all one had to do was to go to the Department of Education or the Department of Public Works and all the work would be carried out, even if the school committee had to pay part of the cost. Because of the policy of Country-Liberal Governments, the staff of the Department of Works has been reduced so greatly that if one now wishes to have anything done at a school, one has to engage private architects and contractors to do the work.

**Mr. Lee:** That is not true.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Again the honourable member is wrong.

**Mr. Lee:** I had Mr. McNamara from the Department of Works out to a school recently.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** To do what?

**Mr. Lee:** To take out estimates for a certain building that I will not mention here.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** When a high school committee wants an assembly hall built—I ask the honourable member for Yeronga or any member of the Government to deny this if he can; all I ask is that he make a donation of about \$6,000 or \$7,000 to party funds if I am correct—it is told by the Government by letter to engage a private architect.

**Mr. Lee:** That is right, yes.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Of course it is. The committee has to pay the architect's fees. Under Labor, all work of that type was carried out by the Department of Public Works.

**Mr. Lee:** By day labour.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** There is nothing wrong with day labour. It is the best way of doing the job.

**Mr. Lane:** If the architect is a member of the committee, could he not do the work gratis?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I certainly would not allow the honourable member to design an assembly hall.

**Mr. Lane:** I did not suggest that.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is what I am speaking about. I am not speaking about something in the back yard; I am speaking about a \$90,000 project.

**Mr. Lane:** Why can't an architect from the committee volunteer his services if he wants to?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** What if there is not an architect on the committee?

**Mr. Lane:** That happened at the Ascot State School a few months ago.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I hope he is so public spirited that he will help us on our next project. Many other school committees would like to obtain his services, too. I suppose that when the honourable member goes to a dance he gives his services free.

**Mr. Lane:** That is an example of the fine community spirit in that particular part of Brisbane.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** And when you attend a dance you give your services free, too?

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! I will stop the dance. I ask honourable members on both sides to refrain from persistent interjections or I will have to deal with them.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** We do not want the present staff of the Co-ordinator-General's Department to be allowed to run down because outside firms are given the work that departmental employees are now performing. That would not be in the best interests of the State. I give that warning because of past experience of what happened in the Works Department, the Railway Department and many other departments where under this Government more and more work has been given to outside consultants and less and less work to Crown employees. Although we are not opposed to the terms of the clause, we do issue that warning.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.52 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members opposite know that as a Government we believe that there should be both a day-labour force and a private-enterprise work-force within the State. We have set out to foster both groups within the department, which I am sure is in the over-all interests of the State. Of course, the situation is considerably different from what it was in the days when Labor was in office, and it is very considerably different in the Works Department today from what it was when I became Minister for Works. The Leader of the Opposition knows very well that, although the activities of the Department of the Co-ordinator-General as a constructing authority have been changed somewhat, in that it was perhaps more active in that field in days gone by, we still have the same offices and the same organisation—indeed, a larger one. Men who dealt with roads have gone into the Main Roads Department. The Leader of the Opposition should know that a large number of officers went over to the Main Roads Department, the Irrigation and Water Supply Department, the Department of Harbours and Marine and the Works Department. Previously the Co-ordinator-General was the constructing authority, as he was in my day as Minister for Works for some of the works at Gatton and for one section of the university in North Queensland. But why have two organisations, each working, as it were, in conflict, to a certain

extent, with the other? Today we have streamlined the whole Government activity in this area. The Co-ordinator-General is still a very important officer, perhaps more important than in days gone by, in the co-ordination of all Government works, in the field of environmental control and many other areas of activity. The Leader of the Opposition must recognise that point and the benefits that accrue to the State as a consequence.

Clause 20, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 27, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 28—Objectives of comprehensive programme of works—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.54 p.m.): Clause 28 is a rehash of section 9 of the original legislation. That section was headed "Scope of orderly planning and development", but clause 28 of the Bill is headed "Objectives of comprehensive programme of works". Most of the subsections are the same in the two pieces of legislation. They are certainly the same in concept, but the words are slightly different. I suppose that can be put down to the terminology desired by the parliamentary draftsmen of the two eras. I am not concerned about that, but I do notice that in the original section 9 emphasis was placed on maintaining full-time employment on full-time wages. Section 9, subsection (iv) refers to—

"The maintaining of persons in full-time employment on full-time wages."

I notice that in the present legislation that has been removed. In other words, it is obvious that the Government does not think it is part of its responsibility to maintain persons in full employment and on full wages. I completely disagree with that.

Also, in section 9, subsection (ix) (d) it says—

"The securing of a fair return for the public expenditure on works generally."

That was one of the facets of the State Development and Public Works, Etc., Act of that day. That has been left out entirely in the present legislation. I hope the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha and the Premier can give this Committee a satisfactory explanation as to why the securing of a fair return for the public expenditure on works generally is no longer required. Surely it is fundamental, when money is expended, that that should be so. I dare say they will argue that it is not necessary to put it in the Bill because their predecessors in Opposition thought it was. They supported it when it was put forward by the then Government, and it has been carried forward in this Government's own legislation until 1971, without amendment. But now the Government sees fit to remove it.

We also notice that, relative to the provision of finance, section 9 (vi) of the old Act says—

“The provision of ways and means whereby finance in respect of works and the creation of works may be spread over the State in equitable proportions, with a view to meeting any fluctuations of financial and general economic conditions.”

In other words, the Co-ordinator-General, in allocating works would take into account the need to inject money into a particular area. I think that was a very good idea. When there is an economic recession in part of the State the Co-ordinator-General should take that factor into consideration, with a view to carrying out some worth-while project in that area. In that way the area could be revitalised, employment could be provided for the local people and money could be put into circulation. I will admit that the Government has done this under its drought scheme, by giving the money to local authorities, but I wonder why that section has been cut out. In its stead the Government has inserted a provision reading—

“The provision of ways and means whereby finance for works and for the initiation of works may be spread over the State in equitable proportions, adequate and proper consideration being given to matters of environment, social conditions and regional potential.”

The Government has completely altered the purpose of the clause. In its view it is only necessary to worry about the finance being adequate and proper consideration being given to regional potential. I am not denying that they are important, but to me the more important thing is action to meet any fluctuations in general and economic conditions. Why cut out one and put in the other? If the Government must have both, I suggest that both should have been included in the clause.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.59 p.m.): If the Leader of the Opposition thinks back to the circumstances and conditions that existed at the time of the introduction of that measure, the explanation is plain. The economic circumstances of that day dictated those particular terms, but, as the honourable member knows, the same circumstances do not apply today to any degree whatever, and that is the reason for its omission.

### [Wednesday, 10 November 1971]

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.1 a.m.): I am glad to have that admission from the Premier, because I and those of my colleagues who represent country electorates are firmly of the opinion that the State today is in a very depressed condition, especially the wool industry.

**Mr. Lee:** Stop harping on wool.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I know that the honourable member for Yeronga is not interested in the wool industry. He is a gentleman farmer who likes to make a “quick quid” out of the problems that confront the industry. We know that he went out west and bought sheep for 5c a head and paid a couple of dollars each for cattle so that he could fatten them on his property. That is his business, but we know that it is all tied up with taxation. The Australian Labor Party believes that many of the country areas are suffering an economic depression brought about by drought, low wool prices and other conditions over which the people have had very little control. It is wrong for the Premier to suggest that no economic problem exists in many of our country areas.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.2 a.m.): Again we have the interesting experience of the Leader of the Opposition and other members on the opposite side of the Chamber contradicting one another. Earlier the honourable member for Barcoo said that the West and the inland areas would be neglected and claimed that they lacked potential. He also said that there was no economic possibility of anything being done. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition says that something will be done. Again there is this conflict of opinion and completely opposed outlooks and attitudes among members of the Opposition.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (12.3 a.m.): In his reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said that conditions perhaps were not—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are dealing with clause 28.

**Mr. CASEY:** On this clause the Premier said that conditions were altogether different. As the Leader of the Opposition rightly commented, certain subsections of section 9 of the Act have been omitted from this clause. They were included in the Act for a very good purpose, and the same can be said of many other provisions that have been transferred to the Bill.

Earlier the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha referred to the origin of the Act and reminded us that some of the provisions were introduced by Forgan Smith. This is true. In fact, section 9 was introduced by him for a very good reason. As honourable members are aware, he was one of my predecessors as a representative of the Mackay electorate, and he held a record term of office as a Labor Premier and had a record term of achievement as Premier of this State. It was with the aid of the sections of the old Act that he led this State out of the depression years. Armed with the sections of the Act he produced great endeavour on the part of various

Government departments to keep Queensland's war effort going and to keep men and equipment moving in our hour of dire need.

Other great Premiers, such as Ned Hanlon, used the sections of this Act to introduce legislation that resulted in the construction of the Tinaroo Falls Dam, the Burdekin Bridge, the Koombaloo Dam and the Tully Falls project. As well, the construction of the University of Queensland was proceeded with by the Co-ordinator-General's Department under that section. A great deal of work has been done under subsections of the Act that have been omitted from the Bill. From the Government's action, one can only presume that it is not greatly concerned about getting a fair return for expenditure and that it does not place any great priority on full employment in this State.

**Mr. LANE (Merthyr)** (12.4 a.m.): I had intended to remain silent on this clause because I thought that the arguments advanced by the Premier and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha were so forceful and self-explanatory that they needed no further comment. However, members of the Opposition seem to be obsessed with certain of the Bill's provisions, so I should like to comment on the source of the alarm that has been voiced by them.

The Bill is progressive. It provides for the conserving of public money through the co-ordination of services and development throughout the State. This clause even goes into detail about encouraging employment, reducing unemployment, and co-ordinating various works throughout the State with that result in mind.

The Leader of the Opposition has dragged the debate aside by dealing with such unrelated matters as the benefits to be derived from day labour compared with contract work in the carrying out of development projects.

**Mr. Houston:** That clause has been dealt with. What's up with you?

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton):** Order!

**Mr. Bennett:** Are you going to tell us about when you were boundary riding at Boggo Road?

**Mr. LANE:** I intend to tell the Committee about the Australian Labor Party's platform in relation to day labour. It is well documented in a booklet I have here. It is obtainable from the Parliamentary Library, and provides the reasons for the basic resentment that Opposition members have to the Bill as a whole, and to this clause in particular.

**Mr. Houston:** What is the date of it?

**Mr. LANE:** It is the latest one. The document to which I refer is the report of the 27th Labor-in-Politics Convention, 1971. It arrived in the Parliamentary Library today.

**Mr. B. Wood:** We are rather proud of it.

**Mr. LANE:** The honourable member is probably proud of it, but there are many people in the community who are not so proud of it. That is probably why they have rejected the A.L.P. over so many years.

I intend to go to the trouble of recording in "Hansard"—

**Mr. BENNETT:** I rise to a point of order. In keeping with the rules laid down by Mr. Speaker, seeing that this document is being quoted from, I move—

"That the document cited by the honourable member for Merthyr be laid on the table."

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton):** Order!

**Mr. LANE:** I have no objection to tabling the document. Maybe a member of the Opposition may wish to do it. I will read the particular reference to day labour.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I rise to a point of order. I moved, as I understand from Mr. Speaker's ruling that I am entitled to, that the document be tabled.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member for South Brisbane has taken a point of order that is correct. When the honourable member for Merthyr finishes his speech, he will table the document.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Put it to the vote.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Bennett) be agreed to—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Aiken	Marginson
Baldwin	Melloy
Bennett	Newton
Blake	O'Donnell
Bromley	Thackeray
Casey	Tucker
Davis	Wallis-Smith
Dean	Wood, B.
Hanlon	Wood, P.
Hanson	Wright
Harris	
Houston	<b>Tellers:</b>
Inch	Jensen
Jones, R.	Moore, F. P.
Jordan	

NOES, 33

Ahern	Low
Alison	McKechnie
Armstrong	Müller
Bjelke-Petersen	Müller
Camm	Murray
Campbell	Newbery
Chinchen	Porter
Herbert	Rae
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Row
Hewitt, W. D.	Sullivan
Hodges	Tomkins
Hughes	Trooth
Kaus	Wharton
Knox	
Lane	<b>Tellers:</b>
Lee	Bird
Lickiss	Moore, R. E.
Loneragan	

PAIRS:

Bousen	Delamothe
Lloyd	Fletcher
Sherrington	Hungerford

Resolved in the negative.

