

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1974**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1974

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. H. Lonergan, Flinders) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

MR. VAOVASAMANAIA R. P. PHILLIPS, M.L.A.  
(WESTERN SAMOA)

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members: I have much pleasure in extending a welcome to Mr. Vaovasamanaia R. P. Phillips, member of the Legislative Assembly of Western Samoa and an Australasian Regional Representative of the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

### MINISTERIAL EXPENSES

#### RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 1 August last, on the motion of Mr. Miller, of expenses of Ministers for the period 1 July 1973 to 30 June 1974, inclusive, showing each separately and in detail.

### PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Agent-General for Queensland for the year 1973-74.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

District Courts Act 1967-1972.

The Magistrates Courts Acts 1921 to 1964.

The Supreme Court Act of 1921.

Collections Act 1966-1973.

Water Act 1926-1973.

Harbours Act 1955-1972.

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

Forestry Act 1959-1974.

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1973.

Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1973.

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

Rules and Regulations under the Cemetery Act 1865.

Report of the Queensland Coal Board of its financial accounts for the year 1973-1974.

(A) Proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as a State Forest of all that piece or part of State Forest 302, parishes of Athlone, Ballon, Bembil, Brownlie, Buchan, Burraburri, Cooaga, Coondarra, Delger, Goldsmith, Hookwood, MacDonald, Malcolm, Nudley, Pelham, Quandong, Warranna and Wongongera, described as Area "A" in the parish of Warranna, as shown on plan FTY.651 made and prepared by the Surveyor-General and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of 187 hectares—under the Forestry Act 1959-1974.

(B) A brief explanation of the proposal.

### QUESTION UPON NOTICE

#### IWASAKI PROJECT, YEPPON AREA

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

(1) Concerning the proposed Iwasaki project near Yeppoon, as he has indicated that Iwasaki Sangyo Pty. Ltd. is not qualified to hold tenures on leasehold lands in Grazing Farm No. 8815 and Perpetual Lease Selection No. 8666, was the company notified of this at the time the plans were submitted and, if not, why were Government departments involved in unnecessary preparation and expense on a plan which could not be implemented?

(2) Why has the Co-ordinator-General's Department called for submissions and planned a public enquiry on a plan which cannot become operational under present land tenure?

(3) As a significant area of the leases should be maintained as a buffer zone to protect the Corio Bay Habitat Reserve, has the company been given any indication that a developmental lease could be declared on any of the land?

(4) As the vacant Crown land on Sandy Point is a narrow and fragile strip of coastal dunes lying in front of an estuary declared a marine habitat reserve, will he consider declaring this land as a reserve protected from development?

(5) Is it intended to maintain Public Landing Reserve 11 on Fishing Creek and the present surveyed public access road, for use by the general public?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "Although in terms of the Land Act a company or corporation, as such, cannot hold a Grazing Selection or a Perpetual Lease Selection, it does not necessarily follow that the scheme advanced by Iwasaki Sangyo Co. (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. could not be implemented. The company was made aware of the provisions of the Land Act in early discussions. The special inter-Departmental Committee convened by the Co-ordinator-General at the direction

of Cabinet, has already heard public submissions and its examination in effect is of the whole conceptual scheme advanced by the company. I understand that the Committee is endeavouring to make a report to Cabinet within the next six to eight weeks. The scheme area covers a variety of land tenure including freehold and reserved and vacant land. The fact that some of the lands involved cannot presently be held by a company is considered at this stage to be incidental only to the whole proposal."

(3 and 4) "I am not clear as to what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition means in his reference to the declaration of a development lease on any of the land but nothing has been indicated to the company as to any possible requirements or result in respect of its proposal. I feel sure the investigating Committee will have full regard to any effect the Scheme might have on Corio Bay and Sandy Point, and the need for any protection of those areas."

(5) "The conceptual plan would indicate that Landing Reserve R.11 will be retained but the maintenance of public access to Corio Bay would be an important consideration in any scheme which might eventuate."

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### ALLOCATION OF PETROL TAX UNDER PROPOSED COMMONWEALTH ROADS ACT

**Mr. NEWBERRY:** I ask the Minister for Mines and Main Roads: Is he aware that under the proposed Commonwealth Roads Act the allocation paid to the States, which at one time under the old Act was approximately 70 per cent of the petrol tax, will be reduced to less than 50 per cent?

Further, will he advise the House what effect financially this reduction will have on the States and how he anticipates the Federal Government will dispense with the balance of the fuel tax it retains?

**Mr. CAMM:** It is true that under the proposed Commonwealth Act the allocation of the petrol tax will be reduced to less than 50 per cent of the amount collected by the Commonwealth. Following the imposition of an extra 5c a gallon, the amount collected is, of course, far in excess of what was previously collected and the 50 per cent will constitute a larger sum than we have previously received; but if one applies an inflationary trend of at least 15 per cent a year over the three-year period, one can see that the amount that will be received will be less in value than the allocations in the previous three years. Consequently, the new formula will have a very adverse effect on the financing of the Queensland roads programme during the next three years.

##### THREATENED BLACK BAN ON YABULU NICKEL TREATMENT PLANT

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I ask the Premier: Is he aware of a threat by the Townsville Trades and Labor Council to impose a black ban on the Yabulu nickel treatment plant if an effluent pipeline is laid to Halifax Bay? Is he also aware that the Townsville Trades and Labor Council is claiming that the Greenvale nickel project gained exemption from the provisions of the Clean Waters Act? Further, is he aware that a campaign of sabotage is being carried out at Yabulu to back up the demands of the militant element at the project and in the Trades and Labor Council?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Yes, I have seen reports that the Trades and Labor Council, with whom the Leader of the Opposition is in close association, has threatened to impose a black ban on the Yabulu nickel treatment plant if a pipeline is laid to Halifax Bay.

Let me say at the outset that there is a deliberate campaign of sabotage under way at the plant to try to enforce the demands of the militant element on the project. These are the people Mr. Egerton was talking about when he referred to union anarchy. They follow the principles of Mr. Jack Munday, the Communist Party leader, in trying to seize so-called worker control of the Yabulu plant, not in any campaign to improve wages or conditions, but purely for political purposes.

What we are seeing is a power struggle within the Townsville Trades and Labor Council. This militant element has claimed that the Yabulu plant was exempted from the provisions of the Clean Waters Act. This is not true. The Greenvale Agreement Act contained no such exemption and the companies in the project, as we know, were required to have carried out an environmental impact study. That study was made by a firm approved by the Water Quality Control Council, namely, Water and Trade Wastes Pty. Ltd. After considering its report, the Water Quality Control Council issued a licence for the pipeline. In addition, the Queensland Government made a grant of \$60,000 to the James Cook University in Townsville for a study of the effects of metal wastes in tropical waters.

This is a very serious matter. I appreciate that the honourable member representing the area has seen fit to have these matters brought to the surface so that everybody in Townsville will know what is happening there.

In an effort to back up the demands by the militant elements, there has been a deliberate campaign of sabotage at Yabulu.

Sea-water has been put into machinery sumps, sand has been put into bearings, lift wiring has been torn out and cut and lubrication lines have been punctured in hundreds of places with a hammer and nails. Members

of the militant element should remember that they are jeopardising the 800 jobs that the Greenvale project is providing for miners, railwaymen and other workers. At a time when unemployment is becoming serious, they should think carefully, because it is their fellow workers who will suffer if the project closes.

**A.L.P. ATTITUDE TO ARRIVAL OF NAZIS IN BRISBANE**

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I ask the Minister for Justice: Has his attention been drawn to an article, accompanied by photographs, which appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of Saturday 14 September, dealing with, and depicting, Nazis arriving in Brisbane? If so, in view of their policy of violence and armed destruction of the Australian way of life, can he inform the House if the Leader of the Opposition or any member of the A.L.P. has made representations to him on the matter, or made any critical statement to the media?

**Mr. KNOX:** I am not aware that, over the week-end, A.L.P. members were interested in the Nazis, and I certainly received no representations from them. Probably they were more concerned about warding off the blows being levelled at them by their president.

**NEW RAIL TERMINAL AT ACACIA RIDGE**

**Mr. R. JONES:** I ask the Minister for Transport: With reference to his statement to the House last Thursday claiming that the Federal Minister for Transport had not advised him in advance of an announcement about an Australian Government initiative for the multi-million dollar rail terminal at Acacia Ridge, as a letter outlining the details of the proposal was delivered to a senior officer of his department before the announcement and as his office received a copy of the letter by telex message to Brisbane at 12.30 p.m. on the day of the Press conference at which the announcement was made at 3.15 p.m., will he withdraw his incorrect statement that the Federal Minister (Mr. Jones) was discourteous in not advising him of the proposal?

**Mr. K. W. HOOPER:** I most certainly will not withdraw my statement, because the information I gave to the House was entirely correct.

**PROPOSAL FOR NIGHT COURSING, REDBANK**

**Mr. HINZE:** I ask the Treasurer, the Minister in charge of racing: Has his attention been drawn to a reported statement by the Federal Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) that land at Redbank will be made available to the Gabba Greyhound Racing Club for the purpose of conducting night coursing and also that he would support an approach to the Commonwealth Government for an amount of approximately \$400,000? If the report is accurate,

is it in keeping with the mismanagement of Australia's economic affairs in that an amount of some \$400,000 could be made available for night coursing?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** I have no knowledge of \$400,000 being made available by the Commonwealth Government for night coursing in this State, nor do I know of any approach relative thereto. It is a fact that there has been some speculation in the Ipswich area about the establishment of a night coursing track at Redbank, and I know that the Federal Minister for Health is himself interested in that undertaking. I point out to the House that a provisional licence was granted to a club that was formed in Ipswich, to operate at the Ipswich show-ground. Ultimately it was found that that club could not raise sufficient finance to ensure the establishment of that track and consequently the provisional licence was withdrawn.

Following that withdrawal, a number of businessmen in Ipswich, supported by Mr. Hayden, made representations to the Commonwealth Government to have portion of the old rifle range at Redbank made available for the establishment of a coursing track. The Gabba Greyhound Racing Club was, I believe, to sponsor that project. Beyond those moves, I know of no similar activity at Ipswich. On the other hand, it is true that an application has been received from the Southport club for the establishment of a night coursing track at the Southport trotting grounds and that application is now being considered by the board. I indicate to the House that I believe that the Southport club will be the next to receive a licence in this State, and I regard Southport as a more suitable place for night coursing than Redbank. If a licence were granted for Redbank, there would be two night coursing tracks in close proximity to the metropolitan area.

**ATTITUDE OF YOUNG LABOR ASSOCIATION TO LEGALISATION OF MARIJUANA**

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I ask the Minister for Health: Will he inform the House whether any approaches have been made to him by the Queensland branch of the Young Labor Association to have the drug marijuana produced and marketed by the State Government? Is he aware that certain members of the A.L.P. have advocated that school-children should be given the opportunity of sampling marijuana and other drugs?

**Mr. TOOTH:** The Young Labor Association has not approached me on any matter at all. Why, I don't know, but I suppose it has nothing worth while to approach me about. As to the request for the legalisation of marijuana, it is merely seeking an indication of the Government's attitude, and of course the Government is very strongly opposed to any suggestion of the legalisation of this very dangerous drug.

REBUILDING OF DELANEY RIVER RAILWAY  
BRIDGE

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** In directing a question to the Premier I remind him that I asked several questions seeking the reopening of the Einasleigh-Forsyth section of the Etheridge railway line and also successfully approached Dr. Rex Patterson for financial assistance to rebuild the Delaney River bridge. In addition to these efforts I made a plea in my Address-in-Reply speech and also sought to direct attention, in the debate on Matters of Public Interest, to the need to save this line. I now ask the Premier: When was it decided to agree to rebuild the bridge, and was it a Cabinet decision? Will any funds from the Australian Government be used for this work and, if so, to what extent?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The decision was made by the Government and me and I announced it to the people up there the other day.

**Mr. Wallis-Smith:** But not to me.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** No, not to the honourable member. I deal directly with the people. I went up there to see these people, on what the Leader of the Opposition described as a junket. I told the people up there what the Labor Party thought of my efforts on their behalf. The matter of the Commonwealth contribution is being dealt with.

FORM OF QUESTION

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) having given notice of three questions—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! In relation to the second question directed by the honourable member to the "relevant Minister", to use his words, I inform him that it is not the responsibility of the clerks at the table to direct questions to the appropriate Ministers. The onus is on the honourable member who asks a question to ascertain the Minister to whom he should direct it.

ORDER IN CHAMBER DURING  
QUESTION TIME

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumba) having given notice of a question—

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. Frawley:** Why don't you shut up, you Communist. You ask your filthy questions, but you don't like it when we do it. Keep your mouth shut for a change.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Wright:** This man should not be abusing other members.

**Mr. Frawley** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Murrumba will cease interjecting or I shall deal with him.

**Mr. Frawley:** I have been provoked.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** And he will be sent out if he persists.

SEWERAGE, WATER SUPPLY AND  
GASFITTING ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Sewerage, Water Supply and Gasfitting Act of 1949 as subsequently amended in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

SOMERSET DAM CATCHMENT AREA  
DECLARATORY BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity): 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 with respect to the payment of rates made and levied in respect of certain lands within the Somerset Dam catchment area and with respect to the liability of holders of such lands in connection with such rates."

Motion agreed to.

CONTRACTORS' TRUST ACCOUNTS  
BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Minister for Justice): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to make provision for the establishment and management of trust accounts by contractors and matters connected therewith."

Motion agreed to.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Minister for Justice): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the limitation of actions."

Motion agreed to.

WINE INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL

## THIRD READING

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

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' CO-OPERATIVE  
ASSOCIATIONS ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL

## THIRD READING

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

LAND SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL (No. 2)

## THIRD READING

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

## AGE OF MAJORITY BILL

## THIRD READING

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

COMMONWEALTH PLACES (ADMINIS-  
TRATION OF LAWS) ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

## THIRD READING

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

GREENVALE AGREEMENT ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

## SECOND READING

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.8 p.m.): I move—

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

The issue contained in this Bill is not contentious. The principal Act provides for perhaps the most important single development in North Queensland in recent years. The Greenvale nickel mining and treatment project will provide a large number of jobs for miners and railway employees and those engaged in nickel processing and administration. In addition, a significant level of new employment will be generated in Queensland industries servicing the nickel mining and treatment operation.

The Government sees the completion of this development as a major milestone of achievement under its policy of decentralisation. The economic conditions which have given rise to the heavy capital cost increase and the adverse movements in exchange rates have, of course, been outside the control of the State Government and the companies.

The Leader of the Opposition has stated that the Bill is not being opposed. Certain comments were made, however, on related issues which need answering.

The Leader of the Opposition raised the question of pollution in Cleveland Bay. This matter has been the subject of consideration by officers from various State Departments and the Water Quality Control Council, which has laid down the criteria which must be met by the companies in the discharge of effluent to the sea.

Presumably the Leader of the Opposition, in mentioning the report on the possible pollution of the sea, was referring to a report prepared for the companies by their own consultants, the release of which would have to be by the companies themselves. He can be assured that particular attention has been paid to this matter and studies are continuing with a view to ensuring that any possible long-term effects will not be overlooked.

The honourable member for Lytton mentioned the issue of air pollution control at Yabulu, but what the Government is doing there by way of phasing in requirements over a short period in this isolated area was explained by the Treasurer.

The Treasury closely examined the project's financial situation before recommending that the guarantee commitment for the companies be extended by \$20,000,000 to \$70,000,000. The guaranteed lenders will hold securities which are very well backed by assets provided not only by the funds which they have advanced but by funds which are supported by subordinate securities or provided as equity capital. The State will receive free of cost a railway and rolling-stock approximating the value of the guarantees.

As I mentioned in introducing the Bill, it is necessary to overcome a legal doubt regarding the power of the Treasurer, on behalf of the Government, to guarantee a further \$20,000,000 of borrowing by the companies.

Members on both sides of the House desire to see this important addition to Queensland's development completed and in production as soon as possible, and I commend the Bill to the House.

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.12 p.m.): As I indicated at the introductory stage, the Opposition has no objection to the Bill, which, as the Premier stated, has been made necessary by increases in capital costs that to some extent are the result of inflation.

I think it is a pity that the Premier did not use the opportunity offering today to answer what I said at the introductory stage instead of trying to gain some political advantage or to besmirch me when replying to a “Dorothy Dix” question asked this morning. In my opinion, this is a very important matter, and I tried to adopt a reasonable attitude to pollution. I say to the Premier through you, Mr. Speaker, that at no time have I done anything to try to halt the Greenvale project, which I think is very necessary for the area that I represent.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Have you tried to assist?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I will leave it to those running the Greenvale project to reply to that question. If the honourable member asks them, he will learn the answer. I would rather he did that than ask me. I certainly have done everything possible to assist.

However, I believe that people have a right to ask questions about the possible effects of pollution and they should not be beaten down every time they say, "What will happen here with pollution?" In my opinion, they are entitled to a responsible reply.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** They should not be entitled to sabotage the project.

**Mr. TUCKER:** If there is in fact sabotage, it can be dealt with under the law. If the Premier implies that I am in agreement with sabotage, that is simply not true and it would be quite wrong for him to suggest it.

I believe that people have a right to ask proper questions on both the pollution of waters and the pollution of air. If there will not be any pollution, a properly prepared statement by officers of the Water Quality Control Council would probably allay some of the fears that presently exist in the areas concerned.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** There is bound to be minimal pollution. It could not be cut out completely.

**Mr. TUCKER:** It is claimed that in a democracy the minorities should have the same rights as the majorities. If the fishermen in the Cleveland Bay area are worried about pollution, surely they have the right to ask the company to state what might happen if effluent flows into Cleveland Bay or the waters of the Barrier Reef. Because they ask such questions they are regarded as saboteurs by the Premier and certain Government members. That is the kind of thing that is being put forward today. It is wrong. If that attitude is pursued, many conservationist and others who are worried about the ecology of the area will be classed as saboteurs. They are certainly not that, and should have the right to ask these questions. If the Premier and Government members have nothing to fear, let them make a clear statement.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Don't you think that in a matter as important as this the report should be presented to Parliament?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has replied to a question the Leader of the Opposition asked at the introductory stage. There is nothing in the Bill about the pollution of waters. I have allowed the honourable gentleman some latitude. He has already replied to the Premier rather fully, so I think we will let it go at that.

**Mr. TUCKER:** In reply to the honourable member for Salisbury I would say "Yes", and in reply to you, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I quite agree. Thank you very much for

allowing me that latitude. I think it was necessary that I should put this explanation forward today. If the Premier and his officers would make some straight-forward statement, they would probably assist.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Did you get it cleared with Jack Munday?

**Mr. TUCKER:** The call-girl on the Government side interjects once again. Whatever he says is of no interest to me, anyway.

The Opposition is in agreement with the Bill and will allow it to move forward to the Committee stage.

Motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 6, both inclusive, and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer) (12.20 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

At the introductory stage of the Bill I gave a full account of what was involved and I have nothing further to add.

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.21 p.m.): Like the Treasurer, my ideas were well canvassed at the introductory stage. As I said then, it is a sectional tax with which we are not in agreement but we well understand that it has now become part and parcel of the State's Budget. Therefore we will allow the second reading of the Bill.

**Mr. WHARTON** (Burnett) (12.22 p.m.): As I did not hear the introduction, for which I apologise, I would like to join the debate. I want to make one or two points.

The Bill raises some problems. I feel that we should have increased certain exemptions in line with the increased rate of tax. I realise that this tax has been put on our plate, if I may use that expression, by the Commonwealth Government; but the fact is that the tax is being increased and I feel that we should increase the exemptions as well.

We must recognise that pay-roll tax is applicable to a business whether or not that business makes a profit. This is a further point I canvass.

**Mr. Tucker:** You are reiterating what I said at the introductory stage.

**Mr. WHARTON:** I did not rise to reiterate what was said by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to make my own points. Pay-roll tax, as a method of taxing people, is not quite as equitable as some other forms of taxation.

Those are the only comments I want to make. It is unfortunate that the Federal Government has inflicted this tax upon us. It is true that we have to raise funds and I do not blame the Queensland Government for this tax. However, I reiterate that if we are going to follow the pattern that has been set we should at least make its imposition more equitable.

**Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer) (12.23 p.m.), in reply: I am sorry that the honourable member was not here during the introductory stage. I believe that the points canvassed by him were fully explained at that stage and I do not think there is any need to take up further time of the House in explaining them again.

Motion (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### MINING ROYALTIES BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (12.24 p.m.): I move—

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

In moving the second reading of the Mining Royalties Bill, I would now like to outline in general details of the regulations associated with the Bill.

As I informed honourable members when introducing the Bill last week, it is only an enabling Bill. The actual royalties to be paid on individual minerals or by individual mining companies and miners will be contained in the regulations which will come into force at an early date.

I now propose to give honourable members a summary of these regulations, but first of all I wish to make clear a few points on the Government's policies regarding the new royalties and our mining industry.

The minerals on which royalties are payable are the property of the people of this State and as such must be used to benefit the people of Queensland and the State's over-all economy. One often heard the accusation in the past that, in allowing the large mining companies to develop our mineral wealth, we were selling the farm. But, as any primary producer could tell us, an unproductive farm is virtually useless.

In the past—in the immediate past, I might add, during the past 15 years or so—the Queensland Government has done all it can to promote investment in this State. I know I speak for the Government, Mr. Speaker, when I say that we make no apology for encouraging this investment, for without it this State today would be in a very serious economic position. The benefits are everywhere to see, and even honourable members opposite would be blind, dumb and ignorant if they could not see for themselves the advantages that we as a State and a nation have gained through such foresightedness.

But let me also remind the House that by following these policies everyone has benefited—the people, the workers and of course the mining companies. No-one, I'm sure, would deny that a company investing hundreds of millions of dollars in a mining project, which many have done, is not entitled to earn a profit. In the earlier days of our major mining operations this profit was extremely small, and in fact for several years many of the companies showed no return at all.

Now, fortunately, that situation has changed and it is time to re-assess the mining companies' contributions to the State in terms of actual money. I say “money”, because the other benefits are already there.

The royalty rates are being substantially increased for the profitable mining companies, and at the same time we are ensuring that we don't price the operators on marginal profits out of business. The livelihood of many thousands of Queenslanders depends on the smaller mining operations and the rates that we propose for them will ensure that this situation continues. As I mentioned in my introduction of the Mining Royalties Bill last week, the royalty rates for what are termed “minor” minerals have been at least doubled.

For example, royalties for silica, rutile, zircon and ilmenite will now be at the rate of 2 per cent of the value of the mineral with a minimum rate per tonne of 25c for silica, \$3 for rutile, \$1.50 for zircon and 25c for ilmenite. The previous minimum rates per ton were 5c for silica, \$1.50 for rutile, 25c for zircon and 10c for ilmenite. In some cases the royalties proposed are five times the previous rate.

In the case of coal, whereas the royalty was a flat 5c a ton, this rate per tonne will apply only to coal which is mined for use in this State. The royalty rate for coal mined for export and interstate trade has been increased substantially. There is also a slight variation in the royalty applying to the type of method used in mining, with open-cut coal having a 5 per cent royalty and coal won by underground mining paying 4 per cent.

The basis for this is that underground operations are more costly and less economical than open-cut mining, and a 1 per cent reduction in the royalty was granted because of this.

A heavy increase in royalty has been levied on bauxite, another of this State's major minerals. The rate of 5c a ton on bauxite used in the refinery at Gladstone has been increased to a minimum of 50c a tonne, while the 10c a ton royalty on bauxite exported has been increased to a minimum of \$1 a tonne. I would add that these are minimum rates which will now apply, as the new rates will vary according to the world price for aluminium.

The previous royalty rates for Mount Isa Mines were payable on profits made by the company, with a maximum of 5 per cent of the profits after tax. The new rates will be determined on the quantity of ore mined by Mount Isa Mines, with a basic rate of \$2 a tonne. This rate will vary according to the fluctuation of the value of the minerals contained in the ore, but the minimum rate of royalty will be \$1 a tonne of ore mined. The precise formula for this royalty has been detailed in the regulations.

The present royalty payable on gemstones is 10c per ton. This is another area where a drastic amendment was needed to bring the royalty in line with current prices. The new rate will be 5 per cent of the value of the minerals won over and above \$30,000. This \$30,000 minimum exemption is not unreasonable, as the expenses incurred by small-scale miners could be relatively high. In view of the isolation and hardships associated with the mining of gemstones, the Queensland Government does not wish to penalise the hard-working prospectors in this industry.

On all other minerals, excluding phosphates, the minor minerals I mentioned earlier and the nickel-ore from Greenvale, the royalty rate will be 2 per cent of the sales in excess of \$30,000 or 5 per cent of the profits in excess of \$30,000 whichever is the lesser amount. The same reasons for applying this \$30,000 minimum limit apply to the small-scale mineral miner as to the gem miner.

The royalty on nickel-ore from the new Greenvale operations will be 10c a tonne while the royalty on phosphate will be 10 per cent of its value. I would add here that, if benefits of the production of phosphate from the areas in North-west Queensland flow on to the State, this rate could be varied in accordance with my previous remarks.

**Mr. MARGINSON (Wolston) (12.31 p.m.):** The Opposition has examined the Bill carefully. With only seven clauses it is a very short one, but nevertheless a very important measure.

It gives us considerable satisfaction to note that royalty payments are to be increased. Once again the Government has adopted the Labor Party's point of view but it has taken it many years to acknowledge that we were right and the delay has meant a considerable economic loss to Queensland and its people.

The effect of this measure is of great magnitude. According to the Treasurer's statement in July—two months ago—it will mean additional royalty payments of approximately \$25,000,000 a year—an additional \$175,000,000 over a period of seven years.

We applaud the increases in royalties, but we do not like having them effected by way of regulation.

They could well be embraced in a schedule to the Bill. I know that the reply will be that Parliament would then be required to meet to change royalty payments. That is so. But we believe that royalty payments are so important that they should be handled in this way. A regulation promulgated while Parliament is not sitting has full effect in law and Parliament could not express its views about the royalty rates prescribed in it until it was tabled. I appreciate that, according to the Bill, the rates to be imposed will be retrospective to 1 August last. The regulation could be in existence for six or seven months before Parliament had an opportunity to discuss the rates set out in its schedule. That, we believe, is very important.

In addition, the time limit for a speech in a debate on the disallowance of a regulation is 10 minutes, and the total time for the debate is limited. For this reason the Opposition suggests that the Bill be deferred and hopes that the Government will attach schedules to the Bill.

Let me make it quite clear that we are not in any way opposing the increase of royalties. Our main objection is to the method of assessing and introducing them. We suggest that it should be by legislation, not by regulation.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Is that the only reason you want to delay it?

**Mr. MARGINSON:** No, it is not the only reason. There is another. Perhaps the member for Chatsworth has really stuck his neck out on this. How is the regulation promulgated? The onus is on the Minister for Mines. Of course, we are told that it is approved by the Governor in Council, but we all know that that means the Cabinet. The groundwork for the determination of these rates is under the control of the Minister for Mines.

Opposition members are very concerned—and they have been for many years—about Ministers having an interest in any matter coming before Cabinet. Some notable figures of the same political ilk as the honourable member for Chatsworth have shared our concern. I refer particularly to Sir Robert Menzies, who strictly laid it down that his Ministers were not to have an interest in any matter being discussed by Cabinet.

It is public knowledge that many Queensland Cabinet Ministers have an interest in mining companies with operations in Queensland. They may be only shareholders, but I am not prepared to guess the size of their shareholdings.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must restrict himself to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** I am dealing with the provision that the regulations will be promulgated by the Governor in Council, which in effect is upon the advice of the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. I make this point: are we to countenance Ministers with fairly substantial shareholdings in these huge mining companies—although they might be small in comparison with the total shareholding of the company—sitting in judgment on the rate of royalty that the companies will pay to the Government? If the matter is raised with Ministers who are not shareholders in the company—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked the honourable member to return to the principles of the Bill, which relates to royalties. I ask the honourable member to apply himself to that subject.

**Mr. MARGINSON:** I believe I have covered the ground. The Opposition is strongly opposed to the setting of the rates by regulation and to the method of their formulation. I strongly believe that the Government is very sensitive on this subject and well it might be when, even on the Treasurer's admission, the Bill will increase the return to Queensland over seven years by \$175,000,000.

If the Government does not want a schedule, if it does not accept our good advice on the matter, at least when the regulations are formulated an independent person with a knowledge of economics should be made responsible for setting the amounts, and it should be to that independent person that the companies would be required to go to have their royalties assessed.

The Opposition has made it quite clear that it does not oppose the increase in royalties. It opposes the way in which they are to be assessed and applied. It suggests that the Government defer the second reading of the Bill until it has had an opportunity to look at our proposals. In view of that, I move the following amendment:—

“Omit the word—

‘now’

and add the words—

‘on Tuesday next.’”

**Mr. HANSON** (Port Curtis) (12.40 p.m.): I have very much pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by the honourable member for Wolston. In these modern times, it is not surprising that there is a great upsurge of national sentiment in Australia, especially among the younger generation, and

there is, of course, constant criticism, justifiable at times, that in our dealings with mining enterprises we are selling the farm and not obtaining enough for our natural resources. This, incidentally, has been the basis of the Opposition's argument on royalties for a great many years. Honourable members know full well the recent history of royalties, and the arguments advanced by the Government when Opposition members have made their criticisms of the Government's actions.

Utah Development Company, for instance, has undertaken considerable expenditure in the winning of coal from the Bowen Basin, but there is quite naturally disquiet among the people when it is known that the great majority of shares in this organisation are foreign owned. As a palliative to Australian national sentiment, a part-ownership of 10 per cent was offered to Australian shareholders. It is any wonder that people ask why royalties are not higher? Is it any wonder that they ask how the Government can justify the miserable rate of 5c a ton that has applied for a considerable period? The profits of the company that I have mentioned, from 1969 to 1973, were \$106,000,000, yet its income tax payment in 1973 was only \$5,600,000. The payments for its exports were made directly to San Francisco bankers. It is only natural therefore that we on this side of the House say that an increase in royalty rates is very necessary.

As a further bonus, the State Government extended the coal-mining leases of this company to an area containing an estimated 2,000 million tons of coal. When mined at the site, the value of coal from this area will be in excess of \$3,000 million. It is no wonder that the Government is slowly but surely accepting the policies espoused by the Australian Labor Party.

I heartily agree with the shadow Minister for Mines (Mr. Marginson) when, in moving his amendment, he spoke of the tremendous responsibilities that will be placed upon the shoulders of the Minister for Mines. It will be noted that clause 3 of the Bill provides—

“The Governor in Council, by regulations made pursuant to section 106, may prescribe that royalty payable to the Crown in respect of mineral, whether the obligation to pay such royalty arises under this Act or under any agreement made with the State of Queensland or under any undertaking given by any person, shall be calculated at such rate or rates, in such manner and on such basis or bases as he, in his unfettered discretion, thinks fit . . .”

This is the real crux of the argument advanced by the Opposition. Royalty rates are to be prescribed by regulation rather than determined in accordance with a schedule contained in the Bill, which would mean that they would be open to scrutiny by the

House. I do not think there has been any greater critic in the whole of Australia than the Premier when he, with his Ministers, constantly decries the Australian Government and talks about its centralist policies. Such criticism constantly emanates from the Government benches. But is it not centralism when only the Premier and the Government sit in judgment in the matter of royalties, and, in prescribing them by regulation, provide only a very limited time for their examination after the relevant documents are laid on the table of the House? Certainly that is very wrong, and I say to the National-Liberal Government, which makes plain its antagonism towards centralism, "People in glass houses should not throw stones." It is definitely doing that at the moment.

In this instance the Premier could be likened to a man who takes unto himself a bride with a dowry of about \$35,000,000 and then covers up and refuses to account for any expenditure. I suggest that that is what he is doing relative to the moneys that will accrue from the royalties now to be charged, and his actions are not in accordance with the best legislative practice.

I draw the attention of the House to a statement by Mr. R. T. Madigan, a man well known in the mining industry, about the relationship that should exist between industry and the Government. He said that industry tends to emphasise the economic optima, and that conversely—and rightly—the Government gives greater weight to the other aspects of the national strategy. He also said that there is no harm in this if it leads to dialogue between industry and government, and he went on to speak about how much can be achieved by dialogue.

One of my criticisms of the legislation now before the House is that the Government, in its approaches to the various companies, showed little inclination to have dialogue; in fact, it engaged in confrontation. I should have loved to be a fly on the wall at Cabinet meetings to hear the arguments that were advanced. Knowing the Minister for Mines as I do, I am certain that, looking into the future, he would have abhorred the great responsibility now being placed on his shoulders through this legislation.

Mr. Madigan went further and spoke about the democratic system providing for hearing advice and for consultation as necessary to ensure that, by the time policy is decided, everybody understands its derivation and their individual places in it.

He added—

"However this is not working effectively in Australia today and urgent attention needs to be given to developing new procedures to get a balanced, efficient result by consultation, understanding and feedback."

I mentioned in an earlier debate the sad story of what is now occurring in Jamaica, where many charges have become really excessive

and people may be pricing themselves out of the business. I hope that the Government of this State—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the principles of the Bill. He is wandering, and I have given him some latitude.

**Mr. HANSON:** I hope that the Government, in the argument on royalties, will not under any circumstances overstep the thin line between resources diplomacy and resources blackmail.

The Opposition objects very strongly to the prescribing of royalties by regulation, as provided for in clause 3 of the Bill. Similar arguments can be advanced against much of the legislation that comes before this Assembly. Unfortunately, under our modern system of government, there is a growing and an alarming tendency towards Executive government. As a member of Parliament, I certainly wish to voice my protest against the increased activity in this direction. Executive government has many imperfections and, of course, there are many resultant disadvantages.

In considering the introduction of regulations, one must concede that a great number of regulations must be introduced to control, often in extensive detail, vast areas of activity. If the whole of the legislative programme had to be carried out by the Legislature itself, no doubt society would be in turmoil. However, the making of thousands of minor rules and regulations with the force of law is a responsibility that should belong to the Executive. Important matters like this, which involve many millions of dollars, should be the responsibility of the elected representatives of the people, who in this Chamber can voice their arguments and seek information in a much wider debate than would be allowed on a motion to disallow certain regulations that had been tabled.

The modern idea of delegated legislation was originally derived from specific parliamentary authority. While the very delegation could be justified on the ground of the demands of practical government, I do not think anyone could argue with the submission that the growing pressure of legislative activities has rendered its supervision increasingly difficult. Whilst its operation is limited by the authority concerned, and the parliamentary control over that authority, delegated legislation is now growing more powerful, and meriting for itself a state of *de facto* independence.

If the Bill becomes law, once the parliamentary session ends, come hell or high water, members will never see, let alone have the chance to debate, the whys and wherefores of the individual royalty charges the Government will impose on the mining companies. Successive Parliaments will have limited time to question ministerial and Executive decisions. Honourable members are all aware of the present practice. They know the motions that are gone through

when regulations are tabled. At the start of a session the appropriate Minister will table, say, 28 regulations under the Marine Act; then the Treasurer will table, say, 20 papers in respect of the legislation he administers. And so on it goes, to the confusion of the elected representatives of the people.

In this particular instance the practice will smother many of the aims of the Government. It could lead to the situation that future Ministers could be subject to grave error. As I said before, the Minister for Mines and Main Roads has a huge responsibility in this matter. Let us not forget that he occupies his present position only because he is *persona grata* with the Premier. That applies to every Minister in the coalition, and it will apply to every future Minister. One man in this State will control the Minister who will bring down the regulations.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the Bill.

**Mr. HANSON:** I am dealing with clause 3 of the Bill which relates to the making of regulations.

Is it not a form of centralism in itself that one man will be able to determine who should be the Minister charged with the responsibility of bringing down the regulations referred to in clause 3?

No doubt certain limitations could be imposed. But let us cast our minds back to a famous case in 1931 under the Transport Workers' Act, namely, the Victorian Stevedoring Company v. Dignan.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! What has that got to do with the Bill? I fail to see how that has anything to do with the Bill. I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the principles of the Bill. The House is debating royalties at the present time.

**Mr. HANSON:** With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the amendment to the Act. Provision is made in the Bill for "The Governor in Council, by regulations made pursuant . . ."

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing in the Bill about Transport Acts or anything like that. The honourable member will confine himself to the Bill or resume his seat.

**Mr. HANSON:** With due respect, Mr. Speaker, a famous legal precedent on Executive decisions was the case of the Victorian Stevedoring Company v. Dignan, in which it was held that, subject to the Acts Interpretation Act, various regulations that had to be laid on the table of the House had the force of law until they were disallowed

by Parliament; they would not depend on any previous parliamentary approval other than the enabling Act.

Under this piece of legislation the authority of this Parliament is being eroded, not in small chunks or miserable little heaps, but to the tune of the \$35,000,000 a year that will accrue in royalties from it.

The Government must realise that on it and on it alone rests not only the determination of these royalties but also the accountability for its blatant decisions, both now and in the future. Is that not centralism at its worst? The Premier assumes the mantle of Louis of France and in effect says, "L'état, c'est moi," or "I am the State." That is totally wrong.

It is accepted practice in every Parliament within the Commonwealth of Nations that delegated authority is acceptable only in exceptional circumstances such as to relieve pressure on parliamentary time, to deal with matters too technical for effective handling in Parliament, where legislation is experimental or for the local application of large, general schemes.

Prescribing of the royalty charges that will apply here will certainly not put any great pressure on this Parliament. Similarly, land tax is amended virtually year after year. There is no great technical detail in these royalty charges—every member of this Assembly can add up, some a bit better than others—and the legislation is certainly not experimental; of course, that is the specious argument that had been advanced by the Minister.