**Mr. LANE:** Having been abruptly and rudely interrupted by Opposition members in an attempt to stand over me and bully me into doing something that originally I did not intend to do, I shall now speak further and more directly on the clause. I raise the matter of day labour to place on record the differences in policy and attitude between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, or the socialist party of honourable members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition has on occasions acknowledged that he has spoken to have recorded in "Hansard" the attitude of his party to various aspects of the Bill. I feel that I have a just entitlement to do likewise from this side of the Chamber.

Day labour is a very sacred, popular and hard-and-fast policy of the Opposition party, and the Leader of the Opposition has supported that policy this evening. It is, of course, to the detriment of private contractors and those employed by them. The Bill, and particularly the clause under discussion, contain several proposals all of which are intended to encourage employment throughout the State. This clause refers to the orderly arrangement and revision of a general programme of works for the State. Surely that is desirable. As long as it was not implemented under some doctrinaire system for the philosophical reasons of certain people, who would want to whinge and complain about it?

That is probably the basic reason why the Leader of the Opposition has raised so much objection to the Bill, and to this clause in particular.

The clause refers also to co-operation in activities connected with works and construction. As honourable members know, many thousands of people are engaged in works and construction throughout the State. Surely these activities should be conducted in an atmosphere of co-operation and with the object of continuing those people in employment and fostering further development in the State.

The clause mentions other matters calculated to conserve public moneys and to ensure that duplication and overlapping in the services and activities of departments of the Government and local bodies are avoided or minimised.

This filibuster is being conducted by the Opposition because they see in the Bill a threat to their running mates in the Brisbane City Council, that all-powerful body that operates to the detriment of the individual citizen in Brisbane. Over the past two weekends, no doubt there have been consultations between leading members of the Opposition, various council aldermen, and those who pull the strings at the city hall, and it has been decided that the Bill poses a threat to the power of the council.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. LANE:** It will not do honourable members opposite any good to hurl personal insults at me across the Chamber. I will not be deterred from saying what I wish to say in the debate. Standover tactics such as those they adopted when trying to make me table a document that I did not wish to table will not do them any good, either.

This is a progressive piece of legislation, and this clause probably goes a considerable way towards outlining its intentions. With an election coming up early next year, the Bill is unpopular from the Opposition's point of view. It is the sort of legislation that appeals to the public because it attempts to do things that are good for the public throughout the State. That is why honourable members opposite, who do not wish the State to develop and have the present Government recognised for what it is—a progressive Government—seek to "knock" and "rubbish" the Bill and tear it apart.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (12.24 a.m.): As my Leader has pointed out, one of the purposes of this clause is to deal with means of evolving schemes for providing employment and improving the general economic development and public amenity of the State.

Although we have heard some spurious arguments from Government members during the debate tonight, not the least of which have come from the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha, I am sure that, without exception, the Premier and every other member of the Government have been horribly embarrassed by the ridiculous remarks that have just been made by the honourable member for Merthyr. He excelled himself in stupidity by what he said about the clause. Of course, he was blown out like a pricked balloon. Not only has he endeavoured to insult me for exercising my rights as a member of this Parliament but—if I may say so with respect—he has also by innuendo insulted you, Mr. Houghton, by saying that he was abruptly and rudely interrupted and bullied, simply because, in keeping with the Standing Orders of the House as laid down by Mr. Speaker and in keeping with Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice", I took the opportunity of exercising my rights as an elected representative of the people to move that a document to which he was referring be tabled.

That is all I did, but in typical detective fashion he says that he was abruptly and rudely interrupted and bullied. His bullying days seem to be still fresh in his mind. One would think he was addressing somebody in the C.I.B. instead of speaking in the dignified atmosphere of Parliament.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clause.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It is an appropriate time for Labor's policy on this matter to be explained. In the limited time available to him under the Standing Orders, my leader endeavoured to explain Labor's policy. Neither he nor anyone else on this side of the Chamber seeks to run behind the policy laid down by convention. We are proud of the decisions that are made, and we are not embarrassed by our policy being advertised. Indeed, we do our best to advertise that policy. The Leader of the Opposition in the limited time available to him was unable to quote in full the policy of the Labor Party which, relative to certain aspects, is day labour. We are quite proud of that, and we do not run behind anybody's skirts to try to shield ourselves from the consequences of our policy.

**Government Members interjected.**

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have repeatedly issued warnings and asked honourable members to refrain from persistent interjections so that the business of the Committee can proceed.

**Mr. BENNETT:** From the Premier down Government members smart with indignation when they are caught out in their artificial attempts to play politics in this Chamber. I repeat that we are quite proud of our policy, and we are prepared to have it advertised, published and recorded.

Because of limited time, my leader did not have the opportunity, nor have I the opportunity, to fully explain Labor's policy under this clause. But in keeping with Standing Orders we are entitled to have a document recorded when it is referred to. The honourable member for Merthyr sought to embarrass us by reading extracts from our policy, and what I did was not bullying, rudely interrupting him or abruptly interrupting him; it was merely to place the full facts before the "Hansard" readers of this State and the taxpayers who elect us. We do not seek to hide our policy or any aspect of it. We seek to have it recorded and published. What happened when we sought to do that? We saw the hypocritical, insincere Government parties hide behind the cloak of their numbers—not behind the authenticity of parliamentary rules and the principles of debate—when we decided quite eagerly and proudly to have our policy of day labour recorded.

**Mr. Knox:** That is exactly what is happening in Western Australia.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The Chairman half rose from his seat a while ago. If I answer the Minister in appropriate fashion, it is possible that I will be in difficulty with the Chairman.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Is it a fact that you have never attended a Labor Party convention?

**Mr. BENNETT:** As I mentioned in perhaps more crude terms when I was not being

recorded, but I repeat them now in view of the inane remark of the Minister for Lands, he is obviously very typically fit this evening.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton):** Order! The honourable member for South Brisbane has been warned before. He will refrain from persistent cross-firing, as will honourable members on my right. I ask him to get on with the business of the Committee.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I foreshadowed the rebuke you are giving me, Mr. Houghton, but after three attempts you still allowed the Minister for Lands to ask me that question. That is why I answered it.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member is reflecting on the Chair. He has been warned and I ask him to comply with the rules.

**Mr. BENNETT:** In view of the query allowed from the Minister for Lands, I indicate to him that I have been at every Labor-in-Politics Convention since 1960 and ever since I have been—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will come back to the clause before the Committee. Otherwise, I will ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr. BENNETT:** You might ask me to resume my seat but you didn't rule the interjection out of order.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

Clause 28, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 29 to 37, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 38—Declaration of regions—

**Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.32 a.m.):** I move the following amendment—

"On page 15, line 18, after the word 'Co-ordinator-General' add the words—

'and at the office of the clerk of each Local Authority that exercises jurisdiction within the region.'"

This clause dealing with the declaration of regions reads—

"The Governor in Council may, by Order in Council made on the recommendation of the Minister, declare any part of the State or of any area over which the State claims jurisdiction to be a region for the purposes of this Act.

"Every region shall be delineated on a plan held available for inspection by the public at the office of the Co-ordinator-General."

That, of course, signifies that it will be in Brisbane but the region concerned could be anywhere. It could be centred around Mt. Isa or anywhere in Northern or Western Queensland, and all I am endeavouring to do

in this amendment is to ensure that it is mandatory that a copy of the plan be placed in the local authority headquarters.

**Mr. Kaus:** That should be normal procedure.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** As the Bill does not say so, it can be argued that it is not mandatory. It is no excuse, according to law, for a person to say that he was not in Brisbane and did not see the plan.

A person in Brisbane can quite easily see if a freeway affects his property. I get numerous inquiries, as I am sure the honourable member for Hawthorne does, about where the bridge is going at New Farm. A plan put up would show this, but we could have, for example, a developmental project outside of Cairns and the people affected may not know about it. There may or may not be some mention of it in the Press, depending on the reporters, but it is not good enough to carry out Government business through the courtesy of the news media.

Of course, not many people read Government notices unless they are looking for a specific announcement. I believe that the amendment will make what I seek mandatory. These things will be done as a matter of custom. But unless it is laid down, no-one is responsible if the map is not shown in the local authority area. I know that the Premier said in reply to a question asked by the honourable member for Ithaca that copies of the map would be available. That is a good idea, but the main thing I want to ensure is that people in the area will see the map without having to come to Brisbane. My amendment means that one or two extra copies of the map will need to be prepared so that they can be shown in the headquarters of the local authorities. As we know, in country areas particularly people go to the offices of their local authorities to pay their rates.

**Mr. LICKISS:** (Mt. Coot-tha) (12.36 a.m.): We should have clearly in our minds what clause 38 means. It provides—

“The Governor in Council may, by Order in Council made on the recommendation of the Minister, declare any part of the State or of any area over which the State claims jurisdiction to be a region for the purposes of this Act.”

I suggest that this would be done in two ways. Firstly, it would be done by the legal description giving the metes and bounds, as is normal, when a declaration of a reserve such as this takes place. Secondly, it is required that a plan of the region shall be placed in the office of the Co-ordinator-General. A map of the region will be nearly the same as a map showing shire boundaries. It is unnecessary to incorporate the terms of the amendment in legislation. I would hope that as easily as a person buys a map of a town or a shire he would also be able to buy a map showing a region. The Leader of the Opposition said that he

envisages a declaration of a region as being a regional plan. He adverted to the fact that he wants to know where a bridge crosses the river. He would not find that on such a regional plan; all he would find is a general map of the region and probably a red line outlining its metes and bounds. I do not think it is necessary to incorporate the amendment.

**Mr. Houston:** Are you the shadow Premier?

**Mr. LICKISS:** I am expressing my opinion just as the Leader of the Opposition had the right to express his. This matter would be handled as a normal function of the Co-ordinator-General's Department and would be quite easily attended to administratively.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.38 a.m.): As the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has said, this will be done administratively, and therefore I will not accept the amendment.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.39 a.m.): At long last the Premier has given way to the authority of the Liberal Party. Time and time again the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has stormed and declared in this Chamber that he wanted maps of the Brisbane Town Plan published everywhere. Tonight he says that a person who lives in Cairns knows what is going on in Brisbane. What hypocrites Government members are. They talk about decentralisation and at the same time do everything possible to centralise everything in Brisbane. I am surprised that the Premier should allow a Liberal city member to dictate to him and his Country Party.

This is not the type of amendment that is tied up with politics. It is an ordinary amendment to ensure that a map is published in these areas. I was not talking about a bridge, but the honourable member for Hawthorne interjected and I gave him an example. This legislation does not stipulate where the regions will be and does not indicate whether they will contain part of a local authority or the full area. We criticise the fact that there are no guidelines as to what a region should be. It could be small or large.

If a Government decided to help a mining venture that was coming to the State, it could well give high priority to the provision of water, power and roads in the area. People with properties in the area would surely like to know whether their properties in part or whole were to be included in the area.

**Mr. R. E. Moore** interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** There is a big difference between what would happen in such circumstances, and what would happen under the Brisbane Town Plan, when the people affected live in Brisbane. As the map is to be published in the Co-ordinator-General's Department in Brisbane, it must have some

value to somebody. The Premier has already assured the honourable member for Ithaca that he will make maps available to anyone who wants them. It is possible that the public will want to see the maps. If I lived in a country area, I would certainly like to know if a town was to be developed, as Moranbah was developed. Property owners made inquiries through members about whether their properties would be required. Surely the insertion of a few lines in the Bill would not create a great hardship. They would ensure that a map would be on display in the areas involved. With our system of education, most people can read and understand, or at least they can follow the general idea.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.43 a.m.): It surprises me that the Leader of the Opposition can be so naive as to suggest or imply that in the administration of an Act of this nature any Government or any department would not automatically do administratively what he suggests should be written into the Bill. He is really getting down to trivialities.

**Mr. Bennett** interjected.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** As I have said, the honourable member for South Brisbane is trying to make a mountain out of a molehill.