The regulations will lead to considerable argument and confusion. While we want the people of this State to receive the benefit accruing from the mining of its minerals, we do not want it to be at the behest of some future Minister who might not carry out his ministerial trust as well as he should.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted (Mr. Marginson's amendment) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 41

Ahern	Hughes
Aikens	Knox
Alison	Lane
Armstrong	Lee
Bird	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Camm	Miller
Campbell	Neal
Chalk	Newbery
Chinchen	Porter
Cory	Rae
Edwards	Row
Fletcher	Scott-Young
Frawley	Small
Gunn	Sullivan
Herbert	Tooth
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Wharton
Hewitt, W. D.	
Hinze	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hodges	
Hooper, K. W.	Moore, R. E.
Houghton	Muller

## NOES, 30

Aiken  
Baldwin  
Blake  
Bousen  
Bromley  
Burns  
D'Arcy  
Davis  
Dean  
Hanlon  
Hanson  
Harvey  
Hooper, K. J.  
Jensen  
Jones, R.  
Jordan  
Marginson

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

## Tellers:

Inch  
Leese

## PAIRS:

Hartwig  
Kaus  
Low

Houston  
Jones, N. F.  
Harris

Resolved in the affirmative.

[*Sitting suspended from 1.4 to 2.15 p.m.*]

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) (2.15 p.m.): In rising to speak to the Bill I voice my total opposition to the principle of setting mining royalties by regulation. There is far too much rule by regulation. Parliament is the only place in which a matter as important as mining royalties should be debated. Royalties are of too much importance to the State's economy to be fixed by regulation.

The Bill gives the Minister or, to be technically correct, the Governor in Council enormous powers in the setting of royalty payments. The stage is being set for all forms of patronage and favouritism. There is also the very real possibility of graft and corruption. I am not suggesting for a moment that the present Minister for Mines and Main Roads would be a party to such conduct; nevertheless it is a fact of life in many overseas countries that considerations have been offered in return for the setting of favourable royalty payments and conditions of lease.

This legislation bears the mark of desperation. The Treasurer is desperate to balance his Budget. The economic mismanagement of this Tory Government requires the sum of \$78,000,000 to square the ledger.

**Mr. Miller:** What is the position in the other States?

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** The honourable member can make his own speech. The Minister for Mines is desperate in his attempt to cover up the sell-out of Queensland's natural resources over many years, and the Premier is desperate to ensure that the legislation is not too rigid and does not offend his multi-national mining friends in case they refuse to make any further contributions to the National Party's coffers.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Put your finger on the place.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am doing that. The royalty controversy has raged for many years. The Opposition, particularly our

leader, has consistently berated this Government and asked it to legislate in the interests of the Queensland people by providing for more equitable mineral royalties. However, the Government has failed to respond, and has been forced into its present position by its gross economic mismanagement. The Treasurer, in his last desperate bid to become Premier of this State, has resorted to obtaining additional revenue by increasing mining royalties so that when he retires from office, and perhaps takes up the position of racing commissioner, he will not have the entire blame for the state of the economy on his shoulders.

**Mr. Ahern:** Pause for applause.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Yes, pause for applause.

As the Opposition has pointed out for years, mining royalties have been far too low. However, neither the Premier nor the Treasurer would take heed. Instead they proceeded to allow the big multi-national mining companies to make Queensland the laughing-stock. As I have said previously, it was not until the present Australian Labor Government was elected in Canberra that we saw any change in the previous ridiculous state of affairs.

The Australian Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Rex Connor), speaking in July of last year on the first steps taken by any Australian Government in the formulation of a national minerals policy relative to exports, said—

"The first industry to feel the impact of these controls was the Queensland coal industry. The black coal industry in Queensland, under the benign guidance of the Bjelke-Petersen Government, had been exporting coal at prices heavily below world parity. Since the new regulations came into force there have been substantial increases in prices received from the Japanese steel industry for Australian coal, which is equal in quality to coal anywhere in the world."

Contrast Mr. Connor's responsible attitude with that of Government members in this Chamber, who are very loud in their abuse of Mr. Connor. But being a resolute man, Mr. Connor stood his ground and refused to be browbeaten by the multi-nationals who had pulled the wool over the eyes of Government members.

**Sir Gordon Chalk:** I think it was pantyhose.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Pantyhose would look nice over the Treasurer's head, and might have the effect of silencing his raucous voice.

I can well understand the reluctance of the National Party to raise the rate of royalty payments. It was proved forcefully at the May election just how much the minerals industry was prepared to back the Liberal and the National Parties. The

money just rolled in. On the return of the Australian Labor Party Government, the Japanese steel industry agreed to pay huge price increases for our coal. All the hog-wash that was spoken during the election campaign to the effect that Mr. Connor's policies would drive the Japanese steel industry to seek supplies elsewhere—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The House is not concerned with Mr. Connor's policy; it is discussing mineral royalties. The honourable member will confine his remarks to the Bill.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am being side-tracked by interjections.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I am not concerned about interjections. The honourable member will apply himself to the Bill.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I remarked at the time that the only source of supply not quoted by the Government was Disneyland. The Japanese are very astute businessmen and know that they are on a good thing in their supply of Australian minerals. Of course the Fitzgerald report really lifted the lid off the mining industry, its overseas ownership and its contributions to the wealth of this nation. This report laid bare the story of just how valuable the minerals industry is to the Treasury coffers. It was greeted with criticism and derision by the gentlemen opposite. Of course, they had to come to the defence of their backers; but it is significant that the big mining multi-nationals have not attacked the report. They know that they are on a sweet cop.

I shall now draw attention to a few pertinent facts on Queensland royalty returns. In his Budget last year the Treasurer estimated that he would get \$4,500,000 from royalties thanks largely to an increase from his great and powerful friends, Mount Isa Mines Limited, whose principal shareholder is the American Smelting and Refining Company of the United States. At the same time he said that he anticipated a deficit of \$4,270,000 and that this would be financed by an accumulated surplus of almost \$4,000,000. However, while the Treasurer was worrying about this petty-cash amount, the mineral companies were laughing all the way to the bank.

To get down to specifics, Professor B. Johns, in his submission to the Senate Select Committee on Foreign Ownership and Control, in September 1972, condemned the Queensland Government's attitude to royalties, and tabled the following figures for 1969-70—

	Royalties	Percentage of Output
Queensland . . .	\$3,000,000	1.1
New South Wales . . .	\$13,600,000	3.5
Western Australia . . .	\$15,700,000	4.6

The royalty payments fluctuated. In 1972 they were nearly \$1,000,000 less than in 1969-70. We all recall that on 2 August 1973 the Treasurer claimed—

“Where rail transport of minerals over specifically constructed railways is involved, the vast financial benefit to the State includes not only the royalty on minerals concerned, but the profit on rail operations.”

If there was any semblance of credence in the Treasurer's claim, he would give full details of the net profit derived from the railways through mineral haulage. But that information has not been forthcoming. The only figures available are from the Railway Commissioner's report which lists gross revenue earnings.

The Opposition has pointed out in this House time and time again that the tonnage hauled and the revenue earnings are now in inverse proportion. If the almighty coal profits were as significant as the Treasurer would have us believe, why is it that the railways alone face a \$46,000,000 deficit for 1973-74? It is simply because the profits from mineral haulage have already peaked and that, unless the Government looks at haulage rates, profitability will show a downward trend.

The Department of Minerals and Energy has listed the 1971-72 royalty collections for Queensland as \$3,800,000, including royalties on sand and gravel from Crown lands. That is an increase of \$1,960,000 on 1967-68, when the huge coal projects were barely off the ground. However, in 1972 the ex-mine value of minerals produced in Queensland totalled about \$358,000,000, an increase of over \$100,000,000 in a four-year period. By comparison, Western Australian royalties totalled \$25,200,000 in 1971-72 compared with \$6,200,000 in 1967-68—an increase of \$19,000,000 over a five-year period. At the same time, the value of mineral production in Western Australia increased by about \$200,000,000 over a four-year period. While the ex-mine value of minerals produced in Western Australia was double that of Queensland in this period, royalty receipts added \$19,000,000 to the Western Australian Treasury compared with Queensland's lousy \$1,900,000.

When the Treasurer was faced with a deficit of the order of \$78,000,000, he looked around to see whom he could soak this time. Unfortunately the cupboard was a bit on the bare side. The T.A.B. had been robbed, stamp duty was already high on such things as motor vehicle insurance and third-party insurance. There was no alternative but to put the bite on his mates, that is, the multi-nationals. If only the Treasurer had listened to the arguments of the Opposition years ago on royalties, he would not be in the present financial straits. The very fact that a Bill is introduced to

raise royalty payments is proof positive that the Opposition's policy has been consistent, responsible and right.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (2.24 p.m.): I join with other Opposition speakers in discussing this legislation designed to enable the Government to determine royalties by regulation. I do not wish to recanvass the arguments used by honourable members on this side of the House over the years but I point out that it is refreshing indeed to see that, in contrast with its earlier outright derision of the policy and attitude advanced by honourable members on this side of the House, the Government has finally seen the sense in our arguments. At this belated stage it sees fit to introduce the principle of increased royalties.

I recall saying five or six years ago when I was the shadow Minister for Mines that, if the Government decided on a royalty of so many cents per ton, surely the safeguard should have been inserted that it be 5c a ton or a percentage of the world price, whichever was the greater. But the Opposition was not thanked for its troubles on that occasion.

It is passing strange that almost on the eve of introducing a Budget in which the Treasurer has obviously been hard pressed to manage the State's finances, legislation is enacted to net him an additional \$35,000,000 to get him out of his troubles. We might well ask whether that is the only reason for increasing our royalty charges on mining activities. We might well ask why this year? Why wasn't it introduced last year or the year before, when we had the spectacle of the State's humbling itself before the Grants Commission?

**A Government Member:** What rot!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** It's not rot at all. The Grants Commission was critical of the Government's performance in not obtaining an adequate return from the activities of the mining companies in this State.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** You've got a fertile imagination.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I thank the honourable member for the compliment. I would hate to be as infertile as he is. Year after year the Treasurer is in financial troubles. I do not know whether being knighted was too much for him to bear, for he has never balanced a Budget since. Year after year he trots off to the Grants Commission for special grants. Suddenly, he finds that he has milked the Canberra cow dry, and we have this belated attempt to get adequate royalty returns from the mineral exploitation in Queensland.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** Why didn't he give us credit for the \$24,000,000 that came from the Federal Government the other day?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Of course, Government members do not mention the good things that come their way—anyway, not in the campaign that they conduct.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** It's not a Government decision.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Of course it's not a Government decision.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** It's a Grants Commission decision.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes, of course it went before the Grants Commission. I am sure the honourable member for Chatsworth will concede that, if we had been charging adequate royalties some years ago, it might not have been necessary to approach the Grants Commission. That is my point.

Why is the alteration being made to the royalty rate this year? Strangely, it coincides with the last financial statement of this Government before a State election. Already the Treasurer is worried that, if he cannot handle the unemployment situation that might develop next year, his party could lose its position on the Treasury benches. I repeat that the legislation is so belated that it gives rise to suspicion as to the timing of its introduction.

**Mr. Lee** interjected.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not wish to argue with the honourable member for Yeronga. I do not claim to be as great an economist as he. However, I do not remember much of a performance by the Honourable Billy Snedden as Treasurer. As a matter of fact, his last Budget was one of the reasons for his party's defeat. McMahon, before him, turned in a poor performance. Honourable members may go back as far as they like in analysing the performances of previous coalition Governments in Canberra. They used to have the five-year itch. There was a recession every five years from the time Sir Robert Menzies was unfortunately elected as Prime Minister. Immediately the Australian Labor Party inherits a problem such as the present one—

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** There was 6 per cent inflation when Snedden was leader of the Government, and a horror Budget was introduced in 1972.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will please confine his remarks to the Bill.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I would not impose on your tolerance, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I realise that.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The Bill highlights the Government's failure over the years to obtain the best return from the State's mineral resources.

I take the matter a little further. I listened this morning to the Minister saying how unprofitable mining can be, and how some companies showed no return at all.

**Mr. Camm:** Some small operators.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes. The Minister then said that he made no apology for encouraging investment to this State.

**Mr. Camm:** That is right.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I was not able to write down all the Minister's words. As I do not want to misquote him, I shall give only the substance of what he said. He said that even Opposition members would be blind or ignorant if they did not recognise the value of exploiting the State's mineral resources. If I am not completely correct, that at least is the gist of what the Minister said.

I now canvass some of the Minister's suggestions. What does the exploitation of mineral resources actually mean? To him it means digging large holes, extracting raw material, and exporting it overseas to be manufactured into articles. Queensland is missing out on the cream of resources development, which is the conversion of raw materials to manufactured articles. Queensland exports bauxite, coking coal, and, with other parts of Australia, iron-ore. The costly processing of bauxite to alumina, in which there is no profit, is carried out here, but apparently there is no insistence on an accompanying manufacturing process within the boundaries of this State.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has made his point. I now ask him to return to the subject of royalties.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Surely what I am saying is bound up with royalties. As a taxpayer, and also the most capable member in this House, I have a right to know why I pay State taxes each year while the State's mineral resources are given away year after year at bargain-basement rates. I have a right to protest, and I believe that my protest is pertinent to the subject of royalty payments.

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask honourable members on my right to cease interjecting.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not think they are as entertaining as the zoological gardens, anyway, Mr. Speaker.

In the Chamber today we witnessed two incidents that I think are very pertinent to my argument. The first occurred when a question was asked by the Leader of the Opposition about operations connected with the refining of nickel from Greenvale. Surely when legislation on a matter as important as that is passing through the House, any relevant report should be part of that legislation. Without transgressing too far, Mr.

Speaker, let me say that I believe that Parliament should be told why it was thought that there would not be any pollutant effects from the operations at Greenvale.

Secondly, my colleague the shadow Minister for Mines moved an amendment to the motion and called for royalties to be part of the schedule to the Bill. That was very significant, and I think it is relevant to this debate. If royalties are to be determined by Order in Council or by regulation, Parliament will not have an opportunity until August next year to object to whatever is decided.

**A Government Member:** You wanted them increased.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** We might think that royalties have not increased sufficiently. What I am suggesting is that the legislation now before the House will give the Governor or the Minister for Mines, or whoever it might be, the right to determine what royalty payments will be made, but Parliament will have no opportunity to discuss them until August next year.

**Mr. Lee:** You will not be here then.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I will not be here next year, but I will be sadly missed in this Chamber. At least I will go out arguing the case for the people of Queensland. Unlike honourable members opposite who enjoy the fruits of luxury, I will not be happy to see everybody in the community paying additional taxes when the burden of mining royalties should be borne by those best able to bear it. The honourable member is quite content to agree to any type of tax as long as it is imposed on the public generally.

As I said, because an election is to be held next year and the Parliament will not sit in January or February—the Government, of course, will not want a parliamentary sittings just before the State election—and because the Government will therefore not table an Order in Council or a regulation relating to royalty payments in this Chamber until it assembles in July or August next year, Parliament will not be able to contest action taken under such an Order in Council or regulation till after that.

**Mr. Lee:** The only reason why you are grizzling is that you know that the people will keep the A.L.P. out of office next year.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am not grizzling. I have served my time honourably in this Chamber.

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I will probably embarrass myself if I continue talking about all my good points.

I think it is very bad indeed for the State that people should see this disgusting spectacle of legislation being rushed through

the House a week before the Budget is brought down, merely because the Treasurer has not managed the finances of the State as he ought to have done. That is what it amounts to.

**Mr. Frawley:** What a lot of rot!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The only reason why the royalty is being changed now is that the Treasurer cannot balance the Budget. He has taxed the beer-drinker; he has taxed the racegoer; he has taxed everybody in the community.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am quite confident about what will happen tonight.

Over the years the people in the community have been sacrificed because the Government failed to take this action in the agreements it negotiated for the exploitation of the State's mineral resources. What has this meant, not only in terms of taxation? It has meant that money for housing has had to be diverted. I can well recall the late J. J. Dedman introducing housing legislation to provide for low-cost homes and for slum clearance. It was never intended to be used to provide houses for the employees of mining companies. I see the Minister scribbling. I know that he wants to blast my argument, but he will come back with the same old cliché. He will say, "Surely these men are entitled to good homes the same as the city dweller." Yes, they are, but it was never intended that Commonwealth funds should be diverted to help wealthy mining companies get established. Their budgets would make the State Budget look like spending-money for a dwarf.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Housing does not come into this.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes it does.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I differ with the honourable member. He will not argue with the Chair, and that is all there is to it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I wouldn't do that.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I hope not.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am the easiest person in the House to get on with. You never have to send me out. I am not like some people. I am saying that it is relevant. Let us not weep tears of blood for the mining companies and say that we have to give the coal away so that they can get established, and charge them royalties only when they were established. They are able to raise money internationally at a faster rate than the Treasurer ever realises. Their budgets make our State Budgets look like the pocket-money for a dwarf.

These facilities should have been provided by the companies, not by the people of the State. We need not have had a

priority list for housing. The agreements entered into should have required the companies to provide housing for their employees.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have been very tolerant with the honourable member and given him latitude. I have just about run out of patience with him. Housing does not come into this. I ask the honourable member to get back to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Everything I have said has been relevant. I do not want to dispute your—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** That is debatable. There will be no argument on that. I ask the honourable member to get back to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** If we had been getting adequate royalty returns for our minerals, we would not have had to divert this money for housing. I have vivid recollections of Mr. Justice Gallagher's criticism of the primitive facilities that were supplied by mining companies that exploited our mineral resources.

**Mr. Newton:** At Moura.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes. It was not until the Government adopted the policy of diverting this money that people in other communities had to go without houses. Surely I have a right to protest on their behalf.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will get back to the principles of the Bill or he will be asked to resume his seat.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I welcome the move to increase royalties because, after all, we have been calling for it for years. We were regarded as being almost un-Australian when we spoke in terms of increasing royalties, but I am very pleased that before my retirement from Parliament next year, our arguments will have borne fruit.

What I query is the reason behind the Bill. Is it introduced for the benefit of Queensland or just to enable the Treasurer to balance his Budget?

Again I question the levying of these royalties on the world price of coal. Apparently we are content still to look at our coal as something to be shipped overseas to be used in the manufacture of steel and so on or to be used for steaming purposes. Every other coal-producing country in the world is moving towards finding new uses for its coal. Something like 73 different articles can be produced from coal, ranging from paint and various insecticides through to motor spirit. I query the idea of basing royalty on the selling price of coal or any other mineral.

It could well be that within five years we will see significant changes in the use of coal. We may well be looking not only at what we can manufacture from these products

in our State but also at what method we can use to gain the greatest advantage from royalty payments. I think we would be foolish at this stage to close the door on mineral royalties and later see a repeat performance by the Treasurer of travelling around the world asking the companies to review their attitude towards the agreements that have been made. This is one of the mistakes already made in the exploitation of our minerals over the years.

With those few pertinent remarks I join with members of the Opposition in welcoming the legislation, but as I say, the circumstances under which it had to be introduced are passing strange.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG** (Townsville) (2.48 p.m.): In speaking to the Mining Royalties Bill, I must say that I am rather amazed at the attitude of the Opposition, which appears to be engaged in a filibuster as if it did not really want this measure to go through on time. I am intrigued at the attitude of honourable members opposite.

As to mining, there is an old Biblical saying—

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** You know as much about mining as you do about medicine.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** My forebears mined gold and silver in this State with their bare hands, which is a damned sight more than any of your relatives did.

There is an old Biblical saying that supports the notion that control of a dormant resource profits nobody anything. It is still very true today. If a resource is left in the ground and not used, what use is it to any country? This is the basis of mining.

What is the basis for seeking royalties and on what basis are these royalties fixed? There are two basic ways of fixing royalties: one is on the profit made from the product mined and the other is on the value of the mineral mined. I know that royalty under this legislation has been classified as 10 per cent of the value of the product, which is quite a sensible way of approaching the problem, because if a mining business is inefficient and has an inefficient post-mining, prefabrication set-up, the profits will be nil or less than they should be and royalties based on the profits of the organisation will be correspondingly nil or less than they should be. If the royalty is set on the value of the mineral we cannot go far wrong.

What is the problem that seems to be facing the Opposition in its constant fear and denigration of so-called multi-nationals?

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** They are raping our country.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** Certainly not. We have a dormant resource, and how are we going to develop it? Can anyone here imagine this State Government or the Federal Government putting \$20,000,000 into Greenvale before getting any return? That

is exactly what happened at Greenvale; the companies invested \$20,000,000 even before a feasibility study had been conducted. Members of the Opposition should think about that. Would Mr. Crean or Mr. Cameron cough up \$20,000,000 to have a feasibility study carried out? Have honourable members opposite forgotten the millions of dollars that were poured into the Bass Strait project before the companies obtained any return for their investment?

The so-called multi-national companies, who are criticised so often by the Labor Party, are helping this country a good deal. At least they have brought about the development of our natural resources as well as some of our provincial cities and towns. Take Townsville, for example. Its population is now approximately 80,000, and this is the result of the activities of a so-called multi-national company. Opposition members simply do not understand the meaning of the term. They refer to Mount Isa Mines as a multi-national company.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** So it is.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** It certainly is not; the company is 51 per cent owned by Australian shareholders. To review its history—the project was started by the English, who failed to make it a success; next the Russians—the mates of Opposition members—had a go, but they proved to be failures; and finally the Americans made it a success with their business acumen and financial jiggling. They became masters of the situation. As I say, Australians now own 51 per cent of the shares.

**Mr. Marginson:** You did all right out of it.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I wish to God I did own some shares in Mount Isa Mines. I have already said that my forebears were engaged in mining. They made no money whatever from it so I don't invest in shares. Mining is hard work for those who put money into it and for those who are engaged in it. The only profit to be gained from mining is the flow-on to the State through decentralisation. Members of the Opposition are too dumb to realise this. How do they think Mt. Isa started? How do they think Townsville gained its prosperity? This was achieved by decentralisation and investment in mining. The same can be said of Wollongong, which owes its prosperity to B.H.P.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Is it true that you are the company doctor?

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I wish I were; I would not then have to be trying to beat some sense into the honourable member's head.

In what way have the multi-national companies benefited Australia? The answer is, of course, by the payment of their royalties as well as the creation of a sound infrastructure, which depends not only on the

mining companies themselves but also on the taxes paid by the employees. It is the money spent by the average worker on food and clothing as well as on other items that has led to the prosperity of this nation and, more particularly, to this State. Queensland is not dependent on hand-outs. Unlike other States, such as Victoria, Queensland is almost a free State, one that does not depend for hand-outs from the likes of Gough Whitlam. However, if we are not careful we will find an excise duty imposed by the Commonwealth Government on our minerals. If the State Government does not get its rake-off first, it will find that what otherwise would be its income is swallowed up by Federal excise duties.

Let us look at the companies that pay royalties. Firstly, B.H.P. and multi-subsidary organisations pay royalties; Comalco pays royalties on its operations at Weipa; the companies engaged in the production of oil in Bass Strait pay royalties; Mount Isa Mines pays royalties; and the companies that will be engaged in operations at Greenvale and Yabulu are to pay royalties. And they all pay their way.

In addition to royalties they pay freight charges. Dozens of times I have heard members of the Opposition talk about the loss sustained by our railways. I remind them that the railways do not run at an over-all loss because any loss that is incurred in one sector of operations is balanced by profits gained on the cartage of minerals.

The Queensland Government has adopted a balanced approach to mining, with the result that it has not been forced to go cap in hand to the Federal Government for assistance. However, the Federal Government's attitude and inflationary policies are beginning to instil into the minds of Australian people for the first time in history a desire not to work. The Australian public have caught this disease, which has emanated from the Fabian socialism espoused by the Labor Party. The average person in Queensland and other States simply does not want to work. As a result productivity has decreased.

With inflation, we need more money. And the State needs more money to run its essential services. It is reasonable that the Minister for Mines and the Treasurer should get together with the people who run the mines and say, "These are the facts; these are the basic problems facing us. The State can be run well if royalties are increased." The arrangement of royalties according to the value of minerals is a reasonable one. There has been reasonable discussion and, as a result, we are to gain \$34,000,000. This will allow the State to carry on.

Our housekeeping and costs have been adjusted and our Budget has been formulated on that basis. There is nothing wrong with that. I can see no reason why the Opposition should desire to prevent the passage

of this Bill. The delaying tactics of Opposition members will gain them nothing. The State has been well managed, especially in its mining industries.

**Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (2.57 p.m.), in reply: I was quite interested in the contributions made by honourable members opposite. Each of them complained that the royalty to be levied will be set by regulation. Some went so far as to say that regulations could be promulgated and that there would be no opportunity to discuss them until next August. I make it perfectly clear that the regulations have been drafted. As soon as the Bill is proclaimed, which I anticipate will be before the end of the week, the regulations will be tabled in this House and honourable members opposite will have an opportunity of opposing their adoption if they so desire.

Opposition members claim that regulations give Cabinet too much power. Who should have power to introduce measures to govern this State? The Cabinet which is elected by the governing parties of the State. Cabinet is the medium through which all legislation is introduced to Parliament. As such, Cabinet is responsible for making regulations that implement the legislation that has been introduced.

One Opposition member—I think it was the honourable member for Wolston—said that because a small shareholding happened to be divided among several Cabinet Ministers some undue pressure could be exerted on them if they had to make a decision about a certain company. That is ridiculous, but it is typical of the thinking of some people who feel that because a man has the industry, initiative or temerity to invest in a mining enterprise he is up to some skulduggery or malpractice.

In one breath Opposition members ask that multi-nationals be excluded from the country and that encouragement be given to the private investor in Australia, and in the next breath, when someone has the initiative and courage to risk capital in a mining enterprise, they criticise him and say that he is up to no good. Notice of a question about this matter was given this morning. When I answer it tomorrow morning I will have something to say about the attitude displayed by honourable members opposite.

Reference was made to Cabinet altering royalty by regulation. A situation could arise while the House was in recess that required the royalty paid by a mining company to be increased, or even decreased to save a company from going into liquidation. In such circumstances don't honourable members opposite think it better that Cabinet should effect amendments to the regulations—in some cases to advantage the Government and in others to save a company from going into liquidation?

**Dr. Crawford:** The point to be made in regard to Mount Isa Mines Limited is that the shareholders received no dividends for a quarter of a century while the mine was being developed.

**Mr. CAMM:** Yes. I am coming to that.

The member for Archerfield, as usual, had a prepared brief, which he read rather badly. Sometimes I could not even understand what he was saying. I hope he gave a copy to the Hansard reporters so that they could understand what he meant to say. He claimed that the Opposition has forced the hands of the Government. If the Opposition has altruistic ideas about royalties, why did the Labor Party not introduce those provisions years ago when it had the power to do so? While it was in power in this State for 20-odd years, did we see any development of any consequence in the mining industry?

**Government Members:** No!

**Mr. CAMM:** No-one with a desire to invest money in Australia came to Queensland. Investors went to a State with a private enterprise Government, such as South Australia, where tremendous development took place as a result of investment by the very multi-nationals whom the Opposition appears to hate.

As I was reminded by the honourable member for Wavell, Mount Isa Mines, one of the biggest multi-nationals to operate in this country, developed the mine for 23 years before the shareholders received one penny by way of dividend; yet today 51 per cent of the shareholding in Mount Isa Mines is in Australian hands. The same can be said of Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. When it began, 85 per cent of the shareholding was held by overseas interests. Exactly the reverse applies today, with 80 per cent of that company's shareholding in Australian hands.

This trend is common all over the world. Multi-nationals, by virtue of the fact that they have tremendous amounts of risk capital, can enter any country and create development through the utilisation of natural resources. However, after a number of years, when the projects become economic in the sense that they are returning profits, the control gradually passes to the indigenous population.

The A.L.P. habitually quotes company profits. Opposition members say that such-and-such a company has declared a profit of "X" million dollars. They pay no regard to the amount of capital investment on which the profits are earned. Let any one of them invest his money in the big mining ventures in Australia today and see if he believes that he receives a just return on his investment.

The development of the bauxite deposit at Gove provides a classic example of this. At the time of that development, the Government of the day insisted that a majority

of the shareholding was to be held by Australians. Many Australian companies—large companies—were requested—almost coerced—to invest in the enterprise. However, sufficient capital could not be found in Australia to meet the Government's request of majority Australian shareholding. Eventually, a Swiss company took up the balance of shares forfeited by Australian investors. The simple reason was that a feasibility study revealed that the project would return no more than 7 per cent. That has been proved to be correct since the project became operational.

I realise, Mr. Speaker, that I have taken a fair amount of liberty in answering the accusations by the Opposition and that my remarks have strayed from the provisions of the Bill. Again and again Opposition members queried the profits earned by our railways in the cartage of minerals. However, it is an established fact. Any economist worth his salt can peruse the records of the Queensland railways over the last 30 years and find that since this Government has been in power—a period of 17 years—rail freights have been increased twice and reduced once. On the other hand, in the last nine years of Labor administration in Queensland rail freights were increased 10 times. The principal reason is that, since we have been the Government, the earnings from the transport of minerals have been sufficient to absorb the increasing cost of operating our railways.

An Opposition spokesman claimed that freight rates had not been increased as costs rose. In that statement he was quite wrong, because in the conditions applying to the railage of coal from Central Queensland rail freight rates are governed by escalation clauses, which in turn are calculated on a formula based on increases in wages, increases in the price of dieselene and increases in the price of steel. As those three costs increase, so does the rail freight on the cartage of coal. It increases at a percentage of the rail freight, and embodied in that rate when it was first negotiated was a profitability factor that enables the security deposit to be refunded over a given number of years. The escalation applies not only to the actual cost of running the railways, but also to the profit factor incorporated in the rail freight. This is a matter that I well remember arguing for some time with the companies concerned. I clearly recall arguing whether the increased costs should apply only to the cost of running the railways, and not to the profits to which we felt we were entitled.

There are times when Opposition members compare the return to the Government from the mining industry in Queensland with that obtained from the same source in other States. I do not intend to compare Queensland with other States. All I will say is that throughout all the negotiations that I have had with mining companies, it has been clear that they would have preferred to own the railway lines, as is the situation

in Western Australia. Although the State could then have obtained a higher royalty return, it would not have had control of the railways, as it has had over the last 15 years since they were constructed or rehabilitated with money supplied by multi-national companies that are so hated by Opposition members.

The honourable member for Salisbury spoke about royalties based solely on profits.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I did not.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member did say that. I can hear and write, and that is what he said. A royalty based on profits would have returned to the State far less than has been received by it during the last few years.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I rise to a point of order. I never said anything about royalties based on profits.

**Mr. CAMM:** The impression I gained was that the honourable member for Salisbury was talking about royalties based on profits.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Never mind about your impression. I never said that.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member said that there were two ways in which royalties could be levied, namely, one based on profits and one based on the value of the minerals.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I never said that at all.

**Mr. CAMM:** If a system of royalties based on profits had been introduced, the State would not have collected as much as it has. For many years, Thiess Peabody Mitsui made very little profit in mining operations at Moura. It is years and years before many of the large mining enterprises become profitable ventures, if their capital expenditure is taken into consideration in the assessment of profits.

The honourable member for Salisbury was also very critical of the way in which, he said, the State humbled itself by going to the Grants Commission.

**Mr. Sherrington:** So it did.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member obviously has little knowledge of the procedures of the Grants Commission. It is not a Government instrumentality. It was established in the 1930's to assist States that had to meet particular increased expenditure compared with the base States of New South Wales and Victoria. Over the last 10 or 15 years, by virtue of the tremendous development that has taken place in this State, Queensland has, by its exports of minerals and primary products such as beef, sugar and wool, become one of the major export-earning States of Australia, and this fact was taken into consideration by the Grants Commission. Following the commission's consideration, presumably it was decided that Queensland was entitled to a grant from the Commonwealth Government.

The recommendation of the Grants Commission goes to the Commonwealth Government, and invariably the Government of the day, irrespective of its political colour, accepts the recommendation of the Commission. States never humble themselves by approaching the Grants Commission. The Treasurer and his officers realised that Queensland was entitled to that money by reason of the additional expenditure involved in gaining export earnings for Australia. I should say that the A.L.P., when it was in Government, had no need to go to the Grants Commission, because its policies retarded development in Queensland not only in the mining industry but also in manufacturing industries. In fact, every industry stagnated as a result of the policy of the A.L.P.

The honourable member for Salisbury criticised the Government for not encouraging the establishment of secondary industries based on the State's mineral resources, I invite him to go and look at the alumina plant at Gladstone, and I should like him to look also at the aluminium processing plants that have been established in Australia. It should be borne in mind that the processing or refining of the State's minerals cannot be confined solely to Queensland. It must also be done further afield.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I rise to a point of order. I object to being misquoted. The Minister has mentioned only refining, which is not manufacturing. I do not like being misquoted. The Minister cannot point to one manufacturing industry in Queensland based on the production of minerals.

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

**Mr. CAMM:** I should say that for most of the aluminium articles used within Australia—the framing for windows, and so on—the processing of aluminium is done in Australia, and some of it is being done in Queensland.

**Mr. Sherrington:** No. We only refine bauxite; we do not manufacture aluminium.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Salisbury has already had ample opportunity to make a speech.

**Mr. CAMM:** I am amazed that the honourable member, in all the years he has been in Parliament, has not absorbed sufficient knowledge to be aware that there are aluminium refineries in New South Wales and at Bell Bay.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member implied that I was referring only to bauxite and alumina. I am referring also to aluminium.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! When the honourable member for Salisbury was speaking, I noticed that the Minister heard him virtually

in silence. I now ask the honourable member to cease interjecting. If he does not, I shall have to deal with him.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I rise to a point of order. Surely I have the right to protest when the Minister distorts what I said. Refining is not manufacturing.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Aikens:** You don't know what you said.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Oh, shut your big mouth!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Townsville South has just walked into the Chamber. If he continues to interject, he will be walking out again very quickly.

**Mr. CAMM:** I will leave the honourable member for Salisbury. He does not seem to understand the difference between refining and smelting. Bauxite is refined at Gladstone; it is smelted into aluminium metal in New South Wales and at Bell Bay and Bluff.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I now warn the honourable member for Salisbury under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr. CAMM:** The metal itself is processed into various articles that are used in Australia. I should say that very few manufactured aluminium articles are imported into this country. Much the same can be said of copper products. Copper refined at Townsville, together with copper from Mt. Lyell in Tasmania, supplies most of Australia's copper needs. In addition, a nickel refinery is now being established at Townsville. What further processing does the honourable member suggest should be done in an industry that is really only in its infancy? The mining of bauxite at Weipa began only about 15 years ago.

The Government has gone to great pains to encourage companies from overseas and companies within Australia to conduct a feasibility study of Queensland's coal resources in the Galilee basin and in south-eastern Queensland and test them for hydrogenation, and also to explore the possibility of establishing petrochemical industries so that some secondary industries can be based on coal. I inform honourable members opposite that such a study will not be completed—in fact, it will not even be started—unless we are prepared to encourage multi-national companies, with their huge capital and their technical know-how, to come here and conduct it. To my knowledge, no company in Australia would be prepared to do this without the assistance and expertise of the multi-nationals.

The honourable member for Salisbury said that he would not have an opportunity to discuss the royalty provisions that are going to be included in regulations. Again he showed his complete lack of knowledge of parliamentary procedure. The regulations will be

gazetted and tabled in the House within a few days of the Bill being proclaimed. No Government ever holds up the regulations associated with a Bill. They will be tabled within 10 days.

**Mr. Wright:** Provided the House is still sitting.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member will still be here in 10 days.

The honourable member for Salisbury said he would not have an opportunity to discuss them. Once they are tabled he can move, if he so desires, for the disallowance of those regulations, at which time he will have the regulations in front of him so that he will know what he is speaking about, and he can have a full-scale discussion on them.

The honourable member got on to the old bogey about the State spending money for the multi-nationals. The money is spent not for the benefit of the companies, but for the benefit of the workers employed by them. There are always conditions which require the companies themselves to shoulder the major responsibility for the financing of housing and water and electricity supplies.

**Mr. Newton** interjected.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member for Belmont does not like to hear this, but it is true. It is something he has failed to recognise over the years. Because we are building houses at Blackwater, Moranbah, Gladstone and other places he says that we are doing it for the multi-nationals when, in fact, we are doing it for the workers of Queensland.

I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Townsville pay tribute to the mining industry and other industries in Queensland. At least he appreciates that the royalties the Government collects are not the all-important factor. What is important is the flow-on of money that results from the companies spending such huge amounts of money. Industries in Cairns depend on the success of the operations in the Mackay region at Hay Point. Industries in Brisbane depend on the successful operation of the coal projects in Central Queensland. The benefits accrue not only to the mining company and to the men who are actively engaged in the mining, but to all the people within the State.

Motion (Mr. Camm) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 7, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### THIRD READING

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

STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING  
AND DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC  
WORKS ORGANIZATION AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.21 p.m.): I move—

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

In introducing this Bill, I stated that it was proposed to give legislative effect to what in fact has been the operation of the legislation to date and further stressed that the amendments were of a minimal nature only.

Honourable members opposite complained of lack of detail of the operation of the Act to date and consequently of the lack of detail of the Co-ordinator-General's Department. I am sure that, should members opposite wish to obtain this information, they will find it in the ample reports of the activities of this important Government department over the wide spectrum of responsibility encompassed by it. However, within the limitations imposed on me in speaking to this motion, I will detail for the information of the House a brief outline of results of this legislation to date.

This legislation, introduced in December 1971, changed considerably the role of the Co-ordinator-General's Department from that of a constructing authority to a top-level management and co-ordination department providing for State and regional development, environmental control and public works programming. Honourable members should appreciate the immensity and complexity of a major departmental reorganization such as this, which deals with top-level expertise. At the inception, this meant the transfer of personnel primarily involved in construction back to appropriate constructing departments and the determination of disciplines necessary to operate the department in its revised form. The task was then to obtain personnel having a very high degree of expertise and efficiency. It is a credit to the Co-ordinator-General that the reorganisation went smoothly, and that Queensland now has most of the expertise necessary to carry out the implementation of the legislation. Sir Charles Barton, one of Queensland's most capable administrators and respected public servants, has always taken a keen interest in rationalising his organisation.

My department therefore is very conscious of the need for decentralisation and already as part of the reorganisation has established an office in Townsville and is in the process of establishing an office in Rockhampton. As the chairmen of the regional co-ordination councils are officers of the Co-ordinator-General's Department, with the delegated authority of the Co-ordinator-General, there is a constant feedback and exchange of views between the department and local authorities.