It is a reflection on the administration of the Co-ordinator-General's Department to even suggest that this would be done without posting maps in the area. As the honourable member must know, that will be done administratively and automatically.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.44 a.m.): Will the Premier tell me why he saw fit to include the words "at the office of the Co-ordinator-General"? If maps are to be published in the locality, why include those words? Why not simply say that the map will be available? The Bill designates Brisbane; that is indicative of the Government's Brisbane-thinking. I know that maps will be published in the country areas now because we raised this matter. If we had not done so, the country people would not have seen them.

Question—That the words proposed to be added to clause 38 (Mr. Houston's amendment) be so added—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Aiken  
Bennett  
Blake  
Bromley  
Casey  
Dean  
Hanlon  
Hanson  
Harris  
Houston  
Inch  
Jensen  
Jones, R.  
Jordan  
Marginson

Melloy  
Moore, F. P.  
Newton  
O'Donnell  
Thackeray  
Tucker  
Wallis-Smith  
Wood, B.  
Wood, P.  
Wright  
  
*Tellers:*  
Baldwin  
Davis

NOES, 34

Armstrong	Low
Bird	McKechnie
Bjelke-Petersen	Miller
Camm	Moore, R. E.
Campbell	Müller
Chinchen	Murray
Herbert	Newbery
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Porter
Hewitt, W. D.	Rae
Hinze	Row
Hodges	Sullivan
Hughes	Tomkins
Kaus	Tooth
Knox	Wharton
Lane	
Lee	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lickiss	Ahern
Loneragan	Alison

PAIRS:

Bousen	Delamothe
Lloyd	Fletcher
Sherrington	Hungerford

Resolved in the negative.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (12.51 a.m.): I move the following further amendment—

"On page 15, after line 18, add the following words—

'The power conferred by this section shall not be exercised save after an investigation made under section 13 of this Act that establishes—

(a) whether a relationship exists between the several localities within the region proposed to be declared, and the true nature of any relationship found to so exist; and

(b) the proper boundaries of the region proposed to be declared.'

During the last division the Premier said that he would let the people of this State know how often the Opposition had opposed regional planning. I should like to make it quite clear that at no stage during this debate has any Opposition member opposed regional planning. On the contrary, amendments such as the one proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and the one that I have just moved are designed to improve the Bill. They are put forward in a constructive way to include in the Bill something that is not now there and that would assist regional planning. In fact, the A.L.P. will be able to go to the people and tell them that the Government refused to accept these improvements.

The Premier said that this is mainly an administrative Bill. It is no use declaring a region under the Bill without setting out some basis on which a regional area should be declared. The proposed amendment puts the horse where it should be—in front of the cart rather than behind it, where it is put by the Bill.

I do not intend to reiterate the points that I made during my second-reading speech except to ask the Premier to accept the amendment. I address myself to the Premier, as Leader of the Government and presenter of the Bill, and not to the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha. The Premier is no doubt well aware of what is actually happening in the Mackay district, in which a

regional study is being undertaken to determine exactly where the cut-off should be. I presume that once that has been done, this regional study will become an excellent basis for the declaration of one of the first State development areas, as the spadework will have been done. The joining of various localities into a development area cannot be done by simply drawing a line on a map. It is not quite as simple to draw boundaries of regions as it is to draw electoral boundaries. In the case of electoral boundaries, the number of voters is divided in a way that suits the political parties. Regional boundaries must be drawn in an entirely different way.

Localities are bound together in many ways—by industries, various types of agricultural pursuits (they vary from region to region), pastoral pursuits, secondary industries, tourism, mining or a combination of any two or more of these. Therefore, transportation needs in and out of an area, whether by sea, road, rail, or air—they vary in different parts of the State—and the dependency of smaller towns on larger towns in certain areas can be determined only when a proper in-depth study of an area is carried out. Localities are governed, by watersheds and mountain barriers; they are governed also by port access and traditional trade routes.

I suggest that no member of this Assembly and no individual member of a department would have the knowledge and skill to enable him to draw a line on a map and say, "This is a region" and, by so doing, correctly determine where the cut-off points should be. Again I refer to the ease with which electoral boundaries can be drawn and point out that Collinsville has been cut off from Bowen. Traditionally and geographically, Collinsville is as tied to Bowen as the Brisbane River is to the city of Brisbane. Is a region to be drawn in Central Queensland encompassing Gladstone and Port Alma? All honourable members know the feeling that exists between those two ports. Such a determination should be made only after a proper study is made.

Under the existing Act, the Co-ordinator-General has power to undertake an investigation and study of a region, and he will have a somewhat similar power under clause 13 of the Bill. The amendment that I have proposed seeks to ensure that the power under this clause will be exercised only after such an investigation has been made. I think it was the honourable member for Maryborough who suggested earlier in the debate that a survey of the Mary Valley was being carried out by the Hunter River Authority and that we should accept the results of that survey. I understand that that organisation has carried out similar surveys over the length and breadth of Queensland and that local television stations have met the cost. They are being conducted to give the stations some idea of the areas they are serving and the industries in those areas.

Surely the Government does not intend to draw lines and say, "This will be the Central region, this will be the North Queensland region, and this will be the Far North Queensland region." The set-up under the Bill is in no way similar to that of the Main Roads Department. A much more effective investigation must be carried out before regions are established.

If the Government wants the provisions of the Bill to work, it will accept the amendment that I have proposed so that regions may be established and declared on a proper basis.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.59 a.m.): The honourable member has killed his own argument by admitting that this has already been done in the study carried out in the Mackay area. If it can be done there, there is no reason why it cannot be done elsewhere. That is the simple answer to his whole argument. It will be done automatically. I do not propose to accept the amendment.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (1 a.m.): If the position is as the Premier states, has the Government in fact already declared the Mackay area to be a region? Is this what has happened? The charter given to Messrs. Rankine & Hill, who in fact carried out the regional study, certainly does not cover the points mentioned in clauses 40, 41, 42 and so on, or to be found in the determination of the developmental scheme or in the declaration of a State developmental area.

Certainly those points are not written into the authority given to Messrs. Rankine & Hill. I asked the Premier when it was likely that the report would be released, so that something could follow on from it along the lines that the Bill is now suggesting will be a natural corollary. The first thing that must happen is the declaration of a region. I do not know whether it will be anything like other reports, such as the Railway Department report that the Minister for Transport is still sitting on. I understand that part of the cause of the delay in the submission of the Rankine & Hill report is that they are still having arguments with the Railway Department about whether it is going to release its report on rail relocation within the Mackay city area.

If this is in fact the case, when will the report be released? The Premier says he has given the answer to my argument. Does he say that the Mackay area, as set out in the original instructions given to Messrs. Rankine & Hill, will in fact be declared a region under the Bill?

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (1.2 a.m.): It is not a declared region under the Bill as such. As I said to the honourable member, the answer is that the procedure has been adopted. It has been set and will be continued. Therefore, it is the one that will be followed automatically in all other cases, also.

As I said before, it does not concern me in the slightest if honourable members opposite wish to persist with all these more or less trivial administrative matters. It is their right and prerogative to do so if they wish. I have made the position quite clear. The honourable member must know that that is the procedure that is adopted. It is automatic. This is the procedure that will take place elsewhere as the Bill is implemented.

For the honourable member's edification, the report on the Mackay study should be ready by about February 1972. That will interest the honourable member.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (1.3 a.m.): It does interest me. When I first raised the matter I was told that the report would be ready in September. When I last raised it, I was told it would be ready in November. Now I am told it will be ready in February 1972.

The Premier has also said that once the study is completed it will form the basis for the declaration of the region. If that is what is to happen, and as the Premier says that that should be the basis for further declarations of areas, why not accept the amendment and have it written into the Bill so that it is there for all time for any other Premier or Government to follow as a proper and correct guide-line in the declaration of a region?

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (1.4 a.m.): The situation surely is that the Opposition is now playing with little things to try to delay the Committee. If honourable members opposite knew anything about regional planning they would know that a prerequisite to the definition of any area for any particular purpose requires this type of investigation. What are we going to do and what is to be the situation? Having set up regional planning under this Bill, and having competent officers to effectively execute it and carry out its instructions, are we to tell them in precise terms what a region is?

This is merely a prerequisite to the declaration of an area, nothing more or nothing less. If we were to spell out all these things in detail, instead of having a reasonably sized Bill we would produce a document that would only confuse the issue. The Bill is straightforward enough in its present form. It will be professionally administered, and the necessary prerequisite investigations effected before any declaration of an area is made.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (1.6 a.m.): Mr. Houghton—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Houghton): Order! The honourable member for Mackay has exhausted his time under the Standing Orders.

Question—That the words proposed to be added to clause 38 (Mr. Casey's amendment) be so added—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Aiken  
Baldwin  
Bennett  
Blake  
Bromley  
Casey  
Davis  
Dean  
Hanlon  
Hanson  
Harris  
Houston  
Jensen  
Jones, R.  
Jordan

Marginson  
Melloy  
Moore, F. P.  
Newton  
O'Donnell  
Thackeray  
Tucker  
Wallis-Smith  
Wood, P.  
Wright

Tellers:

Inch  
Wood, B.

NOES, 34

Ahern  
Alison  
Armstrong  
Bird  
Bjelke-Petersen  
Camm  
Campbell  
Chinchen  
Herbert  
Hewitt, N. T. E.  
Hewitt, W. D.  
Hinze  
Hodges  
Hughes  
Knox  
Lane  
Lee  
Lickiss

Loneragan  
Low  
McKechnie  
Miller  
Moore, R. E.  
Murray  
Newbery  
Porter  
Rae  
Row  
Sullivan  
Tomkins  
Tooth  
Wharton

Tellers:

Kaus  
Müller

PAIRS:

Delamothe  
Fletcher  
Hungerford

Bousen  
Lloyd  
Sherrington

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 38, as read, agreed to.

Clause 39, as read, agreed to.

Clause 40—Regional co-ordination councils—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (1.14 a.m.): This clause sets up regional co-ordination councils. As I indicated at the second-reading stage, it forms the basis of the Bill in respect of planning recommendations made to the Co-ordinator-General and eventually to the Governor in Council. The Premier will tell us that the local authorities will be represented on these councils and that this person and that person will be represented. However, we do not forget what happened when this Government came into power. It sacked anyone who had Labor tendencies and appointed in his place a Government supporter.

**Mr. Lickiss**: That is unfair.

**Mr. HOUSTON**: It is not unfair; it is quite true.

**Mr. R. E. Moore**: It is quite wrong.

**Mr. HOUSTON**: It is quite true. The honourable member was not here.

**Mr. Hinze**: You would put the Trades Hall mob on. You would put "Georgie" Georges on.

**Mr. HOUSTON**: As the honourable member knows so much about what is going on,

I point out that it was the present Government that appointed Jack Egerton to the two committees on which he is now serving. That was a very sensible move, because he is doing a particularly good job. If the honourable member wishes to recommend the appointment of more Trades Hall representatives, that is all right with us.

As I say, this clause deals with the establishment of regional co-ordination councils. Although it provides that a chairman and four or more members may serve on such a council, it does not provide any guide-lines. Surely the clause does not have to be so flexible that anyone at all can serve on a council. The appointment of persons to serve on such important bodies will be a matter of individual choice. I believe that local authorities must feel that they are represented by right, not because they are in favour with the Minister in charge of the legislation.

The clause provides that members will be appointed by the Governor in Council. That means that they will be appointed on the recommendation of the Co-ordinator-General or the Minister himself. I am inclined to the view that the person who should be rightly charged with the responsibility of nominating them should be the Minister. But he may not select people whom the local authority, the regional board or the harbour authority may want.

If we are to have real regional planning, these boards must be represented by a person of their choice, not of the Government's choice. We do not want these regional co-ordination councils to be subsidiary to the Government of the day, or to have their decisions influenced by it. We have seen people who have been appointed by the Government to serve on boards and committees and who have tried to interpret what the Government would like them to do. We want these councils to work effectively, and we believe they can do so only if we set out in the legislation who should be appointed to them. If the Government fails to do that, the public could rightly assume that it wants the legislation to be flexible enough to exclude anyone who it feels will not do its bidding.

I therefore move the following amendment—

“On page 15, lines 36 to 38, omit the words—

‘In making his recommendation to the Governor in Council the Minister shall have regard to the circumstances and requirements of the region or part in respect of which the appointment is to be made.’

and insert in lieu thereof the words—

‘The four or more other members of a Regional Co-ordination Council shall consist of—

(a) a representative of each Local Authority that exercises jurisdiction

within the region or as the case may be, the part thereof for which the council is established;

(b) a representative of each electricity supply authority (other than a Local Authority) that is authorized to exercise and perform its powers, authority, functions and duties within the region or, as the case may be, the part thereof for which the council is established;

(c) a representative of each Harbour Board (including the Harbours Trust within the meaning of The Harbours Acts 1955 to 1968) that is authorized to exercise and perform its powers, authority, functions and duties in respect of a harbour within the region or, as the case may be, the part thereof for which the council is established;

(d) such other person or persons as the Minister, having regard to the circumstances and requirements of the region or part thereof in respect of which the appointment is to be made, recommends to the Governor in Council.

The person nominated by a body that is entitled to be represented on a Regional Co-ordination Council under paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of this subsection shall be the person recommended by the Minister for appointment by the Governor in Council.”

I believe that the amendment does not in any way detract from the Bill. It lays down specifically the three or four persons who will be included. It must be a developmental project of some magnitude to require the Co-ordinator-General to handle it, otherwise it would be handled by the Main Roads Department, the State Electricity Commission, or a combination of two or three departments. This applies only to a project that is handled by the Co-ordinator-General, and it will be a project of some magnitude or some importance.

If the project was on the coast and was associated with transport, particularly water transport, a harbour board would be involved, and it would be advisable to have on the regional co-ordination council a person with knowledge of the harbour board's finances and experience in developmental projects. Likewise, if a project involves the supply of electricity, the elected representative of the local authority concerned should be on the council. The Government has claimed consistently that the responsibility of local authorities will not be deflated in any way. We may differ on this matter. However, this amendment will give the Government an opportunity to ensure that the local authority concerned is represented on the council. If the Government suggests that this is already taken care of, the Opposition cannot accept it.

The Bill lays down details as to who is responsible and who shall and shall not constitute certain committees. We have already passed a clause setting up the

Environmental Control Council. It provides that no fewer than 19 people shall constitute that council. The Government could have provided that no fewer than, say, 18 or 15 people would constitute the council on the assumption that others would be involved. But it did not suit the Government to do that. It correctly laid down that those people would constitute the council and that they could be broken up into subcommittees.

The Opposition is asking that no doubt shall be left in the mind of any person—any future Minister or any future Cabinet—that a regional co-ordination council shall have on it at least the people mentioned. The others, of course, would be appointed at the Government's discretion.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (1.24 a.m.): I should like to add a few points to those raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Some of them refer to earlier comments in this debate. The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha tried to assert, in one of his speeches, that local government would be represented on these regional co-ordination councils and would have its say. It has been clearly pointed out that the Bill contains no provision to ensure that local government has its say. The Opposition seeks to ensure that local government representatives, selected by local government, are members of this council. This is nothing new, because the principle applies in other semi-governmental bodies such as harbour boards, hospital boards, regional electricity boards, and harbour trusts.

**Mr. Houston:** They are designated.

**Mr. CASEY:** Yes. The legislation lays down that local authorities shall be represented on such bodies. If that is intended under this Bill, it seems strange that it has not been written into it. The Premier said that the Bill is the "baby" of the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha, and at one stage the honourable member was in the wilderness in his own party on this subject. Now someone has suddenly seen election-propaganda potential in this issue, and the Bill has blossomed forth hastily and ill-framed. I believe that the Premier has been "conned" into this situation by the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha. For some reason or other, local authorities throughout Queensland are to be specifically denied their rightful representation on regional councils.

I think it was a Government back-bencher who referred to my knowledge of local government. I may not be the most experienced member of this Assembly in the field of local government. I certainly would not claim to have the experience of the honourable member for Ipswich East, the honourable member for Ipswich West, the honourable member for Cairns, and other members who have served, as I have, on local authorities. I also include some members on the Government side who have served for

many years in this field. I will, however, match my knowledge of local government with any member on the Government side.

If Government members who are still serving on local authorities do not support this amendment, they will be letting local government down. They will be the ones whose electors will be informed at the next State election of the stand that they took in the fight for the rights of local authorities. The people will be told of what the Government did when it had the opportunity to give local authorities the right to have their proper say under the provisions of the Bill.

There has been argument about the three and four tiers of government. To spell out the position clearly, there are the Federal Government, the State Government, the local authorities, and the semi-governmental bodies that are joint enterprises between local government and the State Government. These bodies have on them representatives of the State Government and the local authority. If regional co-ordination councils are set up with responsibility only to the Co-ordinator-General and, through him, the Governor in Council, there will be set up another level of government that is not responsible democratically to any electorate or body of persons. The councils will not be responsible to any group of persons or electors to whom they have to report their actions.

The representatives of local authorities who serve on such bodies as harbour boards, fire brigade boards, hospital boards and regional electricity boards have to report to their councils on stands that they have taken on matters dealt with by those semi-governmental authorities. More than one person has been defeated in local government because, as a representative on a semi-governmental body, he took a stand that was detrimental to the people whom he represented on their local authority. The people want their representatives to be responsible to them for their actions in matters that affect the people. All that I can presume is that the Government would like to see happen what happened in 1957, when Government representatives on semi-governmental authorities were tossed out. The Government would like even now to remove from some boards representatives of local authorities. If it persists in its attitude in this instance, one can only assume that it wishes to make political appointments to the regional councils.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (1.31 a.m.): As I received honourable mention from the honourable member for Mackay, I should like to put the record straight as to what I said about his views on local government. I said plainly that the honourable member said that the way to implement regional planning was by a simple amendment of the Local Government Act.

**Mr. CASEY:** I rise to a point of order. What I did say—it will be recorded in "Hansard"—was that if the Government had

wished to introduce regional planning, most of it could have been done by amending the Local Government Act. I ask for a withdrawal of the honourable member's comment.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Wharton): Order! The honourable member for Mackay has asked that the comment be withdrawn.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I am happy to withdraw it.

All we are doing here is instituting a system of regional planning that will be undertaken by the Co-ordinator-General. The Act relating to the activities of the Co-ordinator-General covers the whole area over which the State Government has jurisdiction. I point out to the honourable member that amending the Local Government Act to provide for regional planning would not mean that all areas of Queensland over which the Government has sovereign responsibility would be covered. Whichever way one looks at it, that was the context in which he made his comment, and I am only proving that what he said was not correct.

I admit that I went on record as saying that I believe that local government will play an important role in regional planning. Honourable members opposite do not believe that it will. They are entitled to their opinion. However, if one looks at the proposed amendment and the practicalities of it, one might well ask the Leader of the Opposition why on earth, if a Darling Downs region is declared, he would want a representative of a harbour board on the council? That is implicit in his proposed amendment. Airy-fairy proposals of that type may cause conflict, and I again ask the honourable gentleman what good a member of a harbour board would be on a council for, say, a Darling Downs region or a Mt. Isa region.

**Mr. Houston:** That shows how little the honourable member knows about the amendment. There would not be a representative of a harbour board on a council in areas such as those.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I have no copy of the amendment.

**Mr. Houston:** You should have a copy. You have been the spokesman for the Liberal Party throughout the debate. Where is your initiative?

**Mr. LICKISS:** In answer to the honourable member, I say that I have a little more initiative than he has.

I have raised these points because the proposed amendment relates to representatives who may not be suitable for the requirements of a particular regional council.

**Mr. Houston:** You do not want local authority representatives on the councils?

**Mr. LICKISS:** I have gone on record as saying that I want representatives of local authorities on the councils. I hope that we will not have another long dissertation relative to Labor's policy on local authorities.

I believe it would be unwise to insert in this legislation positions envisaged by the amendment of the Leader of Opposition. The Government will act on what it has said, and I hope that any Government occupying the Treasury benches in the foreseeable future—the Leader of the Opposition certainly will not be a member of it—will honour the provisions of the Bill.

**Mr. MARGINSON** (Ipswich East) (1.35 a.m.): I support the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Mackay. This is the matter I spoke about this afternoon. It is not spelt out in the Bill that local authorities will have representation on co-ordination councils. That is my worry. Although we have been assured by the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha and by the Premier that the local authority will be taken into consideration, why is it not spelt out in the Bill that the local authority will have some representation? If the Government is sincere, it will accept the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which gives local authorities some representation on the councils.

The honourable member for Mackay referred to many boards that have the matter of membership spelt out in their Acts. The Act covering the operations of local abattoir boards indicates that there shall be three representatives of the local authority on the local abattoir board. Many pieces of legislation this Government has introduced indicate the number of members on the relevant board. The Chiropractors Act, which was passed last session, provided for the establishment of a board to conduct the affairs of chiropractors. It set out that there should be six members, one a medical practitioner from the Health Department, two medical practitioners in actual practice and three chiropractors appointed by the Government. It is all spelt out in that Act.

**Mr. Houston:** The Consumer Affairs Council is another one.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** That is correct. We believe that we have reason to suspect that under the Bill there will not necessarily be local authority representatives.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Pick the best you can.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** Whether they are local authority representatives or not? Is that the honourable member's idea?

**Mr. Chinchin:** Why should they all be local authority representatives?

**Mr. MARGINSON:** That is exactly what I am trying to find out. The powers of local authorities are being taken away by this Bill.

**Mr. Chinchin:** This is a different sphere.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** Why cannot the Government be sincere and give us some local authority representation on the councils? The whole point is that, when the Bill becomes

law, what has been said by the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha will not be accepted if it is not in the Act.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (1.38 a.m.): The whole spirit and purpose of the Bill is co-operation and co-ordination with local authorities. That purpose of the Bill has been stated many times. Honourable members opposite who have been trying to draw comparisons must realise that there is only one Environmental Control Council. Of course, there will be many regional councils or co-ordinating councils throughout the State.

**Mr. Houston:** You must have some idea of how many.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** We know exactly what the position is.

**An Opposition Member:** How many would you set up?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** For obvious reasons it would be quite inappropriate for me to specify the particular persons or the categories of persons likely to be included on a council. As I said in reply to the honourable member for Ithaca, representatives on regional councils will, in general, be persons directly involved in the region. Who is more directly involved in the region than the local authority? It will be our objective to include representatives best suited to the task. Here again local authority men are suited to the task. Such appointments, of course, will be made after careful consideration.

**Mr. Casey:** Will they be equal as between the Liberal Party and the Country Party?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I know what the position would be if the Labor Party was in power. There would not be any argument about it. The honourable member for Cook freely and openly said this a moment ago.

**Mr. Houston:** That would not be recorded in "Hansard". He did not make a speech.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** He rarely does, but he made that statement to the honourable member for Cooroora and it was heard by many members. He said "If we were in power, this is what we would do."

There will be many problems in the future, as the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha said, in determining who is to be appointed. Many persons in the regions involved will be considered. The amendment is not acceptable.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (1.41 a.m.): As time goes on, this Bill becomes more and more of a joke. Every time we ask a question of the Premier or his shadow, we are told, "Leave it to us. We will fix it. We do not know how many regions we will declare. We have no idea how big they will be or what we will do." Does anyone over there know

anything? I think the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt is the only one who is prepared to come out and tell us what happened at the caucus meeting, and that is that there will be no representatives from local authorities if they happen to be of a political colour—

**Mr. CHINCHEN:** I rise to a point of order. What the Leader of the Opposition said was totally incorrect. I did not say, and it was not stated in caucus, what would take place in this regard. The thoughts I put forward were my own, namely, that we should have the best men possible on the boards wherever they come from. I should like that statement to be withdrawn.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I withdraw it. The honourable member had me confused. I thought he knew more than he did. It is obvious that he does not know what goes on at caucus meetings. If Governments do not discuss things at caucus, they come here on the blind, put up their hands and cross the floor when they are told to.

**Mr. Chinchén:** What would you do?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** As a Government we would allow by legislation local authorities to select their own representatives on these regional councils. We would not leave it to the whim of the Minister. It is obvious from what the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has said and from what the Premier has left unsaid that it is the Government's full intention to pick and choose the four men or more for a regional council. The grapevine has it that the honourable member is the "pea" for the next vacancy. That is not breaking any confidence. I know it is tough on his colleagues.