By the end of 1972 the senior planning and co-ordination positions had been filled and detailed investigations of regional boundaries were well in hand. In addition, in preparation for the appointment of regional co-ordination councils, the provisions of the legislation received detailed examination and their application in a practical sense was investigated. Regulations were also prepared. As a result, the amendments I presented last year ensured that the principles of the original legislation could be pursued with more certainty and clarity with respect to the establishment and operation of regions, regional co-ordination councils, State development areas and project boards. These amendments were enacted on 19 April 1973, and were followed by the making of regulations on 5 July 1973.

Concurrently with this legislative activity, the Co-ordinator-General held discussions with State Government departments, local authorities, harbour boards, electricity boards and other relevant bodies in order to finalise the delineation of regional boundaries. Following this, in June 1973, the Northern Region was declared and in October 1973 nine regions were declared for the remainder of the State. The boundaries of these regions correspond to the boundaries of local government areas, and discussions with the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics indicate that the regions will be adopted as statistical divisions.

With the declaration of regions the Co-ordinator-General requested all local authorities to nominate representatives to be appointed to regional co-ordination councils, and on 8 November 1973 the inaugural meeting of the Northern Regional Co-ordination Council was held in Townsville. Since then, regional councils for the other nine regions have been appointed and have held at least one meeting.

Apart from establishing regional co-ordination councils and administering their activities, the Co-ordinator-General's Department has other functions. One role of the Co-ordinator-General that often goes unnoticed is the task of ensuring that there is no overlapping or duplication of activities and services of State departments. This is a continuing function, and one which has resulted in substantial savings of resources.

Another function of the department is to provide a think-tank for the Government. It will keep abreast of new ideas and concepts relating to planning and development and ways in which the activities of government and industry can be effectively integrated.

A very important function of the department is public works programming, which it has been involved in since its inception.

The honourable member for Salisbury raised the important question of the availability of technical evidence on which regional planning decisions are based. The department

has been involved in a number of major investigations and for the information of the House, I will indicate some—

Southern Queensland

Moreton Region—

Natural Environment;  
Man Made Environment;  
Water Supply;  
Recreation.

Central Queensland

Gladstone Infrastructure;  
Mackay Regional Study.

Northern Queensland

Burdekin Reappraisal Study;  
Northern Region—Basic Investigation of  
Prospects and Problems;  
Cairns Region Waste Disposal.

General

Population Projections—Queensland  
1971-2000;  
Housing Projections—Queensland 1971-  
2000;  
Inter-regional Trade Flows.

The Moreton studies will be used as background material to the over-all strategic study for Moreton, which I announced recently.

Let me now turn my attention to the matter of regional co-ordination councils. After discussion and investigations, it was felt that Queensland could be suitably divided into 10 regions. This proposal was discussed with the local government authority in the areas and, while time-consuming, the results have indicated the wisdom of involving the department in dialogue with local authorities. The regional co-ordination councils have all met and one of the first issues raised was to seek the advice of the members of the regional co-ordination councils on the legislation under which they were constituted. The results of their deliberations are now the basis for this legislation. I would think that reasonable people will realise that a new system such as this, affording local government the opportunity to play a greater role in the region and to discuss common matters of interest in relation to the development and management of the region, will not produce spectacular results overnight. What this Government is doing is providing the democratic linkage to ensure that decisions made and works performed will be the result of co-operation and co-ordination of effort with the appropriate participation and decision-making carried out at the appropriate levels.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt honourable members will have studied the Bill in detail, and just to clarify the position for them, briefly, I will summarise the sections to be amended.

The proposed amendment to section 32 is intended to make provision for the Environmental Control Council to develop and maintain liaison with regional co-ordination

councils and, where appropriate, co-ordinate their activities in the field of environmental control.

The existing section 40 is to be repealed and replaced by three new sections. The new section 40 specifies the areas for which a regional co-ordination council can be established and makes provision for the termination of councils. The proposed new section 40A clarifies the class of persons eligible for membership on regional co-ordination councils. In particular, the amendment specifies that local authorities be represented on regional co-ordination councils. The proposed section 40B indicates the manner in which members of a regional co-ordination council are appointed.

The amendment to section 41 is proposed in order to ensure that the term of appointment of a member to a regional co-ordination council does not extend beyond the term for which the council is constituted at the time of his appointment.

Amendment of section 42 allows a local authority not satisfied with the performance of its representative to make a replacement. The Government believes that the representative of a local authority should at all times retain the confidence of that local authority. This amendment makes provision for a local authority, if it so desires, to change its member on the regional co-ordination council by resolution, if it is not satisfied with him.

Situations may arise wherein an appointed member of a regional co-ordination council cannot attend a meeting. A new section 42A is therefore proposed in order to provide for delegate members. Under the proposed system, an appointed member would himself appoint in writing a delegate.

It is proposed to amend section 43. This amendment makes provision for a local authority to nominate a person for membership where a vacancy has occurred in the office of a member nominated by that local authority.

To provide for the case where a chairman of a regional co-ordination council is absent, it is proposed to amend section 44 so that a regional co-ordination council may appoint a person to preside at a meeting.

The proposed amendment to section 70 makes provision for the Minister to appoint a chairman to a project board rather than for the Co-ordinator-General to make the appointment.

On the advice of the Parliamentary Counsel, an amendment to section 72 provides for no more than a redesignation of the existing provisions.

In conformity with the proposals relating to section 70, it is intended to amend section 73 in order to provide for the appointment of a chairman of a project board when a vacancy occurs in that office. Also, in relation to the chairman of a project board, the proposed amendment to

section 74 makes provision for the board to appoint a person to preside at a meeting when the chairman is absent.

Finally, a new section 77A is proposed in order to make provision for the accounts of a project board to be audited by the Auditor-General.

It is clear that all these amendments are of a minor nature. Their importance lies in their ability to ensure the smooth functioning and administration of regional co-ordination councils and project boards.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why can't they elect their own chairman instead of having him appointed?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is set out in the Bill, as I have outlined in the details I have presented. I again commend the Bill to the House.

**Mr. B. WOOD** (Barron River) (3.35 p.m.): The Premier has just said that this Bill contains a number of relatively minor amendments. I suppose the most important or the most notable of those so-called minor amendments relates to the constitution of the regional councils. However, I would not agree that that is a minor amendment. It relates to a very important factor—the membership of the regional councils.

**Mr. Bromley:** The regional council mirrors the thoughts of local government.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That is correct. It will be found in due course that some of the regional councils will work more effectively, more efficiently and more competently than others. That will be due in the main to the calibre of their members. Because of their backgrounds, abilities and training, perhaps the members of some councils will be of a higher quality than others. The quality and the make-up of the membership of those councils will be a major factor in their future well-being. Therefore, the membership is of considerable concern to the Parliament, and I would not agree that the amendment is of only minimal importance. I think it is of some consequence.

At the moment the membership of regional councils is restricted exclusively to representatives of local authorities. They are Government nominees in a couple of cases in the far northern zone, where there is no local authority, such as in the shires of Cook and Torres. Evidently the regional councils, comprised as they are of local authority representatives, have indicated to the Government that that is their desire. Certainly, I know they were anxious that their own representation be firmly established. We now see that each shire in the area is entitled to one delegate. The Government has taken notice of what these delegates have said, but I suggest, as a note of caution or by way of further comment, that this is not necessarily the most desirable constitution of the councils.

I agree with the amendments that have been brought down in this matter and I will not argue against them. However, I believe that the membership of the regional councils could be further expanded. The aims of the legislation and the establishment of regional councils are so important—and I agree with the Premier on this—that we should be looking to a wider representation on them than we presently have. I believe that we could well add to the knowledge and experience already on these councils and we could increase the enthusiasm and interest presently available to them. I believe that that is desirable from the point of view of the Government and the councils.

Throughout the debate on the introduction of this legislation some years ago and a subsequent amendment to it, fear was expressed that another tier of government was being established. As I heard the debates at that time, the opinion was expressed that it was not desirable for all sorts of people to be imposing their will per medium of these regional councils. I completely agree that local authorities should dominate the regional councils; I would not argue against that at all. As has been said in previous debates, the councils are purely advisory; so there cannot possibly be any fear of their constituting an additional tier of government. I believe we could well add other people to the regional councils, and I would hope to see future legislation in which it is spelt out that certain other people are entitled to membership on the regional councils.

In my speech at the introductory stage, I said that I thought it would be desirable to appoint members of State Parliament to regional councils. I suppose most members, certainly those in country districts, represent areas that embrace one, two, three or more councils. All members are fairly deeply involved in what is happening in their regions, and they could play a useful part as members of regional councils. I hope to see in the future legislation to include such a provision in the Act.

**Mr. Newton:** We are getting their minutes at present.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** I am pleased to hear that mentioned by the honourable member. I would not like it to pass unnoticed. I appreciate receiving the minutes that I am given, and I assure those concerned that I am taking a particular interest in them. In fact, we all are; we all want to be involved in this work.

**Mr. Bromley:** I think the Moreton Regional Council should send its minutes to aldermen of the city council.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** I suggest that the honourable member for South Brisbane make such an approach to that council.

Regionalism is becoming far more established, and groups throughout Queensland are setting up regional bodies. The Department

of Cultural Activities, for example, is encouraging artistic and cultural groups in large areas to combine for their own benefit and for the benefit of the State. This trend still has some way to go before it becomes well established, but it has made considerable progress. I should like to see one delegate from such cultural and artistic groups elected to each of the 10 regional councils throughout the State. I think that one representative from such a range of activities could play a useful role on a regional council. He would probably have ideas to contribute, and knowledge to give, that few aldermanic or council delegates would have, because of his exclusive interest in one sphere.

In various centres of the State, sporting groups want to combine for their mutual benefit. I will admit that in Queensland at the present time this idea has not gone very far. However, why not have a representative of sporting organisations on each regional council? This is in fact a very big field in this State. A considerable amount of money, work and activity is channelled into sport, and those with this type of special interest and knowledge would have something to contribute to regional councils.

**Mr. Casey:** How do you suggest they would be chosen in the sporting field?

**Mr. B. WOOD:** I shall come to that later.

Organisations are now being set up in various parts of the State for the purposes of the Australian Assistance Plan. I am very interested in these bodies. I notice that there is a question on the Business Paper to be answered tomorrow morning on the attitude of the State Government to the Australian Assistance Plan. Those concerned with these organisations are genuine people with a genuine interest in a plan sponsored by the Australian Government for the benefit of the people.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Dozens of turtle farms.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** The honourable member should talk to some members on his side of the House who support the Australian Assistance Plan.

I would suggest that each regional council contain one delegate from such groups, because they have a particular interest in social welfare. This delegate would represent a great number of organisations that look after those who are deprived, and he would have something of value to contribute to the regional council.

I understand that in many parts of Queensland there are regional development boards, or boards dealing with tourism and travel. They have been set up to promote local industry and tourism, and to try generally to promote their areas and bring more people to them. I should think that such people would be essential on the regional councils. Their presence is of great importance because they are working in the field and know better than anyone else what is needed in the region.

Again, there would be gaps throughout the State. One could not go to each of the 10 regions and find a board working. However, where a board such as that exists, and where its activities are fairly extensive and cover a wide area of the region, it should be entitled to one representative on the regional council.

I thought that the aim of the measure before us was basically to allow statutory bodies such as harbour boards and electricity authorities representation on regional councils. Of course, that will have to come about, and I have no argument against it. But if that is its only aim, I think it is far too restrictive and not sufficiently wide-ranging. Over all, I think it will be found that many people from other groups who have something of great benefit to contribute will be willing to do so, and I think that would be of advantage to the councils.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** Don't you think they would become too unwieldy if there were so many?

**Mr. B. WOOD:** No. I do not think so. That is a point to be considered, but I have mentioned only about six different groups. At present some regional councils have 10 or a dozen members; some perhaps one or two fewer. I do not think that up to 20 members—actually, it would be fewer than that—would be too unwieldy. That is not such a big group. I do not know of any bodies other than those I have mentioned that should be represented.

Another point that I wish to mention—and I do not agree with this—is that where other classes of people are to be allowed onto regional councils, it seems to me, as I read the provision, that the decision as to which person shall be the representative is left to the Minister. If a statutory body or any of the groups that I have mentioned is to have a representative on a regional council, I think it is up to the body or group concerned to nominate its representative, just as local authorities nominate who shall represent them. Unless I have misread it—and I do not think I have—a regional council can say to the Minister, "We want a representative from the Harbour Board." It is then up to the Minister to say who that representative shall be, no doubt on the advice of the harbour board. In my opinion, it should be spelt out quite clearly that the harbour board itself nominates its representative. I think that is important.

**Mr. Davis:** Otherwise it might lend itself to malpractice.

**Mr. B. WOOD:** That may be. The Premier of this State has a great deal to say about centralism in Canberra. Admittedly, the matter I am dealing with is a very minor one; but as the decision is being made in Brisbane rather than in the decentralised area

in which the body itself is situated, I do not think it is fair to criticise Canberra when such a policy prevails.

Those are my major comments on the legislation. The Opposition has no objection to it, but I believe that the comments that have been made in the debate today and the comments that were made at the introductory stage are certainly worthy of consideration.

**Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (3.49 p.m.):** It is very pleasing indeed to hear the honourable member for Barron River agree with the provisions of the legislation. I could hark back to the introductory stage, of course, when all sorts of sinister implications were made about what was then innovative legislation in Queensland, and indeed in Australia. It is pleasing to find the honourable member endeavouring to put forward constructive suggestions. He raised a number of matters that are worthy of consideration and certainly of comment.

Both at the introductory stage and today, the Premier outlined the amending provisions, stressing that they are of a minimal nature only. Having had an opportunity to read the Bill, honourable members will concur with that. The honourable member for Barron River suggested an improved establishment of the regional advisory councils. The Premier was very careful to indicate to the House just how the establishment was arrived at. It was left to local government members on the original advisory councils as set up in the early stages of implementation of the legislation. Provision is made for bodies outside local government to have representation. By motion of the regional advisory council persons are nominated, and then at the discretion of the Minister in charge of the legislation—the Premier—they can be appointed to the regional advisory council by Order in Council.

When referring to the regional advisory councils, it is significant to look at the role the Commonwealth Government is playing in relation to advisory councils in Queensland. For the purpose of its regional considerations it has been pleased to accept the 10 regions set up by this Government. As it is using these regions for the purposes of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, it is obvious that if membership is kept to local government representation the regional advisory councils as such will also be acting in that capacity in relation to the Grants Commission.

It is passing strange that honourable members opposite agree now that there should not be a third tier of government in Queensland. I wonder how they relate this to their Federal colleagues who are hell bent on establishing a unicameral regional form of government in Australia, beholden entirely to a central Government in Canberra.

**Mr. Davis:** You don't know what you're talking about.

**Mr. LICKISS:** That is the actual policy of the honourable member's party, as he will see if he cares to read the utterances of the Prime Minister. They leave nothing to the imagination. At the introductory stage I actually quoted the Prime Minister's views on regional government, the ultimate destruction of State Government, the ultimate destruction of local government as we presently know it, and the inauguration of a strong, unicameral regional government system beholden to his central Government in Canberra.

The question of the importance of linkages in Government administration in this State should be stressed again. This Government, in terms of planning at the micro-level, has established a very strong linkage between local government and the State Government through the Department of Local Government. At the macro-level, where regional strategies are developed, this linkage is reinforced by virtue of the regional advisory councils having local government representation, through the Co-ordinator-General's Department, with the Premier as Minister for State Development.

This legislation has been the object of a great deal of examination by Governments throughout Australia. It would be logical to expect to see the development of this type of legislation in the other States of the Commonwealth. I am happy that honourable members opposite have been pleased to comment favourably on the development of the legislation, which we said at the outset was innovative in concept.

I think it is a great tribute to the Co-ordinator-General of Queensland (Sir Charles Barton) and his staff that they have been able to re-organise one of the premier Government departments of the State and reorientate it from a constructing authority to a planning authority with such success in such a short time. With the Premier and other honourable members I commend the legislation.

**Mr. HARVEY (Stafford) (3.55 p.m.):** We acknowledge that the Bill before the House is a very necessary one for the State. Throughout Queensland there are 133 local authorities, each expounding its own policy, and it is rather regrettable that on many occasions the local authority boundary determines the attitude and policy that will be applied on one side of a road as distinct from the other.

The population of Queensland is growing so fast and its industrial activities are expanding at such a rate that the avenues covered by this legislation cannot be confined within local authority boundaries. In planning, we are dealing with people, their needs, their business involvement, their industrial requirements and participation, and their leisure. The economics of the whole exercise are also very important in the building of a city, in the establishment of its recreational facilities and in other areas of activity. These

are all very costly items but, whatever their cost, we must acknowledge that cities should be built and developed in the interests of the people.

Dealing with the benefits that flow from the establishment of regions, I cast my mind back to the period prior to the establishment of Greater Brisbane when the area was served by 19 councils as well as numerous boards and commissions.

The residential area of our capital city is no longer confined within the boundaries served by the Brisbane City Council. Therefore we must have an overriding planning authority which, in this part of the State, because of its topography, the contour of the land, and the general necessary services such as water conservation, transport and other public service, is related to the West Moreton area. All these matters need to be dealt with on a regional basis. Fortunately, in recent times recognition has been given to the necessity of organising transportation on a regional basis. We know from the minutes of the Co-ordinator-General's Department that it is looking at the possibility of establishing a water board for the West Moreton catchment area. I remember Gordon Cowling, who was a former manager of the Brisbane City Council's Water Supply and Sewerage Department, mentioning this many years ago.

We are also becoming somewhat concerned about the unnecessary duplication of services requiring skill, equipment and technical know-how. In this part of the State we have a local authority that might be able to afford to employ highly skilled personnel; in other parts of the State individual local authority budgets may not be strong enough to enable them to employ the necessary skilled personnel and they have to rely on outside consultants who may be right on many occasions and wrong on others.

In this plan, under Sir Charles Barton we achieve co-ordination of all these facilities and technical skills to ensure that such personnel are utilised to the fullest advantage. This ensures that the money derived from rates and other charges is used to the best advantage of the community irrespective of the part of the State people reside in.

In the setting up of any regional committee, board or trust public participation is of paramount importance. Among the members of such a body must be some who are answerable directly to the public, because quite often public servants adopt a bureaucratic outlook and disregard the wishes of the people. Further, the decisions arrived at by such a committee must be made known to the public and not allowed to leak out, as it were, from behind closed doors. Everything must be above board and decisions arrived at must be made available to all, not just to a few who through lines of communication obtain information that they can use to their personal gain.

Among the matters that call for consideration by a regional committee are the national estate and population explosions. Naturally, too, the economy of any region will have a great bearing on such a committee's considerations. It has been forecast that by 1980 the population of the south-eastern sector of the State will be in excess of 1,000,000. Moreover, we are told that 64 per cent of Queensland's population resides in the south-east corner of the State. As Queensland's natural resources are spread throughout the State, it is important to ensure that regional development occurs not in one corner and not along the coastal belt alone but throughout the State. Local authorities as well as the State and national Governments must do all in their power to develop all areas under their administration.