The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha asked what would happen in Toowoomba where there is no regional harbour board. Is it not obvious that if there is no harbour board there will be no such representative? That is what the amendment says, but where there is a representative available he should be on the board. The Premier suggested that this Bill is different from other Bills. Why is it different from such Bills or Acts as the Fire Brigades Act, the Hospital Act and others where decisions or recommendations have to be made to another body. We designate some of those positions and some are free. Under my amendment the Government could still swamp the council with representatives if it so desired.

If regions are going to be as large as has been indicated by some Government members and are to include a multitude of shires, the whole purpose of regional planning will be defeated. Surely the word "regional" indicates an area small enough to be investigated and planned properly. At the most two or three local authorities would be concerned.

**Mr. Chinchén:** That is your guess.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** My guess is more informed than anything the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt has told us so far.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Would you think a maximum of two or three shires in any region is reasonable?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That will give an area of a fairly large size; but apparently some Government members are thinking of areas larger than that.

**Mr. Porter:** I would hope so.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** How big will the regions be?

**Mr. Porter:** I hope they will be bigger than two or three local authority areas.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** We are getting more information from the ginger group than from the Premier.

**Mr. Chinchin:** This is our own thinking.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has been praised by the Premier as the one responsible for this legislation.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Get on with the clause.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I have dealt with the clause; I am now answering interjections. However, the Opposition presses its amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 40 (Mr. Houston's amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 33

Ahern  
Alison  
Bird  
Bjelke-Petersen  
Camm  
Campbell  
Chinchin  
Herbert  
Hewitt, N. T. E.  
Hewitt, W. D.  
Hinze  
Hodges  
Houghton  
Hughes  
Kaus  
Knox  
Lane  
Lee

Lickiss  
Lonergan  
Low  
McKechnie  
Miller  
Müller  
Murray  
Newbery  
Porter  
Rae  
Row  
Sullivan  
Tooth

*Tellers:*  
Moore, R. E.  
Tomkins

NOES, 26

Aiken  
Blake  
Bromley  
Casey  
Dean  
Hanlon  
Hanson  
Harris  
Houston  
Inch  
Jensen  
Jones, R.  
Jordan  
Marginson

Melloy  
Moore, F. P.  
Newton  
O'Donnell  
Thackeray  
Tucker  
Wallis-Smith  
Wood, B.  
Wood, P.  
Wright

*Tellers:*  
Baldwin  
Davis

PAIRS:

Armstrong  
Delamothe  
Fletcher  
Hungerford

Bennett  
Bousen  
Lloyd  
Sherrington

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 40, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 41 to 47, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 48—Declaration of State development areas—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (1.54 a.m.): The amendment that we propose to this clause is similar to one that has been rejected. However, we propose to proceed with it because the circumstances are slightly different. The provisions of this clause, as distinct from those of the earlier clause on which we submitted a similar amendment, are different in terminology in that the Governor in Council, by Order in Council made on the recommendation of the Minister, may declare any part of the State to be a State development area if he is satisfied that the public interest or general welfare of persons resident in any part of the State requires it.

It is not merely a recommendation. An area will be declared as a State development area for a specific purpose. If this were not so, the Governor in Council would not ask for the area to be delineated on a plan held available for inspection at the office of the Co-ordinator-General. This must be done if he is satisfied that the public interest requires it. Therefore, the public are interested.

Why should members of the public have to inquire at Brisbane? The Premier will no doubt claim again that it is clearly understood that this will be done, but the Opposition does not accept that statement. If it were to be automatic, why is it provided that it shall be shown at the office of the Co-ordinator-General? That is one place where it would be shown.

Without labouring the point, I move the following amendment—

“On page 17, line 35, after the word ‘Co-ordinator-General’ add the words—

‘and at the office of the clerk of each Local Authority that exercises jurisdiction within the development area.’”

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (1.57 a.m.): This clause indicates the need to undertake a proper investigation before a regional co-ordination council is set up and before a State development area is declared. There is not much purpose in declaring a State development area without having some idea of what will be entailed in the developmental work and what will be encompassed by the area. Some Government members seem to have a misconception on the point I made earlier relative to a preliminary study.

The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha said we should not concern ourselves with writing small matters into the Bill. I point out that the estimated cost of the regional study of the Mackay district was \$134,000. Therefore, it is not a small matter. Of that amount, the Government paid \$124,000, the Mackay City Council paid \$8,000 (including \$5,000 for a special study on the provision

of parking areas which was undertaken at the same time) and the Pioneer Shire Council paid \$2,000. Government members have claimed that there is no need to write these small matters into the Bill.

By a point of order I pointed out that I did not claim that these matters could be attended to by amending the Local Government Act. Reference was made to foreshores. In fact, foreshores are covered by other Acts. Earlier this year we passed an Act to set up marine national parks, which cut across foreshores in existing Acts, and even national parks cut across one section of that Bill. To ensure that a development area is set up properly, a study should be undertaken. I do not intend to move a further amendment on this occasion. I strongly support the one moved by the Leader of the Opposition because I believe that the people in all areas to be affected by declarations as State development areas would like to see maps setting out what is to be done.

The Bill also contains no provision, once an area is declared and a map displayed, for objections to be made. Objections can be lodged in most other fields. This is an alarming omission from the Bill.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (2.1 a.m.): As I have already said, I am not prepared to accept this amendment. I said that this would be done administratively, and I reiterate that statement.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.2 a.m.): I thought the Premier would return to that point, which is why I made my first speech short. I refer the Premier to clause 51 (b), which states—

“a copy of the scheme shall be held available for inspection by the public at the office of the Co-ordinator-General and elsewhere as he directs.”

If what we want is to be done automatically, why have the words “elsewhere as he directs” been included in that clause? Does that not indicate that a copy can be made available at other places? Unless some words are included to indicate that a second place can be used, it will not be used. In this case, there are no words to indicate that a copy will be available “elsewhere” as well as at the office of the Co-ordinator-General.

Question—That the words proposed to be added to clause 48 (Mr. Houston's amendment) be so added—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 26

Aiken  
Baldwin  
Blake  
Bromley  
Casey  
Davis  
Dein  
Hanton  
Hanson  
Harris  
Houston  
Inch  
Jensen  
Jones, R.

Jordan  
Marginson  
Moore, F. P.  
Newton  
O'Donnell  
Thackeray  
Tucker  
Wallis-Smith  
Wood, P.  
Wright  
*Tellers:*  
Melloy  
Wood, B.

NOES, 33

Ahern	Low
Alison	McKechnie
Bjelke-Petersen	Miller
Camm	Moore, R. E.
Campbell	Müller
Chinchen	Murray
Herbert	Newbery
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Porter
Hewitt, W. D.	Rae
Hinze	Row
Hodges	Sullivan
Houghton	Tomkins
Hugnes	Tooth
Kaus	
Knox	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Bird
Lickiss	Lane
Loneragan	

PAIRS:

Bennett	Armstrong
Bousen	Delamothe
Lloyd	Fletcher
Sherrington	Hungerford

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 48, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 49 and 50, as read, agreed to.

Clause 51—Approval, implementation, and variation of development scheme—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.9 a.m.): Clause 51 (1) (b) says—

“a copy of the scheme shall be held available for inspection by the public at the office of the Co-ordinator-General and elsewhere as he directs”.

The Opposition is asking that the Bill be specific, and accordingly I move the following amendment—

“On page 18, line 18, after the word ‘directs’ add the words—

‘and at the office of the clerk of each Local Authority that exercises jurisdiction with the development area to which the scheme relates.’”

That would lay it down quite clearly within the Bill. The Premier did not answer the question about the reason for the different wording of the two clauses. He could not answer it without admitting that we were right in our submissions. All that the clause says is “elsewhere as he directs.” It is left in the hands of the Governor in Council to direct. It is strange to think that it will only go elsewhere if the Governor in Council so directs. Surely the Premier would prefer to prescribe by statute that it will go to the local authority rather than have time taken up at Executive Council meetings to approve that it go to various local authority areas.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (2.12 a.m.): I cannot accept the amendment. This can be done administratively.

Question—That the words proposed to be added to clause 51 (Mr. Houston's amendment) be so added—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 25

Aiken  
Baldwin  
Blake  
Bromley  
Casey  
Davis  
Hanlon  
Hanson  
Houston  
Inch  
Jensen  
Jones, R.  
Jordan  
Marginson

Melloy  
Moore, F. P.  
Newton  
O'Donnell  
Thackeray  
Tucker  
Wallis-Smith  
Wood, B.  
Wood, P.

Tellers:  
Harris  
Wright

NOES, 31

Ahern  
Alison  
Bird  
Bjelke-Petersen  
Camm  
Campbell  
Chinchen  
Herbert  
Hewitt, N. T. E.  
Hewitt, W. D.  
Hinze  
Hodges  
Houghton  
Hughes  
Kaus  
Knox  
Lane

Lee  
Lickiss  
Lonergan  
Low  
Moore, R. E.  
Müller  
Newbery  
Rae  
Row  
Sullivan  
Tomkins  
Tooth

Tellers:  
McKechnie  
Müller

PAIRS:

Bennett  
Bousen  
Dean  
Lloyd  
Sherrington

Armstrong  
Delamothe  
Crawford  
Fletcher  
Hungerford

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 51, as read, agreed to.

Clause 52, as read, agreed to.

Clause 53—Acquisition of land in State development area—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.19 a.m.): My main point in speaking to this clause is to get a clear statement from the Premier. He has been very forthright in suggesting that everything in the garden is lovely and that everything right will be done anyway, but he does not explain anything.

On my interpretation of this clause, the Government can take over land that it desires for some particular purpose for either a short or a long period. After the Government had been criticised for declaring its state of emergency under the State Transport Act, it issued certain threats. Suggestions had been put forward that it could have taken over the Exhibition Ground by some other means. I ask the Premier straight out whether or not under this clause the Government could take over some land either in Brisbane or anywhere else in the State for a short period if it so desired if, for example, a strike was in progress or protest meetings were being held. The Government pushed the terms of the State Transport Act to the extreme to declare its recent state of emergency, and this clause is much more specific.

Subsection (2) provides—

“The power conferred by the preceding subsection may be exercised notwithstanding that at the time of the taking or acquisition the development of the land taken or acquired is not provided for in an approved development scheme.”

The probability is that in Brisbane a development scheme will be in operation. If so, Brisbane and the surrounding district would be declared a State development area. Naturally the Exhibition Ground or some other sports field would not be part of that scheme, and subclause (2) says that it does not have to be part of such a scheme. It is important that the people of Queensland know the purpose behind the inclusion of this clause, as it need not have anything to do with a scheme under review or consideration.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT** (Chatsworth) (2.24 a.m.): This clause has worried me a great deal and I, too, look to the Premier for certain assurances. When I saw that there could be acquisition of land for the purpose of dealing with, among other things, civil strife I had reservations about it for two reasons. Firstly, I wondered whether a civil servant, senior and respected though he may be, should be able to act in the field of civil strife, which appears to be far removed from the aims of the Bill. Secondly, and more importantly, I wondered whether this clause would provide another means of controlling law-and-order problems if ever they arise again.

Honourable members will know that I stood alone against my Government colleagues when the state of emergency was declared. I did that not because I argued against the Government about the necessity to adopt a firm approach but because I felt that a state of emergency should be declared only under the direst circumstances. My attitude then, and now, is that matters of public order should be controlled, governed and spelt out in a specific Bill and not invoked under a section that is hidden away in an Act that ostensibly serves a completely different purpose.

After the Springbok problems I was so worried that, at Liberal Party branch level, I initiated discussions and subsequently fostered a resolution that went to the Liberal Party's Rockhampton conference in June of this year. That resolution was amalgamated with another containing similar sentiments from the Taringa branch of the Liberal Party. From the two resolutions, this final resolution flowed from the council records—

“That this Council:

(a) regrets that no other laws exist providing for compulsory temporary acquisition of property except under the state of emergency provisions of the Transport Act;

(b) urges the State Government to complement these provisions with a more restricted law providing for the

same purposes and for machinery for maintaining law and order for particular purposes in localised areas;

(c) that the Transport Act and such new legislation provide always for the special instituting procedures for maintaining law and order to be referred to Parliament within one week of its proclamation."

I agree with the sentiments expressed, although I think I would have worded them slightly differently if I had had greater influence on the conference's determinations.

Because of my worry about this matter and my great concern that things like this should be spelt out in a specific Act and not buried, I wanted certain assurances on this clause before indicating that I was prepared to support it. The assurances I have received are that under certain circumstances it could in fact be necessary for the Co-ordinator-General to acquire land that has been razed or damaged as a consequence of civil strife. In that context, and that context alone, I will support this provision, but I go on record in these terms: If ever this clause is used in my judgment for purely political purposes, away from the spirit of the Bill, I will find myself again in opposition to the Government, and I reserve my right to take such a stand.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (2.27 a.m.): There appears to be some confusion on this clause. The context of this legislation indicates a construction quite different from, and more restricted than, the proper construction of section 23 of the State Transport Act.

Nowhere here is there a reference to anything about a state of emergency. When the Bill is examined in its proper context—that is, as a State and regional planning and developmental Bill—on looking at this clause we see that the Co-ordinator-General may take—admittedly that means he may take by compulsory process—or otherwise acquire—that would mean by private treaty—land situated in a State development area. That presupposes that the area must have been declared by Order in Council as a State development area. On looking at the powers for taking land as they apply to the Co-ordinator-General, it is seen that land is acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act. For a start, that involves a 30-day delay while objections to the purposes for which the land is to be taken are examined. There are then the normal processes and, as we know, it is very difficult indeed to get the acquisition of land through in a short time.

I understand the fears raised by the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague the honourable member for Chatsworth, but when everything is examined in its proper context it will be seen that this action would take place as a result of civil strife, not prior to it, in anticipation of it, or in any other fashion.

I again return to the purposes of a State and regional planning and development Bill and point out that it must contain provisions to meet all circumstances that might possibly confront a State in its administration. Admittedly the chances of this arising are quite remote. Nevertheless, when we are making a major amendment to legislation of this form, I can see no reason why it should not be incorporated. At the same time, I feel sure that the Premier would be only too willing to give an undertaking that this clause would never be used, that it could not be used—in fact, legal interpretation would positively identify that it could not be used—in relation to a state of emergency.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (2.30 a.m.): As the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha has said, there are no political intentions of any kind in this clause. As he said, it deals with something as the result of civil strife where large areas could be destroyed or devastated, for instance, at a university or on a street, and somebody has to accept the responsibility and do something about it.

We have not experienced anything like this in Australia, but I, and possibly the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members, have seen in Japan, San Francisco and other places devastation of property during civil strife. It is necessary to have some body or organisation with the power to act, such as the body that it is intended to set up. This clause gives that body power to take the necessary action.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.32 a.m.): The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha and the Premier are not really convincing. The Premier did not deny that this power would ever be used. He said that certain things were likely to happen and he skirted around the question.

If what the honourable member for Chatsworth said is completely correct and this power will be used only if there is civil strife and buildings are damaged or the public need protection, it would not be a bad idea. But surely this would apply to any part of the State and not only to State development areas.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Would you agree with my sentiment that we should have a separate law-and-order Bill?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** If such a Bill was necessary, yes. But I might debate the necessity for it. I do not know whether the honourable member asked the question which became obvious to me as he spoke, namely: What if this happened in an area that had not already been declared a State development area? In such a case the Co-ordinator-General has no power. Has he power only in a State development area? No other clause gives him this power in other than a State development area.

**A Government Member:** He could declare the area at any time.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister for Transport said a State development area could be declared at any time. During the Springbok tour we had protest demonstrations and marches. The Government said that Ballymore Park was not suitable. In that case the area could be declared a State development area, and this clause provides that it is not necessary for any development to be going on. The Minister for Transport admitted—

**Mr. Knox:** Rot! You are talking absolute nonsense.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister said a moment ago that it could be declared a State development area at any time.

**Mr. Knox:** I haven't said anything at all.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister must talk in his sleep.

What if something happens in an area that has not been declared a State development area? Will the Premier answer that question?

**Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (2.35 a.m.):** The Opposition have been talking about safeguards. This seems to be a pattern; they want certain safeguards written into the Bill. This clause acts as a safeguard, because a State development area can be declared only by the Governor in Council.

**Mr. Houston:** How long would it take to declare an area if you were in a hurry?

**Mr. LICKISS:** How long does it take to get an Order in Council through in a hurry?

**Mr. Houston:** I suggest that what the Minister for Transport was mumbling about is correct.

**Mr. LICKISS:** Let us look at the position in the context of the Bill. Land can be taken by compulsory process, and the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act must be invoked. Under that Act, 30 days' notice of intention to resume must be served. All the normal processes have to be gone through. The land could be acquired by normal acquisition or treaty, and then one does not have to resort to the compulsory process. How long does it take to obtain land by either of these means?

**Mr. Houston:** You can take it overnight. You read the next page. It makes it clear that you cannot oppose the taking of it.

**Mr. LICKISS:** That is right, but the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act still have to be invoked, and under that Act 30 days' notice of intention to resume has to be given in the first instance.

**Mr. Houston:** It doesn't say that.

**Mr. LICKISS:** The honourable member has not gone far enough. He is supposed to have examined the Bill. He will later find out that when the Co-ordinator-General takes land, he has to take it under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act.

**Mr. Houston:** No, he has not.

**Mr. LICKISS:** I advise the Leader of the Opposition to look at the Bill. Does he suggest that he does not have to do that?

**Mr. Houston:** In substance he does not have to do that.

**Mr. LICKISS:** Then how does he take the land?

**Mr. Houston:** That's what I'm asking you.

**Mr. LICKISS:** The provisions of the Land Acquisition Act apply.

**Mr. Houston:** No, they do not.

**Mr. LICKISS:** It will be interesting to see what happens when we come to that clause.

The provision is quite clear. The first move is that a State development area is declared by Order in Council. That declaration entitles the Co-ordinator-General to take the action proposed under section 33. Quite frankly, there is a considerable time lag involved in such a taking.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (2.38 a.m.):** I shall reply briefly to the Leader of the Opposition. If, as a result of strife, an area was devastated and it was considered desirable to develop the area and do something with it, a development area would be declared. That is the answer to the honourable member's question.

Clause 53, as read, agreed to.

Clause 54, as read, agreed to.

Clause 55—User of land under approved development scheme—

**Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (2.39 a.m.):** As I indicated during the second reading, I am concerned about this clause as it currently reads because it takes from the individual his complete rights. I therefore move the following amendment—

“On page 19, after line 53, add the following words—

‘The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply in respect of a user of land found by the Local Government Court provided for by the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1969 to be a user that should not be permitted having regard to the situation of the land, the existence of a town plan or other regulatory scheme that affects the land, and the likely effect of the user on adjacent land in the locality.

The Local Government Court is required to hear and determine the matter referred to in the last preceding paragraph on the application of a Local Authority that exercises jurisdiction in respect of the land in question or of any person who has an estate or interest in land adjacent to that land and who claims his estate or interest is injuriously affected by the user complained of.

The Local Government Court constituted to hear and determine an application made to it under this section shall

have all the powers and jurisdiction conferred on it by the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1969 in relation to appeals to it under that Act and, in addition, the provisions of subsection (2) of section 28 of that Act shall apply to a determination of the court made under this section.’”

I believe that the Premier said at one stage that this is an administrative Bill and that its provisions were outside the jurisdiction of the courts. As the clause now stands, it seems to me to be designed specifically to assist major development companies in certain areas and also to assist wealthy developers in Brisbane to cut across the provisions of the City of Brisbane Town Plan. In fact, it is completely at variance with proper town planning principles.

We did not know that honourable members would be discussing the clauses of the Bill at 20 minutes to 3 in the morning, so only a few copies of my proposed amendment were circulated. It simply means that an individual person, organisation or local authority is given the normal right of appeal to the Local Government Court if the property concerned is removed from the provisions of a town plan. If an area alongside a property is rezoned, the owner of that property has the right to have his appeal against that change heard in the Local Government Court.

I had a good deal to say earlier about the Clutha Development Agreement Bill that was passed by the New South Wales Parliament, under which the people of Coalcliff, many of whom had built homes to take advantage of the beautiful view of the sea, found that they had been removed completely from the provisions of a town plan. I might say that the Bill, which was gagged through the New South Wales House by a Liberal Government in that State so that proper opposition could not be offered to it, said that Part 12A, I think it was, of the Local Government Act of New South Wales would not apply. In effect, the whole section dealing with planning and town planning under that Act was set aside completely by the Clutha Development Agreement Act.

Under the clause as it now stands, the Minister or his department may, at the request of a development company, set aside completely existing town planning legislation. That decision would become law, as if the decision had been properly made by a local authority. Surely that is a case of the Government taking away the rights of local authorities and the rights of individuals who have chosen to live in a certain zone under a town plan. I sound this note of warning. Town plans have to be approved by the Government before they become law. If the clause is given effect to, the local authority concerned will suddenly discover that it has lost its rights under its town-planning legislation. The reaction will be

similar to that in New South Wales to the Clutha Development Agreement Bill. Protesters will march.

Much has been said in this Chamber about law and order. I remind the Committee that in New South Wales the protesters were encouraged by no less a person than Sir Garfield Barwick, the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia and a very prominent member of the Liberal Party, and also by Mr. Edward St. John, another prominent member of the Liberal Party in New South Wales, who endeavoured to get rid of John Gorton when he was Prime Minister of Australia before Billy McMahon unseated him.

A big protest meeting was held on the issue and all the protesters could not squeeze into the Sydney Town Hall. There were nearly as many present as there were on the occasion of the visit of His Holiness the Pope. The strife that the Minister for Mines and Main Roads has with conservationists will be nothing compared with what will eventuate when people find that under the Bill they can and will be completely “de-town planned”.

At the second-reading stage I cited a specific example of a coal venture in my own area. The Pioneer Shire Council is doing the right thing and properly going into every aspect of planning to ensure that coal is stockpiled in areas where it will not affect people under the existing town plan. By an edict of this Government all of its planning could be completely wiped out.

Throughout the debate Government members have been trying to indicate that we on this side are objecting to regional planning. On the contrary, we are putting forward proposals that would improve the Bill. The proposed amendment would save the Government a lot of strife in the future from its own people who will object to their rights being taken away. We have heard from Liberal members particularly their thoughts and ideas on town planning. They have all been strong supporters of town planning. Unless they vote with us for the amendment, they will be cutting completely across anything they have ever said in the Chamber about town-planning.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (2.47 a.m.): I cannot accept the amendment. The formulation of a development scheme naturally would be done in consultation with local authorities. As there will be co-operation in this regard, there is no purpose in the amendment, as I see it.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (2.48 a.m.): I cannot accept the Premier's answer. Throughout the Bill there is no provision for the local authorities to have any say in this matter. In the preceding clauses, which deal with the taking of land for a development scheme, there is no provision that the local authority shall be consulted, that it shall

have the right to object, that it shall have the right to submit proposals or, indeed, that it shall have the right to do anything. The first words in the clause, "Notwithstanding the provision of any other Act", make it very clear. They certainly cover the Local Government Act. The provision cuts right across the existing provisions of town-planning legislation. There is no way that the Premier can duck out of that.

Question—That the words proposed to be added to clause 55 (Mr. Casey's amendment) be so added—put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 26

Baldwin	Melloy
Blake	Moore, F. P.
Bromley	Newton
Casey	O'Donnell
Davis	Thackeray
Dean	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Harris	Wood, P.
Houston	Wright
Inch	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jensen	Aiken
Jones, R.	Marginson
Jordan	

NOES, 31

Alison	Lonergan
Bird	Low
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Camm	Miller
Campbell	Moore, R. E.
Chinchen	Müller
Herbert	Newbery
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Rae
Hewitt, W. D.	Row
Hinze	Sullivan
Hodges	Tomkins
Houghton	Tooth
Hughes	
Kaus	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox	Ahern
Lane	Lickiss
Lee	

PAIRS:

Bennett	Armstrong
Bousen	Delamothe
Lloyd	Fletcher
Sherrington	Hungerford

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 55, as read, agreed to.

Clause 56, as read, agreed to.