As we know, the present trend is for the population to move to the cities. This is regrettable because, among other things, a heavy concentration of people in a city requires high-density living in high-rise buildings. Quite frankly, I liken them to beehives; they are nothing more than concrete structures containing numerous cells. The people who live in them—the husbands and wives who go out to work all day and come home at night to rest their weary bodies—have no backyards and no open space. This is certainly not good living. In Sweden, a country noted for high-rise development, the divorce and crime rates are higher than anywhere else in the world. People must be allowed both to work and to engage in recreational activities amid proper surroundings. Children should be given the opportunity of playing in back yards under parental control. They need open space. Leisure hours spent within the confines of four walls are far from rewarding.

Vast areas of the State remain undeveloped. If we were candid I am sure we would admit that all of us have not done all we can to ensure that the people who went into those areas as pioneers are given sufficient incentive to remain there. Furthermore, we have not provided them with many of the amenities and facilities enjoyed by city dwellers. Therefore, the opportunities available to the regional co-ordination councils to foster the development of their areas are immense. We must realise at all times that regional development involves people, lines of communication, facilities and services such as the transport of goods and so on that people may require or that they produce.

When I was overseas a few years ago I obtained a copy of a report entitled, "Study Design for a Comprehensive Transportation and Land Use Program for the Detroit Region". Some of the questions asked were in these terms—

"How should the area's growth take place in the years to come—a continuation of unplanned sprawl, recentralization, longitudinal growth along transportation arteries, in clusters separated by open spaces or some combination of these?

"What are the attitudes and goals of citizens and public officials in regard to their neighbourhood, their community, and the region itself?"

"How can the development of the region be guided in accordance with these values?"

"What role should mass transit facilities play in a regional transportation system?"

"How much will it cost to provide various levels of transportation service? What will be the cost of deficient transportation service?"

Later, the report set out, the planning formula—Firstly, the function of data collection; secondly, analysis of the information collected; thirdly, plan formulation and testing; fourthly, plan review and adoption; and fifthly, plan implementation.

The legislation before us creates the powers to be conferred on this authority. They will ensure that it will be not only a committee that will meet and make decisions, but also a committee that will be able to implement its decisions, which will effect over-all development in the way of land use, supporting services, technical advisory committees and inter-government and community relations. All these facets are vital to the State's development.

I often think of the British Isles, which has a population that could be fitted into Queensland twice over. Australia faces a big problem caused by sparsity of population and extensive lines of communication. If we are to achieve our ultimate objective, we must ensure that we create not only public participation, but also the legislative powers and economic machinery to implement the requirements necessary to develop this country properly.

I am particularly pleased with the amending provisions. I am also very pleased to receive, from time to time, the minutes of the body that has been set up. They prove that the committee has nothing to hide and that the action being taken by it is in the best interest of the State. I commend the proposals outlined by the Premier.

**Mr. LANE** (Merthyr) (4.9 p.m.): The amendments to the Act will have application in areas other than land use. At the introductory stage I pointed out how this legislation could affect social welfare in Queensland. I said that a master plan has been compiled in Canberra known as the Australian Assistance Plan. I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Barron River refer to it. That plan seeks to establish a new system of grants for welfare organisations in the community through what is known as regional councils for social development. They are bodies that will be set up on a regional basis throughout the State and the nation. It is interesting to note that the Social Welfare Commission has adopted the boundaries as laid down under the legislation we are presently debating. As

I said, we should not be concerning ourselves merely with the fields of land use and major construction work. That was recognised by the honourable member for Barron River.

**Mr. Casey:** The Act never restricted it to those fields. The original Act was a very broad one, if you examine its sections.

**Mr. LANE:** Yes. I am aware of that; but most of the debate in this Chamber has been restricted to the topic of land use and associated matters. That is why I wish to discuss the effect that these amendments will have on social welfare grants once the Australian Assistance Plan is implemented.

The documents that have been compiled outlining the plan in broad terms show that already over \$2,000,000 has been allocated by the Commonwealth Government to regional councils for social development throughout the nation. In fact, already in Queensland an allocation of \$114,000 has been made to interim regional councils. As each council is established under the plan, it qualifies for a seeding grant of \$20,000 to finance a secretariat, which would include a manager and typing assistance. In addition, each region will have allocated to it directly by the Commonwealth Government the assistance of social planners.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** There are plenty of chiefs.

**Mr. LANE:** Yes, there are. However, one would hope that at some stage there will be Indians to do the work, because there is a tendency in social welfare work to engage more in planning than in works of compassion. Little actually reaches the stage of helping people. We can finish up with endless planning. That expresses some of the reservations I have about the Bill.

**Mr. Davis:** It's got nothing to do with the Bill at all.

**Mr. LANE:** It is quite obvious that the honourable member for Brisbane knows nothing about the contribution I am making to the debate. If he did, he would realise that what I say is closely related to the legislation. He is quite dull and his lack of perception is not surprising.

When the Australian Assistance Plan was first introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament, the Liberal Party spokesman (Mr. Don Chipp, M.P.) had these comments—

"Here is one of the most important social documents laid down in this Parliament for 20 years. I should like to compliment the Commission"—

that is, the Social Welfare Commission—

"for an outstanding document and I extend my appreciation to the Minister for embracing it and its philosophies."

I noticed in the debates in the House of Representatives on 18 July this year, after some regional councils had been set up and part of the plan had been implemented, Mr. Chipp said—

“We are saying that the way in which the Minister is administering the Australian Assistance Plan is now beginning to border on a national scandal. The point we are making is that it is pork barrelling political patronage.”

That was his second comment, almost 12 months after the first.

In Queensland we have not reached that stage of development of the Australian Assistance Plan where we are able to judge whether Mr. Chipp's latter remarks apply here. Quite frankly, I should like to give it a trial at this stage to see how it works, because I am aware of the financial deficiencies in the social welfare field. I am grateful for any means by which finance can be made available to worthy welfare organisations in the community.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Has this got good local support?

**Mr. LANE:** It has support among people who are aware of what is proposed. Although people are a little reluctant to embrace such a radical new scheme, generally speaking I think they take the attitude that I have adopted; they are prepared to give it a trial and see what happens.

**Mr. Davis** interjected.

**Mr. LANE:** The horrible cackle of the honourable member for Brisbane does not do anything to help this cause. He sees everything as a Trades Hall exercise. There is no good will in him, either here or at local level. He is not interested in the people in the community, so it is not surprising that he carries on with this nonsense here.

When this plan to handle social welfare grants on a regional basis, in accordance with current legislation, was implemented, it was on a recommendation of the Social Welfare Commission. I think that people in all States, including members on both sides of this House, were entitled to be a little disappointed that the Federal Minister for Social Security (Mr. Bill Hayden) rejected the offer of State Governments to participate in consultation with the Social Welfare Commission to formulate this plan. Mr. Hayden chose not to involve the States in the deliberations of the Social Welfare Commission. There is among public servants and members of this House a great deal of knowledge and experience in social welfare matters, and I think we were all entitled to be a little disappointed that people with these qualifications were not involved in the work of the commission. In fact, Mr. Hayden rejected outright the request by the States for representation on the Social Welfare Commission.

The commission came up with the Australian Assistance Plan. Whilst we are prepared to give it a go, I think we are justified in feeling a little cautious about possible interference with State constitutional responsibilities. It seeks to encourage local community groups to establish themselves as regional councils based on regions set out in the current legislation, the Commonwealth Government to fund their activities direct to regional councils. In the long term, it may well be found that this contravenes section 96 of the Australian Constitution.

In the implementation of the plan in the Greater Brisbane area, a recommendation has been made to the Social Welfare Commission and to Mr. Hayden.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! How does the honourable member tie the Social Welfare Commission in with the Bill? I find it very difficult to see the connection. I ask him to return to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. LANE:** The State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organisation and Environmental Control Act, the subject of this debate, divides the State into regions for the purpose of planning. Those people within the community, and the members of this House, who are simple-minded think that it relates only to the planning of public works, and to expenditure by the Government on a regional basis for land-use planning. In fact, it has direct application to social-welfare planning since the implementation by the Australian Government of the Australian Assistance Plan. I think we should all be concerned about social welfare, and how grants are to be made to community organisations.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! A short while ago the honourable member read out one of the principles of the Bill, and that is one matter on which he and I are completely in accord. However, I ask him now to come back to the principles of the Bill. It would appear that there is a difference of interpretation between the honourable member and me.

**Mr. Wright:** Go off the cuff.

**Mr. LANE:** I am going off the cuff now, despite the remarks of the creepy member for Rockhampton.

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. LANE:** You just leave your girlfriend at home when you are down here in Brisbane.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LANE:** Go home to your wife and family and behave yourself as a respectable young man should.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LANE:** The Casanova of the campus; that is what he is known as—chasing every little tart—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Merthyr. When I rise to my feet, you will take heed. Furthermore, you are not obliged to take notice of interjections.

**Mr. LANE:** I am concerned about social-welfare grants on the basis of the regions laid down under the Bill.

Another aspect about which I think honourable members should also be concerned is the monitoring role of the regional councils set up under the Australian Assistance Plan. Two documents have been compiled by the Australian Government on this matter. The first is known as Discussion Paper No. 1, and in chapter 2 it says that one of the duties of the regional councils shall be "to continually evaluate and monitor the social needs of the region and to report on these to the State and the Australian Governments". I take it that is the region referred to under the Bill.

I was quite pleased this morning to hear the honourable member for Maryborough, who is very close to his electorate and aware of what is going on in it, ask a question of the Premier about that particular point in the Australian Assistance Plan. He sought information in which I, too, am interested, that is, as to how these regional councils will monitor the needs of their region—I understand that one or two have been set up in Queensland—and whether they have yet made any reports to the State Governments on the needs of their region as laid down under the legislation at present being debated.

**Mr. Davis:** What regional councils are you talking about—the N.A.C., or the other ones?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LANE:** For the benefit of the honourable member for Brisbane—

**Mr. Davis** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I now warn the honourable member for Brisbane under Standing Order 123A. I have already warned him several times today.

**Mr. LANE:** They are in a mess, Mr. Speaker, and that is the point I am trying to make.

Another duty of the regional councils is to devise plans for welfare service provision to meet the needs of the region.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! What is the honourable member quoting from? I ask him to inform me.

**Mr. LANE:** I am quoting from Discussion Paper No. 1 under the Australian Assistance Plan, which ties social-welfare grants from

the Commonwealth Government into the regions as laid down under the legislation now before the House.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** In that case, the honourable member is definitely out of order. On page 2 the Bill says, "to co-ordinate the work of departments of the Government of the State, local authorities, regional co-ordination councils . . .". As far as I can see, the Bill does not mention what the honourable member is referring to, and I ask him to come back to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. LANE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that I cannot continue to discuss the welfare needs of the regions of the State under the Australian Assistance Plan. I will make my speech at another time when I am permitted to do so.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (4.25 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable members who have spoken on this very important Bill and how it affects the State generally. I appreciate all the contributions that have been made, particularly that by the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha, who for a long time has put a lot of work into this whole area of State responsibility and activity. His help and advice have been of great benefit to me and the Government. I appreciate his efforts very much indeed.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Wharton, Burnett, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—New s. 40A; Constitution of Regional Co-ordination Councils—

**Mr. B. WOOD** (Barron River) (4.26 p.m.): I desire very briefly to restate my view that it is desirable that, whatever class the regional council may wish, the local group should nominate its own delegate. Clause 4 gives this right to the Minister; the council may decide what class it wants to invite onto the council, but the Minister makes the actual appointment. I do not think this is desirable, and I ask the Premier to indicate that an amendment might be made at some future time to allow the local group to make that nomination.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (4.27 p.m.): I do not see the same danger as the honourable member for Barron River sees on this, because I think it is similar to the provision that now applies to the appointment of members to all statutory boards and semi-governmental authorities under the control of the Government. The appointment is actually made by the Minister as the person in law who makes the recommendation to the Executive Council. I think there have been very few occasions in Queensland when a group's recommendation to the Minister

has not in fact been accepted. Nevertheless, taking the point made by the honourable member for Barron River, it could happen.

One other aspect of clause 4 concerns me more. I refer to subsection (2) of new section 40A at lines 18 and 19 on page 3 of the Bill, where it states—

“. . . recommend to the Minister that a person or persons of a class or classes specified by it should be appointed . . .”

Unfortunately the Bill does not specifically define “class”. I should like the Premier to expound just a little more on what he envisages by “class”. That word could perhaps cover the points made at the second-reading stage by the honourable member for Barron River when he suggested the various groupings in the community that may be interested in participating in the work of regional councils. It might even cover those the honourable member for Merthyr referred to. I think the definition of “class” should be spelt out a little more clearly so that honourable members will know just how far the Government intends to go in extending the work of regional councils in the various groups in the community.

I point out that the term is also incorporated in clause 8, which refers to a representative of a specified class. That is fairly broad. How far down do we go? It could be extended to all sections of the community—to the marbles association or something like that if we really wanted to get down to classes in the community.

The other point I wish to make is that much work has been devoted to having these appointments made for a specific period. The Bill sets out that the term of office of anybody being appointed to a regional council shall cease at the end of the term of that council. I should like the Government to take cognisance of the fact that it is most necessary that the term of regional councils be co-ordinated with the term of the local authority. The whole basis of appointment, for the majority of members anyhow, is through local authorities, so in the actual operation of the legislation it will be absolutely essential that the period of appointment of regional councils be closely tied to the actual date of local authority elections on a three-year basis.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (4.32 p.m.): I think we ought to go back to the original concept of the legislation, which was to promote co-operation and co-ordination between local government on the one hand and the State Government on the other. Experience showed that local government representation on the regional advisory councils was the wish of local government generally. Through experience we have found that, in terms of local government there are regions, comprised of local government areas, where the members of the local government are elected by popular franchise. But there is one other category of local

government where there is no elected representation—such as the Shire of Torres and the Cook Shire—and provision is now being made for the Premier to appoint a person to be a member of the regional advisory council.

If we go back to the various stages of the legislation, particularly at its inception, we had all sorts of ideas as to who should comprise the membership of regional advisory councils. We considered members of harbour boards, members of regional electricity authorities, and I could go on ad infinitum. The question of who was to draw the line was a matter that had to be discussed.

The honourable member for Mackay referred to the question of classes as, I think, did the honourable member for Barron River. The word “class” is the Parliamentary Counsel’s terminology, in this concept to refer to other than local government. I feel sure that honourable members will realise that we have to be guided by the Parliamentary Counsel in drafting the legislation. If the Bill is to pursue the original concept of achieving co-operation and co-ordination between the Government and local government, I think it necessarily follows that any additions to the regional advisory councils should be done with the good wishes of the present membership of the regional advisory council, which is local government representation.

In its turn, local government appoints its representatives to the regional advisory council and, under this legislation, local government can dismiss those representatives, replace them, and so on. We also say that the regional advisory council, by its own motion, can ask that a member of a regional electricity board or a harbour board or a representative of some other body be appointed. They make the recommendation and the Premier, at his discretion, then makes a recommendation for the appointment by Order in Council. I do not think there is anything sinister in this. It is merely upholding the original concept of the legislation, which, I repeat, was on the basis of co-operation and co-ordination of effort as between the State Government on the one hand and local government on the other.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 7, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—New s. 42A; Delegate members—

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (4.35 p.m.): I do not wish to labour the point on this matter of class, and I am grateful to the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha for having given a part explanation of the intention of the Bill. Legislation, however, must be specific, so I merely ask that at a later stage a straightforward definition of the term “class” be given.

I point out that other amendment provisions in the Bill contain wording that has been altered. In fact, clause 2 refers to "all persons and associations that concern themselves in activity directed towards control of the environment," and so on. We all know that one of the associations making the most noise on environmental matters is the Communist Party. Surely we would not envisage giving that organisation direct representation on a regional council. Perhaps I am using an extreme example, but I am only trying to make my point. After all, the dictionary definition of "class" refers to a group of persons. The Government must give consideration to defining specifically the class of organisations that it believes should have the opportunity to participate in the activities of the regional councils.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (4.37 p.m.): We must have confidence, as I am sure we have, in the personnel who are appointed to the regional advisory councils. I do not think we should be too restrictive if they, in their wisdom, feel that anyone from any walk of life and representing any discipline or organisation should be either debarred or included. This matter should be left fairly wide open and to the good sense of the regional advisory council, because the appointment of a person recommended for appointment must be carried on the motion of the majority of members of the council. I have every confidence in local government representation on these councils, and I am sure that other honourable members share my sentiments.

The next matter is that the Minister has a discretion, so I think we ought to lean towards the regional advisory councils, who, I am sure, will achieve the best results. I do not think any further amendment is necessary in relation to the term "class".

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 15, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

## SALE OF HUMAN BLOOD BILL

### SECOND READING

**Hon. S. D. TOOTH** (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (4.40 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

In my introductory speech I advised honourable members that the Bill was brief and easy to follow and I feel sure that now there has been an opportunity to study the proposed legislation they will agree with me. There are, however, one or two points which may bear further elucidation.

I am advised that blood consists of a fluid portion called the plasma in which blood cells are suspended. The plasma contains many important substances which have various special qualities. These various substances can be separated from whole blood by a process called fractionation.

Human blood is a very precious product, but unfortunately whole blood can only be used for transfusion for a period of three weeks after donation. The process of fractionation is therefore very important. It is used to process the plasma from outdated blood to isolate various components which last much longer than whole blood itself and which can be used separately. In some medical conditions red cells alone are used. In others the various proteins derived from the plasma are administered. Apart from those blood products available for emergency treatment by transfusion, many other substances useful in other ways may also be isolated from blood. Some of these are available for special immunisation against such diseases as tetanus. The plasma also yields agents which are used to produce clotting of the blood in certain haemorrhagic conditions. All the products already mentioned would be covered by the definition of blood in the Bill, which refers to any substance derived from blood.

In my introductory speech I mentioned that at one time a local firm was interested in joining with a United States company in commercial trading in blood. The reason for the inquiries was related to the purchase of placentae from maternity hospitals. From these organs can be derived a clotting agent and other blood products. Other organs could be used for the production of blood products. It is for these reasons that the definition of blood must include those organs from which it is possible to derive a constituent of blood for therapeutic use or for the preparation of a substance for therapeutic use.

The process of fractionation by which individual blood components are made was developed in America during the last World War by a team of scientists at Harvard Medical School. It commenced in Australia in 1952 at the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories. The work is carried out in close co-operation with the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service. Blood and other products derived in this way are available free of cost through the blood transfusion services. I emphasise that, in addition to those substances distributed in this way, those blood products used in special immunisation procedures are supplied free of cost to private practitioners through the various branches of the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories.

I emphasise those points because, during the introductory debate, the honourable member for Albert referred to some notations on hospital accounts which, he said, indicated that patients were charged for blood. That is an error. Blood is provided absolutely free of cost by the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service. It is probable that what the honourable member was referring to was the service by professional people in the transfusion that was received; certainly there was no charge for the blood.

That brings me to a point raised by the honourable member for Port Curtis in the introductory debate when he referred to the possibility of the record of donors in the Blood Transfusion Service being used as police records. It is possible that the honourable member was referring to an article in "The Bulletin" of 31 August 1974. I have discussed this matter with the authorities and the Director of the Queensland Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service stated that that particular article contains a number of fallacies. The time is a long way off when identification of a person by the manner described in the article could be achieved.

A person's blood grouping can only be used to prove innocence, not guilt. For instance, if a specimen of blood shows that it belongs to a group other than that of an accused person, he is naturally excluded from that grouping. If analysis shows that the specimen is of the same grouping as that of the accused, this only means that he or some other one of the same large blood grouping may have committed the crime of which he is accused. It in no way positively identifies him.

Dr. Shaw has advised that the Queensland Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service observes the strictest confidentiality regarding donor records. I hope that will set the honourable member's mind at rest on this matter.

Not all blood products are used as therapeutic agents. Some, including special control sera, are used in tests carried out in pathology laboratories. These substances are manufactured by agencies other than the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories and are available through normal trade channels.

At one stage the Commonwealth Government was considering placing the immunisation blood products on the pharmaceutical benefits list under the National Health Act. In order to cover such possibilities in the future, it is necessary to include an exemption provision in the legislation.

In earlier comments I commended the Queensland Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service and mentioned that the local service maintained a rare-blood register for the whole of transfusion. By this means the whereabouts of rare-blood donors are recorded and they may be quickly advised if their assistance is required. It is extremely rare for a case to arise when a person needing a rare-blood-group transfusion is not treated with blood derived from voluntary donations. Such an occasion, however, could arise and it is therefore necessary to provide for such a rare event, which may entail the purchase of blood of this type. Such provision must allow quick action but also contain the necessary safeguards. Measures to provide for this are included in the Bill.

Further provisions of the Bill include the prohibition of advertising a willingness to buy as well as the prohibition of selling of

human blood. Steps to be taken in the event of an offence against this Act are also set out. The provisions in the Bill are based on the uniform legislation suggested by the Commonwealth and States' Attorneys-General. They are concise but are still adequate to achieve the purpose intended. I commend the Bill to the House.

**Mr. F. P. MOORE** (Mourilyan) (4.48 p.m.): As I was inadvertently absent during the introductory stage, I must make a few comments—

**Mr. Lane:** When were you released?

**Mr. F. P. MOORE:** I must reply to that interjection from the honourable member for Merthyr, who is known for his frequent inane interjections. Because of the circumstances obtaining in my electorate, I had to travel 100 miles to get to an airport. The honourable member can walk round his electorate in half an hour.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister mentioned a chemical analysis, which is possibly beyond his own comprehension but which is an explanation of blood in general. The Opposition has no barrow to push against the legislation. To the extent of the Minister's outline in his introductory remarks, which I have read, it is beneficial and quite straightforward. There is nothing objectionable in it and much that is worth while.

However, I take objection to a remark made by the Minister about the honourable member for Nudgee. He said, "I listened to his speech this afternoon on the public address system—"

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! When did this allegedly take place?

**Mr. F. P. MOORE:** At the introductory stage.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The honourable member should have risen then and objected.

**Mr. F. P. MOORE:** I am saying that the honourable member for Nudgee, a member of my committee, deserves an apology from the Minister.

The Minister showed his ignorance in his remarks concerning the honourable member for Port Curtis and the article, "Police think your blood is worth bottling" by Timothy Hall that appeared in "The Bulletin". The words of the honourable member for Port Curtis were his own, as the debate in which they were used took place on 29 August and "The Bulletin" referred to is dated 31 August. The statement of the honourable member for Port Curtis did not come from Timothy Hall's article, and I say to the Minister that the honourable member also deserves an apology from him.

All in all, the Opposition has no objection to the legislation.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG** (Townsville) (4.52 p.m.): The honourable member for Mourilyan stated that the Opposition agrees with the legislation. I can understand that statement, because the Bill is based on sound principles. It surprised me that the honourable member, who is the Opposition's shadow Minister for Health, offered no constructive suggestions. All he did was criticise statements made about Opposition members.

The aim of the Bill is of great importance not only to this State but to the nation, because it sets out to put in correct perspective the unlimited supply of disease-free blood. It applies not only to whole blood, which even under the most ideal conditions of refrigeration lasts approximately three weeks only, but also to blood components. All these components of blood are most essential, especially in a State in which emergencies are likely to arise. A large proportion of this State's income is derived from mining, and a mining disaster can result in many casualties being thrust suddenly upon the hospital system. Considerable amounts of blood and blood components are then required.

During the war in Vietnam, the entire needs of the blood transfusion service were met by American citizens. An unlimited supply of blood was available for Australians, Americans, Vietnamese, Chinese, and any others who were wounded in the combat area, and all of that blood was supplied by American citizens. When one looks back and remembers the casualty rate among Americans, one sees that this was a magnificent example of devotion by the American people. It is unfortunate that it is often overlooked by Australians.

Medical services must be maintained, and this can be done only if an adequate supply of blood is available. In some States, it was collected in a haphazard way at major hospitals, and there was no co-ordination of collection or distribution. Quite often a surgeon would have to take blood from a relative and give it to the patient. Under the national Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service, State services have been set up, and fortunately they have been manned by most devoted personnel and administered by, in the main, very knowledgeable physicians and fine administrators. I mention especially the State Director, Dr. Shaw, who is outstanding in the world in his particular field of medicine. He is always available, and the transfusion service in this State is something of which we can be proud.

The far-flung areas of Queensland are supplied mainly from major hospitals in the coastal belt, which feed back into the smaller district hospitals, and this service is completely under the control of the Queensland Branch of the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service. Blood is taken at the base hospitals and stored. If additional blood or blood of a special group is needed urgently, it is provided. Anyone in the State can simply

pick up a telephone, ring the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service, and the blood needed will be on the next plane out of Brisbane. Even some of the rarest groups of blood are provided in that way. In a great emergency, I have telephoned the transfusion service and blood has been rushed to Townsville by plane within a few hours.

**Dr. Edwards:** And there is no charge.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** As the honourable member for Ipswich said, there is no charge, which is very commendable.

In America, for many years blood was sold. It was taken by all and sundry at different hospitals and in different services. As a matter of fact, as a crew member of a ship just after World War II, I actually sold my blood in America. They did not care whether one had malaria, syphilis or anything else. They just took the blood and paid the donor \$5. Most members of the crew of the ship were anaemic when they left New York, because they had made three or four donations of blood. The British Government would not allow anyone to take more than \$100 out of the country. The crew of the ship had to obtain dollars, and they obtained them by selling blood.

From my personal experience, I can say that blood was taken under shockingly unhygienic conditions, and after the two donations that I made the wound was infected. God help the man who was given my blood! He would not have got syphilis, but he would have got malaria.

What takes place in America is frightening. In a city such as Chicago, for example, 200,000 transfusions might be made annually, which means that trading in blood is fairly big business. There may be up to 5,000 deaths a year in America from hepatitis caused by inadequate sterilisation of needles used in transfusion services.

That was one of the real problems in the 1939-45 war. Blood plasma was dropped from the air. Many troops who were given plasma contracted serum hepatitis, with serious illness following, and in some cases they later died from cirrhosis of the liver. It was bad enough to be shot by a Japanese, but it was terrible to die three or four years later as a result of poisoning from one of your countrymen's blood.

**Mr. Bromley:** What happened to the malaria in your blood?

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I generated more blood. I came to a good country where I had a high-protein diet.

Hepatitis is a big problem, and it can be carried into the actual product of a transfusion service from the original donation. Under the present system in Queensland, the risk of that happening is minimal. The blood is carefully taken by trained personnel.

To give honourable members an idea of the number of people involved in the Red Cross Blood Transfusion service in this State, I mention that there are 130 centres with a total of 346 doctors and 1,252 supplementary staff—trained nurses, attendants and voluntary drivers. That is a fairly large number of dedicated people giving their services. They are well trained and understand fully the problems associated with a blood transfusion service, and they are providing a wonderful service for the community. The result is that Queensland has a service that is virtually free from any risk and able to meet any calls made upon it.

It provides not only whole blood but also what are known as fractions of blood. Blood that is not used within three weeks, or any that looks at all odd or haemolysed, is immediately returned to the central transfusion service in Brisbane. Special facilities are provided for air transport to Brisbane. These waste or so-called unused donations are fractionated at the laboratories that have been set up by the transfusion service. Those laboratories are staffed by skilled bio-chemists and haematologists and highly trained specialist technicians. The laboratories fractionate the unused blood with the result that we have a great quantity of gamma globulin and various other by-products which are so essential in preserving the health of the community.

**Mr. Hughes:** Wouldn't you say that Dr. Shaw and his staff have brought a lot of credit to Queensland?

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** As I said previously, Dr. Shaw is probably the most outstanding man in his field in the world. He is a most knowledgeable man. He is always ready to give of his energy and knowledge to anyone in trouble.

To give honourable members an idea of the growth of transfusion services in Queensland, in 1969-70 102,000 donations were collected. A donation is between 300 and 430 cc. In 1973-74 the figure increased to 120,000 donations. The population increased by 2 per cent, but the donations increased by considerably more than that. The service is being used more and more because blood is readily available.

The idea behind preventing people from selling blood is to make blood more readily available throughout the State. When a commodity is sold, the ability to obtain it is very often confined to the larger cities where more money is available, with the result that outlying areas are starved for that commodity. The law of supply and demand comes into it. The logistics of it all come down to a very fine point. When money comes into it some areas could very easily be starved for blood supplies.

The Bill has everything to commend it. I am pleased that the Opposition could find no fault with this extremely worth-while piece of legislation. I do not think anyone could.

Motion (Mr. Tooth) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 6, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### VALUERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (5.5 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Valuers Registration Act 1965-1971 in certain particulars.”

This Act was passed in 1965 to provide a measure of protection in the public interest by ensuring that all persons who are engaged in the practice of valuing land will be registered in accordance with the provisions of the Act. As with most other professional and technical groups in the community, it was considered desirable that certain standards be achieved by persons to qualify them to practise in this field and to regulate their conduct thereafter.

Under the Act the Valuers Registration Board was established and this body has the powers and functions to administer the Act with regard to the registration and to the standards of conduct of valuers. This board comprises three members—firstly, the Valuer-General who is ex officio a member and chairman; secondly, a person appointed by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister from persons nominated in a panel of names supplied by the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers; and, thirdly, a person similarly appointed from a similar panel of names supplied by the Real Estate Institute of Queensland. Amongst the qualifications for eligibility for appointment to the board is the requirement that such person be a registered valuer. The two last-mentioned members of the board are appointed for a term of three years but shall be eligible for reappointment.

The Bill provides that the requirement whereby one member is appointed to the board from persons nominated by the Real Estate Institute of Queensland, and whose names are included in a panel of names supplied by such institute, should be deleted from the Act and replaced by a provision whereby the third member of the board be a person

who is a registered valuer appointed by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister.

The Valuers Division of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland has recently amalgamated with the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, which latter body is already represented by one member on the Valuers Registration Board. It is not considered desirable that two members of the one organisation on a board of three should be the statutory requirement, but that the Minister should retain the discretion to appoint a registered valuer to become a member of the board.

The present board member representing the Real Estate Institute of Queensland is Mr. D. J. Bingham, F.C.I.V., A.A.S.A., A.C.I.S., the managing director of Sharp and Musgrave Pty. Ltd. He has been a member of the board since its inception and was last appointed to the board on 2 March 1972 for a period of three years. This Bill provides that a person appointed in such a way as was Mr. Bingham may continue in office until the expiration of his term, and being a registered valuer, be eligible for reappointment.

The Valuers Registration Act provides for the appointment of a secretary to the board and defines the term "secretary" to include a person temporarily discharging the duties of the secretary, but the Act is silent regarding the appointment of an acting secretary in the absence of the secretary or while awaiting the permanent appointment of a new secretary.

The Bill provides that the board may, with the approval of the Minister, appoint a person to act temporarily as secretary in the event of a vacancy in that office or during the absence of the secretary. As with the permanent appointment of a secretary, if that person is a member of the Public Service, he will be able to hold such appointment in addition to the position he holds in the Public Service.

From the inception of the Valuers Registration Act until 14 February 1970, an applicant was eligible for full registration if he fulfilled one of two alternative sets of requirements. Firstly, if he was of or above the age of 25 years at 14 February 1966, was of good fame and character, and possessed the required practical experience qualifications, he was eligible. However since 14 February 1970 the second alternative became the sole requirement for eligibility, that is, that an applicant must be of or above the age of 22 years, be of good fame and character, and either hold a certificate of competence recognised by the board or have passed an approved examination.

He must also satisfy the board that he has "sufficient practical experience in or in connection with valuing land for at least four years within the 10 years last preceding the date of his application for registration".

Until 1973 the approved examinations in Queensland consisted of part-time certificate courses, now of 5 years' duration, conducted by the Technical College and the Technical Correspondence School. At the beginning of 1973 a three-year full-time diploma of business (valuation) course commenced at the Queensland Agricultural College, Lawes, and this course has a higher standing than the part-time certificate courses and includes some practical content.

This Bill has a provision designed to prevent those students who undertake the full-time course at the Queensland Agricultural College from being disadvantaged by having to wait for a minimum of seven years (three years at the college followed by at least four years' practical experience) before registration, whereas many of the students who undertake the part-time courses are being registered in five years as they obtain substantial practical experience while studying.

The Act states that the board shall determine the classification of an applicant according to his competence as a rural valuer or an urban valuer or as both a rural and urban valuer. It further provides that the practice of an unregistered valuer is prohibited, but does not state that a registered valuer classified as a rural valuer should value only rural land and that a registered valuer classified as an urban valuer should value only urban land.

**Mr. Burns:** Will it be a requirement in future that they must do that?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** No. They can register either as a rural valuer and value only rural land, or as an urban valuer and value only urban land. However, if they qualify in both they can value both.

While it is a desirable aim that a registered valuer should be capable of valuing all types of land, rural and urban, the practicalities of an individual's inclination and experience have to be considered. I have only to refer to the approaches to be adopted in valuing the grazing areas in the Far West compared with those adopted in valuing the intensively developed commercial areas of Brisbane. The Bill provides that a registered valuer classified singly as either rural valuer or urban valuer shall not value land other than in accordance with his classification. A valuer who is classified as both can of course continue to value all types of land.

The provisions in this Bill are designed to update the present Valuers Registration Act and to ensure its continued efficient administration.

I commend the motion to the Committee.

**Mr. BALDWIN (Redlands) (5.14 p.m.):** From the Minister's introductory speech it appears that, generally speaking, the amendments envisaged by the Bill are, if not overdue, then at least necessary. The Bill

obviously takes cognisance of changing circumstances around us on a national basis. The Minister referred to an anomaly caused by the amalgamation of the two bodies at the State and Commonwealth levels. We appreciate the need to effect a change.

I have a few general remarks to make about the Act and the amending provisions in this measure as they refer to the composition of the board. Although the Minister and his advisers have seen fit—and rightly so—to attempt to update the provisions in the Act to meet the changes outlined by the Minister, I point out on behalf of the Opposition that we see this measure as retaining the traditional protection of the establishment as provided in the Act. I refer to the continuance of appointees. I see no reason whatsoever for continuing this artificial, outmoded protection of the establishment. The Bill contains requirements upgrading the professional standard of persons who are to be registered. People who are to be elected or selected by these institutes are men of experience, education and integrity. That is proven by the fact that the organisations have nominated or elected them. I therefore see no reason why they cannot become members of the board without any artificial protection.

I view this legislation as a kind of vote of no confidence in their efforts to update and upgrade the system. It is somewhat belittling and demonstrates a fear that is no longer valid. I could see a basis for it in the days of the wild bushrangers when squatters were pegging out unlimited areas and placing bogus values on them and getting them through the Lands Department or some other department for sale, taxation or other purposes. Today, with our vast network of communication and upgraded standards, it is no longer necessary to preserve an unnecessary, expensive superstructure of tradition. I make that observation in passing believing that I am bound to make it on behalf of the Opposition. We have made that point frequently and I am sure from my experience that it is a right and proper attitude to adopt in this modern age.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I can't quite determine what you would like eliminated. I assume that you want something removed.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I did say that I was making a general observation on the Act and the proposed amending provisions, which are carrying on a tradition. My remarks apply equally to all of the boards and to the Government's method of continuing to preserve something that I have described as unnecessary and expensive.

**Mr. McKechnie:** You have no specific request that I remove anything?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** No. No matter how genuine the Minister himself may be—and I do not doubt his sincerity, having observed him

and his readiness to listen to sensible suggestions—I would not say the same of the Minister's Government. But that is something for the Minister himself to decide in his own conscience. I am making no request on behalf of the Opposition. It is merely a reflection of attitude or philosophy of political parties. I would not request any member of the Government to change his philosophy. It would be tantamount to asking him to change his party and to sit on this side of the Chamber. That is a decision he makes based on his own beliefs.

However, returning more specifically to the Minister's proposals to the Committee, I am sure that all members on this side agree with the provisions for an acting secretary to be appointed in the absence of the permanent secretary. I have no real objection to the acting secretary's being a public servant. However, it seems rather strange that a public servant appointed in an acting capacity could still be called upon to carry out his normal duties in the Public Service. That seems to me to be tantamount to admitting that there are supernumeraries in the Public Service, and I am sure that no public servant would want it to be thought that he could be taken from his onerous task to fill another position, and not be missed or replaced. I am sure that that would be a blow to his self-respect and ego. It certainly would be to mine. However the Minister might be able to tell us that that is covered elsewhere and that the person appointed as acting secretary would not be required to carry out his normal Public Service duties. He, in turn, might be replaced by an acting appointment, or he might be compensated by provisions for the payment of overtime. I think this is important, because it could affect his normal working and his health. Undue physical, mental, and nervous strain could be placed upon a public servant by such an appointment. I believe I have some justification at least for bringing this problem to the attention of the Committee. As I said, the Minister might already have this covered. If he has, I shall be very pleased to hear it in his reply.

We must concede the necessity for the reduction from 25 years to 22 years in the age of an appointee, provided he is qualified by certificates of competency and the other requirements of good name and good character, as the Minister said, to be accepted for registration by the board.

Indicative of the continuing rise in standards of education is the proposal to recognise the new diploma course conducted at the Gatton College, as the Minister mentioned. I do not know whether there will be universal agreement with what I am about to say, or even agreement on this side of the Chamber, but I agree that an updated full-time course of three years' duration, conducted no doubt by trained, skilled and experienced lecturers, should be recognised. Any student can learn quite well from others if he has a receptive mind and realises that those who are conducting the course are

compressing their experience and practical skill into a more formalised process of imparting their knowledge. Such students have the advantage of obtaining at least some of their practical experience with greater ease.

I do not want those remarks to be interpreted by any member as meaning that I do not accept the value of practical experience in the field. Far from it. I am myself more a practical man than a man of theory, although as far as possible I try to combine the two. I see in the Minister's proposal an intelligent combination of theory and practice that can only benefit the profession of valuing and protect entry into the profession for those who have not been so fortunate as to undertake the full-time professional course.

The last point that the Minister put before the Committee seems in slight contradiction to everything that went before. On the one hand, students undertaking the three-year course are recognised as doing a much upgraded course, and we are led to believe that a modern course takes cognisance of the fact that urban valuing and rural valuing are becoming more integrated than ever before and the aim is at integration rather than treating them as entirely separate skills. Even though urban and rural valuing differ in some aspects, the general principles underlying them have, so far as I can see, many common elements, so I have praised the three-year course as necessary and good for the profession. It seems strange, then, to perpetuate an outmoded dichotomy in the practice of valuing after students have been through this course of training. I gather that they may be registered to value in either field or in both fields, which presupposes that some of them will do more in the course than those who become only rural valuers. That seems to follow from what the Minister said. If it is an integrated course, I cannot see any reason why all who qualify should not be registered for both.