Clause 57—Approval of certain works—

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (2.55 a.m.): Members of the Opposition have been trying to get something written into the Bill to give local authorities some right either to be referred to or to have some say. This clause can be a very dangerous one because under it a disagreeing council can be forced to borrow money to undertake work that it does not want to do or even is not allowed to do. Later clauses provide that project boards can be set up to do certain work and that local authorities have to pay for that work. As I said at the second-reading stage, a local authority can become merely a collector of precepts for various project boards, and it will be denied the opportunity of having any matter referred to it.

I suppose the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha will remind us that this provision is already in the Act introduced by Forgan

Smith. This is certainly true and he put it to good effect, as the Forgan Smith Bridge in Mackay was built by what was then called a Bridges Board, which was set up by the Pioneer Shire Council and the Mackay City Council and included representatives of both local authorities.

The clause does not contain these words, which appear in the existing Act—

"In the carrying-out of any such works as aforesaid the local body concerned shall consult with the Co-ordinator-General. . . . Before the making of any such order as aforesaid the Governor in Council may have regard to any representations which any local body concerned shall submit."

The only portion of the Bill that refers in any way to local authorities is in this clause, reading—

"If the Governor in Council is satisfied the words recommended should be undertaken by the local body or local bodies concerned he may, having regard to representations (if any) made in respect thereof by any local body concerned . . ."

I do not think the provision is spelt out clearly enough. However the Government has clearly shown that it is not greatly interested in including in the Bill any rights of local authorities.

**Mr. Houston:** Do you think the Minister for Local Government is greatly interested?

**Mr. CASEY:** He does not appear to be interested. He has not raised his voice once in this Bill. This would be one of the most important pieces of legislation affecting local authorities to be presented to Parliament for some time, and I should think the Minister for Local Government would be very interested in it, particularly as he voted against the last amendment. In fact, he voted in support of the Government having complete overriding powers in all town planning Acts and town plans. I sincerely hope he remembers that when all the objectors to town plans throughout the State come to him with their problems. If I find out who any of them are, I assure him that I will write to them about his stand so that they may know how he feels about their objections to town-planning problems before they present themselves to him.

The only opportunity that a local authority has of having a say under this clause, and other related clauses, is when it defaults in the borrowing of money, whereupon the Treasurer can force it to take over the commitment. The Premier has already indicated that the Treasurer may recover such moneys by filing suit in the Supreme Court against the local authority. That is the extent to which the Government is prepared to go to ensure that a local authority meets any commitment it may wish to enforce on it. The only way in which a local authority can have a say is by forcing the Government's hand by defaulting. If the Minister thinks it is warranted, the Governor in Council may direct that the issue be

heard by such person or persons as may be appointed under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. A local authority would have to be extremely desperate to have its voice properly heard by the Government.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton South) (3.2 a.m.): As the member for Mackay said, this provision was included in the original legislation, but I point out that the role of local government has changed considerably since 1938. In those days they were more concerned with housekeeping duties and the provision of roads and lighting. Today they carry heavy burdens in caring for libraries and cities, and in providing land for sporting clubs. They also carry a great part of the financial burden of National Fitness groups throughout the State. This clause will add to their burden.

Local governments face a steadily mounting debt of many millions of dollars. This clause will make their position worse by providing that the Co-ordinator-General may simply order them to carry out certain works. In Britain the Government is trying to do something to help local authorities, and about 60 per cent. of their funds are provided by way of direct grant. I am sure that only a very minute percentage of local government expenditure in Queensland is granted by the State Government. It is a pity that, under this legislation, we are adding to the burdens of local governments, and it further substantiates my contention that the future of local governments in Queensland is a very dismal one under the present Government.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.4 a.m.): I might say that the honourable member for Rockhampton South is becoming political, although perhaps some honourable members opposite might accuse me of that. If I had the time to make a comparison between the position of local authorities today and that of local authorities in olden days, I am sure it would be very interesting for the honourable member, who is quite a young new member and perhaps does not know all the background of local authority activity over the years.

Under this clause, the Governor in Council cannot order any local body to do certain work unless he first has regard to representations from that local body. That is the basis on which this clause will be applied.

Clause 57, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 58 to 69, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 70—Project Boards—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.6 a.m.): I have frequently said that this Bill is consistent in its inconsistencies. Certain boards and councils are to be established, and their members are to have certain requirements. However, there is little safeguard for public money when decisions are made to undertake certain work. It has often been said that

99.9 per cent of the people are honest and honourable. However, companies still go "broke", secretaries do the wrong thing, and policemen go bad. There are many examples of individuals doing the wrong thing. One of the aims in legislation has been not to put temptation in the way. Another aim is to pay a sufficiently high salary so that the recipient will have no desire to do the wrong thing. I have no fight with those aims.

According to the Premier, project boards are an important part of this set-up. They will comprise experts in the various fields of the project. Those experts, under the Co-ordinator-General, will be the administrative heads of that project. The Co-ordinator-General or his representative will be chairman of the board. The other members of the board will be people who the Co-ordinator-General or the Governor in Council decides will work in the best interests of the State or the project. They are very honourable provisions. However, there will be no restriction on the activities of the four or more persons who will be selected. They could have an interest in a company that is dealing directly with a project board. Under another clause, a project board is given power similar to that given to the Co-ordinator-General to do the work.

To ensure that these persons are restricted in their activities, I have endeavoured to frame an amendment in line with the disqualifications relating to the Co-ordinator-General and his deputy. It could be argued that we are getting down to a list of public servants, but these people need not be public servants. In reply to a question by the Premier as to the Opposition's attitude to people holding shares in companies, I said, "It depends on how much contact they have with those who are working for the Crown" or, in this case, working for the project board.

I therefore move the following amendment—

"On page 23, after line 43, insert the following words—

'A person is not qualified to be appointed as a member of a Project Board if, otherwise than as a member of a body corporate that consists of at least twenty members, he has a pecuniary interest in the undertaking of the works in respect of which the board is or is to be established, or is likely to benefit financially from any contract that is likely to be made for the purposes of such work or any part thereof.'

It is no use crying after the event. As the Premier said, he does not inquire into the shareholdings of public servants. I dare say that in appointments to project boards no inquiry may be made about the shareholdings or activities of persons wanted on a board. That would be rather lax but, according to what the Premier said earlier, it is possible. There is no safeguard against the thought

that a member of a project board may be getting a rake-off from his membership of it. Surely laws have to be framed so that no board members can be tempted to make use of the positions that they hold.

We are not asking that there be any alteration to the membership of boards, or that there be any restriction on the right of the Governor in Council to select persons deemed fit to be members. All that we ask is that the Governor in Council have the obligation to satisfy himself on certain matters concerning persons considered for board membership, and also to see that, after selection, members do certain things. It must be remembered that these persons will be selected for a term of three years, and that they will be in receipt of some financial gain. The amendment is moved in the interests of strengthening the Bill, and for no other reason.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.13 a.m.): I am prepared to accept the amendment. I assure him, however, that it deals with a precaution that naturally would have been taken. On the other hand, I cannot refrain from at least making a couple of pertinent remarks.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke a moment ago of certain inconsistencies. The thought came to my mind that here he has shown that he does not mind a member of a project board being interested financially in the undertakings of the board, or benefiting financially from a contract made in the performance of the board's undertakings. This is quite inconsistent with the attitude that he adopted earlier towards public servants at the higher level, even if their only interest was as shareholders in a public company. His present stand is not consistent with his attitude to the Co-ordinator-General being a shareholder in a public company. All I can say is that it seems that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. Because of the attitude expressed earlier by the Leader of the Opposition, I could not help but feel entitled to make those remarks.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.14 a.m.): Naturally, the Premier is entitled to say what he has just said. However, let me make the position clear. As the Premier knows, courtesy to Parliament, and certainly to the Premier as its leader, demands that amendments be framed having in mind what one imagines will happen. One has in the back of one's mind the thought that an amendment can be changed at any time before one finally moves it. I assure the Premier that if the Opposition had succeeded in having its earlier amendment relative to the Co-ordinator-General agreed to, the reference to a body corporate would not have appeared in the amendment I have now submitted. Having regard to the numbers, I expected that

the earlier amendment would not be agreed to. I thank the Premier for accepting the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Houston) agreed to.

Clause 70, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 71, as read, agreed to.

Clause 72—Termination of membership of board—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.16 a.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 24, after line 16, add the following paragraph—

'(f) if he becomes disqualified from being appointed as a member of the board by reason of subsection (3) of section 70 of this Act.'

This is a consequential amendment.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.17 a.m.): As I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, I am happy to accept the amendment. It depends on the acceptance of the previous amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Houston) agreed to.

Clause 72, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 73 to 77, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 78—Power of Co-ordinator-General to take land—

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (3.18 a.m.): The Leader of the Opposition protested against the Co-ordinator-General's taking land in a certain way. I pointed out to him at the time that there were two methods by which the Co-ordinator-General could take land. He could take it by acquisition, which virtually is by treaty, or he could take it by a compulsory process.

He will see that the clause states quite clearly that the Co-ordinator-General has to use the machinery provided under the Acquisition of Land Act, and that slows down the process about which the honourable gentleman was concerned.

Clause 78, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 79 to 85, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 86—Undertaking private works—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.19 a.m.): I wish to refer to this clause because it relates to an amendment that I shall move at a later stage. The clause states—

"(1) The Government of the State may enter into an agreement with any person that private works agreed on by them shall be undertaken by the Co-ordinator-General on such terms and conditions as are provided in the agreement.

"(2) The Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, authorize the Co-ordinator-General to undertake works agreed by the Government of the State (whether

under the preceding subsection or otherwise) to be undertaken by him and the Co-ordinator-General is hereby empowered to undertake those works as authorized works subject to and in accordance with the Order in Council and the material agreement."

As I pointed out earlier, the Co-ordinator-General would only come into works of some magnitude. I have no fight with the Government doing certain work under a water-tight agreement with private enterprise, if it is part of the development scheme. I suppose that one could find many examples of work carried out in that manner. The point I wish to make is that the agreement is made between the Co-ordinator-General and the company, and agreed to by the Governor in Council only, not by this Parliament. We have had arguments on both sides of the Chamber about it not being wise to put all the power in the hands of the Executive, and that Parliament should have a say on important matters. I am glad to see that some of the ginger group are here. I am sorry that the honourable members for Clayfield and Toowong have gone home, but that is their business.

The point is that the final approval of the agreement will be given by Order in Council. Under normal conditions one would say that that was fair enough. Even though there would not be a debate on the agreement in the Chamber, at least we would have an opportunity to object. But a subsequent clause lays it down clearly that Orders in Council under the Bill will not come before Parliament. They will not be debated by Parliament because there will be no opportunity for them to come before Parliament. I do not want to deal with that clause at this stage, but in such a case, when an agreement has been made, it is approved completely by Order in Council, and is there any financial limit for an agreement that is made between the Crown, through the Co-ordinator-General, and a private company? Would there be a limit of a few thousand dollars or could it be a deal extending to many millions of dollars?

Clause 86, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 87 to 91, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 92—Expenses of works—

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.23 a.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 31, lines 6 and 7, omit the words—

'90. Expenses of works. (1) When works are undertaken by the Co-ordinator-General—'

and insert in lieu thereof the words—

'92. Expenses of works. (1) When works are undertaken by the Co-ordinator-General or a Project Board—'

This was a mistake in printing. The figure "90" should be "92". Clause 61 provides for

"Procedure on local body's default". It authorises the Co-ordinator-General or a project board to commence or complete the works. The phrase "Or a Project Board" is now included in clause 92 to make it consistent.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.25 a.m.): I have no objection to what the Premier is trying to do, namely, to use one clause to cover two bodies that could be involved in the expenditure—the Co-ordinator-General and the project board—but I think that the insertion of the words, "or a project board" in line 7 will cause further complications later in the clause. I suggest to the Premier that if he looks further down in the clause he will see that it may be necessary to add the words "or a project board" in line 17.

At line 12 this clause reads—

"the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, require the local body or Department or person concerned to pay to the Treasurer of Queensland, at such time or times and on such terms and conditions as specified in the Order the whole or a proportion, specified in the order, of the costs and expenses incurred by or on behalf of the Co-ordinator-General in connection with the works."

It is a moot point whether the Co-ordinator-General and a project board are one and the same thing. I do not think they are because the clause dealing with the project board covers the right of the board to borrow money and the right of a local authority in connection with financial arrangements. The money should not be paid into the Treasury but to the project board because the debt would be due to it. It is perhaps logical to extend the heading of the clause to cover a project board, but unless there is another amendment later on in the clause, the money remaining over could go straight to the Treasurer and not be retained by the project board. And there are no provisions in the Bill for the transference of such money from the Treasury back to the project board. I ask the Premier to look at that.

Amendment (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.27 a.m.): I move the further following amendment:—

"On page 31, line 17, after the word 'Co-ordinator-General' insert the words— 'or a Project Board'."

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.28 a.m.): We will accept that.

Amendment (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Clause 92, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 93, as read, agreed to.

Clause 94—Subsidies or Treasury loans for works—

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (3.30 a.m.): I move—

"On page 31, line 35, omit the word— 'may'

and insert in lieu thereof the word—  
‘shall’.”

By way of explanation, whichever way we look at it, the repayment of finances obtained by project boards will be made by the ratepayers in the areas concerned. Of course, the local authorities will be paying the precepts to the project boards. The clause provides that the Treasurer may grant a subsidy. The people who are paying, that is, the ratepayers, are entitled to receive a central government subsidy through the project boards just as they receive a subsidy through the local authority. The clause provides that this shall be done as if such works were being undertaken by a local authority.

I should like to correct a fallacy about subsidies. It cannot be denied that in this State the subsidies granted to local authorities have been downgraded by this Government. I accept the fact that the volume of subsidy in 1971 may be greater than that in 1961, 1951, or even earlier; however, the percentage is less now than it was previously. Local authorities are now required to meet a greater proportion of costs from their own revenue than in previous years.

The amendment is a simple one and it will merely give ratepayers the same rights as those enjoyed by them when they are paying through their local authorities.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (3.33 a.m.): The amendment is not quite as simple as the honourable member for Mackay would have us believe. The clause might be described as an empowering clause. It will allow the ordinary processes of Government finance to take their normal course. This proposal empowers the Treasurer to expend moneys that he may not have and be able to expend. That matter should be taken into account. I do not think the amendment will achieve what the honourable member hopes it will achieve; on the contrary, it may be somewhat restrictive and unavoidable.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (3.34 a.m.): I shall address my remarks to the Premier because he is more conversant than the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha with the financial responsibilities of the State. The honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha claimed that the clause would be a compelling clause. That is the general idea. It is not entirely correct for him to say that this is a financial allocation for the expenditure of money that may not otherwise be expended, because as I understand the Bill the project boards will be set up only when certain local authorities are either unable or not prepared to undertake the work.

Once the project boards are set up, the local authorities have to accept financial responsibility for the work that is done. Even if they want to default in their financial responsibility, they are brought back again under this clause. Treasury loans for works are entirely different from borrowings by the Co-ordinator-General. The last portion

of the clause distinctly says, “as if such works were being undertaken by a local authority”. If the works were undertaken by the local authority, the cost would be met by the ratepayers and, if subsidy applied, they would in fact receive it. I therefore feel that in this clause the word “shall” should be substituted for the word “may”.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.36 a.m.): The honourable member wants to insert the word “shall” to provide something concrete. I am quite sure that if he were the Treasurer or the Premier, his attitude would be completely different. This clause is designed to empower the Treasurer to expend moneys if he so wishes, or if he can. I do not think anyone would want to write into a clause a word that would, in effect, compel the Treasurer to expend certain moneys that he may not be able to spend or have available. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted from clause 94 (Mr. Casey’s amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 31

Ahern	Lickiss
Alison	Loneragan
Bird	Low
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Camm	Müller
Campbell	Moore, R. E.
Chinchen	Newbery
Herbert	Rae
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Row
Hewitt, W. D.	Sullivan
Hinze	Tomkins
Hodges	Tooth
Houghton	
Kaus	
Knox	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lane	Hughes
Lee	Müller

NOES, 26

Aiken	Marginson
Baldwin	Melloy
Blake	Newton
Bromley	O’Donnell
Casey	Thackeray
Davis	Tucker
Dean	Wallis-Smith
Hanlon	Wood, B.
Hanson	Wood, P.
Harris	Wright
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Inch	Jensen
Jones, R.	Moore, F. P.
Jordan	

PAIRS:

Armstrong	Bennett
Delamothe	Bousen
Fletcher	Lloyd
Hungerford	Sherrington

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 94, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 95 to 103, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 104—Power to obtain material from watercourse—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.44 a.m.): This clause does not indicate in any way that any private contract, treaty, or lease already granted by the Crown to any individual or company will

not be interfered with. It does not stipulate that it applies only to land not already covered. Many other clauses which have already been passed set out that the Co-ordinator-General has power to take land, chattels, goods, and many other things. The material required by the Co-ordinator-General to carry out a project should be made available to him if at all possible. I am considering a case in which a contractor or company has the right to mine and sell river material, particularly gravel and stone. Even if a contractor's claim is interfered with, it might be said that he can apply for, and be given, compensation for the sand and gravel taken by the Crown, the Co-ordinator-General, or the board. But what about others who had contracts with, or relied upon, the person who held the original lease? They, too, might have projects under way, and where will they then obtain supplies of sand and gravel to continue their jobs?

If this situation cannot be covered in the Bill, I ask the Premier if something could be done by means of regulations to ensure that those who have contracts with the original supplier do not have their activities interfered with.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.46 a.m.): A situation such as that envisaged by the Leader of the Opposition could arise at some time or other, but I would assume that in those circumstances the contractor concerned would naturally be compensated if his lands were to be used by the Co-ordinator-General.

**Mr. Houston:** He would be, but what about the people with whom he had contracted for the supply of sand and gravel? They may have projects under way.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is extending compensation along the line quite a considerable way. I should think that the compensation would be sufficient to enable the original leaseholder to fulfil his contracts from a source of supply elsewhere. There would obviously be other places from which sand and gravel could be obtained. It may have to be carted a longer distance, but I am quite sure that in the over-all scheme of compensation this situation would be covered.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.47 a.m.): I take it that if this clause is not sufficient to meet the situation, a suitable regulation will be made?

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.48 a.m.): I am sure that such a contingency would be covered, and that the persons concerned would be protected. That is sure.

Clause 104, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 105 to 118, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 119—Publication of Orders in Council—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.49 a.m.): In the original Act, section 31, which later became section 36 after an amendment, reads—

“(1. All Proclamations, Orders in Council, and regulations made or purporting to be made under this Act shall be published in the Gazette and shall upon such publication be of the same effect as if they were enacted in this Act and shall be judicially noticed, and shall not be questioned in any proceedings whatsoever.”

Naturally, the Opposition has no fight with that. The section continues—

“The publication in the Gazette of any such Proclamation, Order in Council, or regulation shall be conclusive evidence of the power and authority to make same and of all matters contained therein.”

Section 31 (2.) reads—

“All such Proclamations, Orders in Council, and regulations shall be laid before Parliament forthwith, if then sitting; and, if not then sitting, within fourteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.”

Then follows the usual coverage about debating such matters within 14 sitting days, and so on.

Clause 119 provides—

“Publication of Orders in Council: Every Order in Council made for the purposes of this Act shall be published in the Gazette.”

**Mr. Chinchin:** We amended the Acts Interpretation Act to make it unnecessary to do this on every occasion.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is all right, but I wish to have recorded in “Hansard” that that applies in this instance.

**Mr. Hanlon:** The amendment to the Acts Interpretation Act applied only to regulations, not to Orders in Council.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Orders in Council are mentioned here.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** If the honourable member for Mount Gravatt will listen for a moment, he will understand that the clause says that every Order in Council made for the purposes of this Act shall be published in the Gazette—nothing else. It does not say that it shall be laid before Parliament, and there is no reference in it to regulations. The original Act referred to Orders in Council, proclamations and regulations. As the honourable member for Barooka pointed out, there is no need to mention regulations in the Bill because they are covered by the recent amendment to the Acts Interpretation Act.

**Mr. Chinchin:** That is the point I am making.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The honourable member mentioned Orders in Council.

**Mr. Chinchin:** They are covered in the Bill.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** They are not covered in the Bill as far as coming before Parliament is concerned.

**Mr. Chinchin:** They have to be gazetted.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Only gazetted, and the Gazette does not come before Parliament.

**Mr. Chinchin:** I am not arguing with you on that point.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The only point I am arguing is whether or not an Order in Council should come before Parliament. Regulations come before Parliament.

We have already approved certain clauses of the Bill under which decisions may be made by Order in Council. One of those is clause 86, which deals with the undertaking of private works. I asked the Premier when the clause was being discussed whether he would give the Committee some indication of the value of the work. It is obvious that the Crown, through the Co-ordinator-General, could be carrying out on behalf of private enterprise work valued at many millions of dollars. Formerly, when the Crown has been involved in building a railway, say, or in providing houses, a separate Bill has come before Parliament. Perhaps one could argue that in cases such as this, as there is a project board and the Co-ordinator-General, and as Cabinet considers it, there is no need to have a separate Act, that an agreement is all that is needed. That might be sufficient in some cases, but surely Parliament should at least have the right to pass judgment on an agreement involving millions of dollars of public money. Surely we are not going to allow, as the Bill proposes, the Executive Council alone to decide whether or not an agreement is good or bad.

We are all realistic enough to know that once the Government agrees to something and on Order in Council is issued, it is not likely that the Opposition can object successfully to it. However, on other occasions Bills have been brought forward with confidence and have been defeated, and tonight it would have needed only three Government members to show their real worth for some of the amendments proposed by the Opposition to be carried. So, on behalf of the Opposition, I move the following amendment—

“On page 39, after line 30, add the following words—

‘Every such Order in Council shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly within 14 sitting days after its publication in the Gazette if the Assembly is in session and, if not, then within 14 sitting days after the commencement of its next session.

If the Legislative Assembly disallows an Order in Council by resolution of which notice has been given at any time within 14 sitting days after the

order has been laid before it that Order in Council shall thereupon cease to have effect but without prejudice to the validity of anything done or omitted thereunder in the meantime or to the making of a further Order in Council.’”

What we are proposing is to insert in the Bill the necessary provision that was in the original Act, and to allow the Acts Interpretation Act to look after the regulations.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.56 a.m.): There is a difference between Orders in Council made under the old Act and under this Bill. Under the Bill the Orders in Council are administrative in nature and not of a legislative nature, as are measures that come before Parliament for debate. They do not provide for rights and obligations. Because of that, I cannot accept the amendment.

My advisers tell me that if the amendment was restricted to Orders in Council under clause 86, it could be accepted.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.57 a.m.): I helped the Premier with an earlier amendment and put the record straight. Therefore, I do not think there is anything wrong with the Premier allowing the amendment to be slightly altered to make it apply particularly to Orders in Council under clause 86. I have no objection to the Premier moving that amendment to my amendment. It is completely wrong that contracts of such a magnitude can be entered into without reference to Parliament, thus giving Parliament the chance, even if it is a loaded Parliament, to put its seal of approval on them. If, because of what his advisers have told him, it is the desire of the Premier that the amendment apply only to Orders in Council under clause 86, I am quite happy to have it that way.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (3.58 a.m.): Actually, the Orders in Council cover a little more than administrative provisions. The Premier said that the Orders in Council were only administrative. I do not accept that. The Orders in Council that will be issued will cover the setting-up of additional Government instrumentalities such as developmental areas, co-ordinating councils and project boards. I refer to the financial provisions on page 31 of the Bill, under which Orders in Council can be issued to cover the spending of considerable sums of money by the Government, by project boards or by Government instrumentalities. This morning the Premier tabled an Order in Council under the Greenvale Agreement Act authorising the Government to increase from \$43,000,000 to \$50,000,000 its guarantee to the companies involved. That is a difference of a cool \$7,000,000 of governmental commitment under an Order in Council.

**Mr. Houston:** The Premier is prepared to accept the amendment.

**Mr. CASEY:** That is very good news.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (4.1 a.m.): On second thoughts, and after a discussion with my officers, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Houston) agreed to.

Clause 119, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 120 to 122, both inclusive, and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

The House adjourned at 4.3 a.m. (Wednesday).