More importantly, because of the other matters that I have brought to the attention of honourable members—much more widespread knowledge and better communications within the State and within the Commonwealth—I cannot see any reason why they should not be both. If their qualifications are good enough for rural valuing, they should be good enough for urban valuing. I do not think that a dichotomy should exist. I believe there is a much closer relationship between urban and rural valuing than appears from what the Minister has said and what is proposed in the Bill.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I agree with you, but there are reasons that I will outline later. That might save the honourable member time now.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** That being so, I will resume my seat.

**Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (5.31 p.m.):** I hope that the honourable member who has just resumed his seat will not mind my saying that I found it very difficult to follow him.

**Mr. Davis:** It does not surprise me that you find it difficult to follow him.

**Mr. LICKISS:** That may be so; it might be difficult for me to follow you also.

Having recently relinquished the State presidency of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers and being familiar with the amalgamation that took place between the Valuers Division of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland and the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, I am aware that, as the Minister explained, there is an Australia-wide trend for all qualified valuers to come under the one professional institute. The valuing discipline in Australia has assumed an importance in many aspects of planning and development that it did not have before, and I think that is very desirable.

On the understanding that the Valuers Division of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland was dissolved permanently, the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers undertook to take over as corporate members valuers in the Valuers Division of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland. That has now taken place, and that is the reason for the first amendment mentioned by the Minister. The Real Estate Institute of Queensland is no longer mentioned, because it now has no professional valuers, as an institute.

**Mr. Burns:** Could there be professional valuers who are not members of the new amalgamated body?

**Mr. LICKISS:** The honourable member for Lytton makes the point that there are many registered valuers who are not corporate members of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. That is one of the problems facing the Minister and the Registration Board, in terms of professional qualifications. When registration begins, there will be a number of people who were practising valuers but who were not appropriately qualified to practice in all fields of valuation. For example, a person practising in Western Queensland might have been a competent rural valuer, but he would know very little indeed about urban valuation; conversely, people practising in the precincts of the capital city or in suburbia may have been quite competent to make urban valuations but would not be competent—and they would know this themselves—to make rural valuations. Of course, when a person makes an urban valuation or a rural valuation, there is a twilight zone in which he cannot decide whether he is making a rural valuation or an urban valuation. It has components of both.

The honourable member for Redlands said that he would like to see all valuers competent in both rural and urban valuation.

I expect that valuers qualifying now academically and with experience would be registered as both rural and urban valuers. In any professional institute, the idea is to lift the standard of the discipline.

Over the years the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, firstly by initiating its own course of study, upgraded the academic standards of valuers. The Commonwealth Institute of Valuers in Queensland had a great deal of co-operation from the education authorities, and now the present five-year part-time course at the technical college, plus the experience gained during that course of studies, turns out a valuer who is competent to value. The course at Lawes is a tertiary course, and, as it is a full-time course, the students gain a great deal of experience during their studies. This is now taken as part of their experience in their final qualification before they are admitted to corporate membership of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers.

I agree that all practising valuers, particularly the era of valuers coming up now, need to be thoroughly trained in all aspects of rural and urban valuation. They need to have a sound knowledge of the discipline, so that their discipline together with other disciplines, goes into a multi-discipline activity in relation to the functioning of government and the functioning of private enterprise.

It has always been the aim of professional institutes that successive generations of membership should have enhanced educational and professional standing in the community.

I should like to pay a tribute to the Valuers Registration Board. Its membership since its inception has always been the chairman, the Valuer-General as chairman (presently Mr. Neville Cook, who is sitting in the lobby), Mr. Frank Isles, as a representative of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers and a Fellow of that institute, and Mr. Doug Bingham, a Life Fellow of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, as a nominee of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland. Now that the Minister in his wisdom has deleted from the legislation the reference to the Real Estate Institute of Queensland, I hope that he will see fit to reappoint Mr. Doug Bingham to his position. Those men have served the State very well by starting from scratch and working out a registration system which has proved successful in the registration of valuers.

I would hope that all professional disciplines will take it as an obligation on their part to constantly review courses, review experience, and update the standard of their members. This is what the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers has done throughout Australia. At a time like this it is appropriate to recognise persons in this and other States who have made a contribution in this particular discipline. In Queensland we have been singularly fortunate that we have had

valuers who have shown the way to some of the developing nations. I refer to persons like Mr. Vince Brett and Mr. Trevor Jones, the brother of the honourable member for Cairns. I pay tribute to them for the way in which they have carried the flag for the profession not only in Queensland and Australia but also overseas. I also pay tribute to the often-maligned Valuer-General's Department and its officers, to Mr. Neville Cook, the Valuer-General, and to Mr. Bill Harland, the Deputy Valuer-General, the past Federal president of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers and a past State president of the institute.

Although those people are on occasions maligned in their professional capacity, it is interesting to recall the very high standard they have attained and the contribution they have made not only to the profession but also to the administration of this State. We ought to be mindful of the role they play in the rather thankless job they carry out. No-one likes to think that the valuation of his property is on the increase, particularly from the rating and taxing point of view.

I commend the provisions of the legislation. I feel that the Valuers Registration Board has now come of age in terms of the recommendations and appointments that it has made in the registration of valuers. Queensland is setting an example and I think that the other States will benefit by this legislation, which again is rather innovatory in terms of registration of valuers and inauguration of a system which is now being copied by all the States of the Commonwealth.

**Mr. BURNS** (Lytton) (5.41 p.m.): I could not agree more that it is of great value to the State to have registered people operating in this very important field which affects all of us, particularly in the valuing of our residential land and thus in the rates and tax we pay.

**Mr. Hughes** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** I do not know what will be happening to the honourable member now that he is going to leave the Parliament. He will not be able to get up to some of the lurks he has practised in the past. Maybe the rest of us will still be able to continue living fairly good lives and doing the right thing.

The point I wanted to make in relation to this question of registration of valuers and the amendments proposed in this Bill arose as a result of the Minister's remark that in the past the board has comprised the Valuer-General, one nominee from the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers and one from the R.E.I.Q.. He said that the reason we are changing this provision is that the R.E.I.Q. and the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers have amalgamated so the Government does not really oppose amalgamations. It might oppose the amalgamation of unions, but not the amalgamation of professional bodies.

**Mr. Lickiss:** It is not really an amalgamation; it is simply that the Valuers Division of the R.E.I.Q. has gone over to the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers.

**Mr. BURNS:** That is so; the people who are valuers and who joined the R.E.I.Q. as valuers will now have membership of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. It seems to me that great numbers of real estate agents are in the Q.L.R.E.A., the other large organisation which covers real estate agents in this State, and they should have a right to some say in an appointment to this board.

In the past the R.E.I.Q., as a body, represented real estate agents who were valuers and it had a say by recommending a panel of names to the Minister, who then selected someone from the panel to act on the board. Now, because valuers are covered, not by the R.E.I.Q. but by the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, we are leaving a void and instead of filling the void from the other real estate agents organisations, we are altering the Act to provide that the Minister should make another selection. To me, this is a continuing slight on small agents.

The Q.L.R.E.A. members are not the big money boys of the real estate profession; they are not the Ray Whites or the Postles and others who have been wheeling and dealing, selling hotels and operating in high-rise buildings and the development of land. The Q.L.R.E.A. is composed of the small agents around the suburbs, including people situated in Cannon Hill, Morningside, Wynnum and other areas in my electorate. I feel that these people are entitled to representation. They should be able to make representations to the Minister that one of their valuer members should be appointed to the board. They should be able to put up a panel of names and say to the Minister, "All right, select one of ours."

I cannot see any reason why the Minister should object to this. Their organisation is registered in the courts. They are accepted in the State. We allow them to operate. We give them accreditation through our various State Government organisations, so clearly we have nothing against them. If we have nothing against them, there is no reason why we should not put in their representative when we drop the R.E.I.Q. out.

Other people, too, might be involved. I cite the Q.L.R.E.A. because I know of the argument and disputation that has continued over multiple-listing.

**Mr. Lickiss:** They do not claim to be representatives of valuers; they are real estate agents.

**Mr. BURNS:** The R.E.I.Q. never claimed that its members were all valuers. Speaking about the R.E.I.Q., I sold real estate around the town and was involved with real estate

agents who had "R.E.I.Q." after their names. In the old days it used to be the Real Estate Institute; it did not have the "Q" at the end.

**Mr. Lickiss** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** I am only going on what the Minister has said. He spoke of the R.E.I.Q. I should not imagine that Mr. Postle and some others would have given away the right of nomination to some sub-committee of their organisation. I base that comment on the way Mr. Postle has been running his organisation and dominating the scene on the multiple-listing side. It seems to me that a lot of people will remain uncovered by the one group that is the result of the amalgamation, and they should have the right of nomination through some panel. The point I was making prior to the interjections was that it could be the Q.L.R.E.A. or some other organisation. Surely an organisation other than this one group should have a say.

**Mr. Chinchon:** Which group do you suggest?

**Mr. BURNS:** The Q.L.R.E.A.

**Mr. Lickiss:** This is the only group or institute or professional valuers in Queensland.

**Mr. BURNS:** In reply to an interjection earlier today, the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha said that quite obviously a large number of registered valuers were not members of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers? Where are they? Some of them could be members of the Q.L.R.E.A. I know personally one valuer who is, and there are probably others. The membership of that body is large, and it seems to me, therefore, that it should have the same rights as those given in the past to the R.E.I.Q.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (5.47 p.m.), in reply: Both the honourable member for Redlands and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha paid tribute to the men on the board. I appreciate their remarks. The honourable member for Redlands said they were men of integrity, experience and ability; the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha went further and expressed his appreciation to the three men, whom he named, for the wonderful job they do on behalf of valuers generally and the people of Queensland.

The honourable member for Redlands suggested that a more simple approach could be adopted. I have taken a note of what he said, but he did not nominate any alternative. At the moment I cannot see any provision on the appointment of valuers that could with advantage be excluded. However, I shall look at it in due course.

Both he and the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha claimed that valuers should be registered for and capable of valuing both

urban and rural lands. As I said by way of interjection while the honourable member for Redlands was on his feet, this is desirable. However, at a time when we are endeavouring to obtain valuers and are unable to fulfil our commitments, we are prepared under the present exigencies to accept men who are qualified only for one or the other. I go along with the suggestion put forward for the long term.

The honourable member for Lytton expressed concern at the fact that there is some group of valuers that did not have the opportunity of being represented on the Valuers Registration Board. The Bill gives any individual the opportunity, because, as I said in my introductory speech, there will be the Valuer-General ex officio, a representative of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, which now incorporates the R.E.I.Q., and a member (a registered valuer) nominated by the Minister. Any group or individual is quite welcome to make suggestions to the Minister, who will decide which person nominated is the suitable one.

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

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I assure the honourable member—I heard his comment—that an opportunity will be given to all to make representations.

The Bill has not met with any opposition. I feel that I have replied to those members who have suggested that improvements could be made.

Motion (Mr. McKechnie) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. McKechnie, read a first time.

### CITY OF BRISBANE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (5.50 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

I think there was general agreement at the introductory stage of this Bill that Mud, Green, Bishop, Fisherman and St. Helena islands should be included in the city of Brisbane so as to enable control to be exercised over the future use and development of such islands.

During the course of the debate, mention was made of Macleay, Lamb, Karragarra and Russell islands, which were included in the Shire of Redland recently. All honourable members are aware of the uncontrolled development which took place on these four islands, and it is essential that action be

taken to prevent similar development occurring on the islands in Moreton Bay which are not presently included in a local authority area.

It should be pointed out, however, that the five islands mentioned in the Bill as being included in the city of Brisbane are in a different category to the islands recently included in the Shire of Redland. The islands proposed to be included in the city of Brisbane consist solely of Crown lands, whereas the islands included in the Shire of Redland consisted of freehold land.

In the case of Crown land outside a local authority area, the future use and development of the land would be subject to a degree of control by the Crown as the owner of the land. In the case of freehold land outside a local authority area, no controls existed and this was the chief cause of the problems that arose over the development of Macleay, Lamb, Karragarra and Russell islands prior to their inclusion in the Shire of Redland.

I think all honourable members agree with the honourable member for Sandgate that the islands of Moreton Bay and the other islands off the Queensland coast are part of our heritage and should be preserved for the benefit of the people. Many of the islands are already included in local authority areas and the inclusion of the other islands will mean that control can be exercised over their development. The bringing of the islands under local government control will mean that the local authority can exercise town planning powers, and powers in relation to health and the erection of buildings. In my opinion these are very necessary powers if we are to prevent undesirable development occurring.

A number of honourable members raised the question of the expenditure required to be incurred by the Brisbane City Council when the islands are included in the city of Brisbane. As I stated at the introductory stage, the five islands mentioned in the Bill are largely undeveloped and I do not envisage that great costs will be entailed for the Brisbane City Council at this stage. Any future development on the islands will be subject to control by the local authority and by the Crown as owner. It would seem to me that any development which is allowed to take place on the islands could be made conditional upon the developer's making a substantial contribution towards the cost of providing facilities in relation to his development.

The honourable members for Redlands and Salisbury suggested that a special authority should be established to administer the islands in Moreton Bay. I do not think that this is necessary. I think that local government is the proper authority to administer the controls necessary and that an ad hoc authority should not be created for that purpose. As I said earlier in my speech, many islands off the coast are presently in

local authority areas and the local authorities concerned are successfully exercising control over development on those islands. I do not think that local authorities would be favourably disposed towards the creation of an ad hoc authority of the type suggested by the honourable members.

The major issue at the introductory stage seemed to be whether Moreton Island should be included in the city of Brisbane or in the city of Redcliffe. I have given a considerable amount of thought to this matter since that debate and have communicated with the Brisbane City Council thereon. I understand that the council is opposed to the inclusion of the island in the city, although, as I pointed out at the introductory stage, two aldermen of the council were reported in the Press as stating that in their opinion the island should be included in the city. It appears the council considers that the unalienated part of the island should be reserved for public purposes under the Land Act or declared a national park.

As I have previously stated in the House, I consider that all islands off the coast of Queensland should be included in local authority areas so that control may be exercised over the use of land and the erection of buildings on the islands and so that health requirements can be adequately enforced. I feel that these matters are functions of local government and that accordingly all off-shore islands should be included in local authority areas.

With this end in view I believe that Moreton Island should be included in the city of Brisbane, and I foreshadow an appropriate amendment of the Bill at the Committee stage. The inclusion of the island in the city of Brisbane would not inhibit the creation of Crown reserves or declaration of a national park thereon if the Government so decides. As honourable members are aware, the great majority of Crown reserves and national parks are included in local authority areas without detriment to their administration. In fact, many Crown reserves are placed under the trusteeship of the local authorities in which they are situated.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Redlands) (5.58 p.m.): Since the Opposition Local Government Committee received the Bill, it has had time to study it and to make inquiries about many aspects of it. Honourable members will recall that at the introductory stage the Opposition reserved its final decision until it had an opportunity to study the Bill. The opinions expressed by us during the introductory debate most clearly were directed towards a determination that the matter of greatest importance was the preservation of the essential environmental character of the bay and coastal islands.

I concede that we did not oppose the Bill outright. During my own contribution to the debate I gave our reasons for that stand. I recall that I quite clearly expressed my opinion and desire that there should be some integration of the islands because of the common elements of environmental conditions and because of what I consider to be the necessity of preserving these for the preservation of the general marine life and also the ecology of the river mouth, the bay, and the nearby coastal regions. Those general opinions were enlarged upon and supported by honourable members on this side of the Chamber and by at least one member on the Government side. At that time, all of us, with perhaps the exception of the Minister, were groping for some means by which our desires could be achieved. None seemed to be very clear on what should be done.

[Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 7.15 p.m.]

**Mr. BALDWIN:** Before the dinner recess, I was outlining to the House the reasons for the Opposition's decision to oppose the second reading of the Bill. I had reached the point that inquiries led us to believe that the continued fragmentation of the islands among three or four local authorities was not in the best over-all interests of the coastal, river-mouth and bay islands.

We concede, to a point, as we conceded at the introductory stage, that the islands should come under an authority; but we doubt whether their fragmentation among several authorities, with widely differing ideas on planning for the islands, is the best solution to the problem.

The thinking of the Opposition is that it is necessary to bring all islands under local authority control somewhere, somehow. This has been done, of course, in the case of Bribie Island and North Stradbroke Island, and we must look now at what has happened on those islands. In other words, there has been time for the results of local authority control to be manifest in the development of the islands. When one looks at those islands over all, one sees an excellent example of the result of the imposition upon them of a mainland mentality. By fragmenting them among mainland local authorities, the way is opened for their utter destruction. Overcrowding has already occurred. The planned industrialisation, the denudation and the fragmentation that have taken place so far in the environment and ecology of the islands should not be allowed to proceed any further merely for the sake of convenience, or for the benefits expected from development of some kind.

The Minister said quite clearly in his second-reading speech, "The Moreton Bay islands are part of our heritage and should be preserved." And the Opposition wholeheartedly agrees with that. But he went on to say that they should be developed, that developers should be made to contribute to

them, and so on. We all know what happens when developers contribute. They want a big slice back (and how!) with their measly half-chain roads, 24-perch allotments, and total disregard of the natural environment and what the very soil character will bear. To do this on Moreton Island, Stradbroke Island and islands in Redland Bay would be to allow houses to slip from the hills into the bay in their own slime, because the effluent, the detergents and other organic acids that flow down dissolve completely the calcareous or ferruginous cements that hold the grains in the compacted dunes together—not to mention, of course, the matrix of the deep root formation that is further denuded every time a house is built. The concentration of houses on these islands has a very low limit indeed. I cannot see developers even being conscious that such a low limit of density should be observed, let alone being willing to agree to it.

However, the whole plan goes much deeper than that, from what I have been able to dig out so far. Again I cannot reconcile the Minister's acceptable statement that our heritage on these islands should be preserved with another statement he made that Moreton Island should be included in the city of Brisbane so as not to inhibit development—and then he added "and provision of national parks". Taking that at its face value, I accept the Minister's statement. However, one does not need specialised knowledge to know—and in fact it is widely known to all honourable members in this Chamber—that with greater provision of recreation areas, national parks and open spaces of any kind, whether for schools or for any other public purposes, instantly comes an ever-increasing geometric factor of progression relative to the cost of bringing services to any people or any undertaking in that area. That would apply particularly to islands such as those mentioned in the Bill. Who will bear the cost of providing these services? In this case, perhaps it will be the city of Brisbane.

The Minister has spoken of the inclusion of these islands in the local authority areas and has foreshadowed the inclusion of Moreton Island in the provisions of the Bill. I remind him that at the introductory stage I asked him what the decision of Cabinet was and what the decision of the Brisbane City Council was. I asked him whether these were going to be impositions, or whether they would be negotiated inclusions with assistance or compensation of some kind. So far, the Minister has not answered any of my questions. I hope that he will reply to them one way or the other when he closes this debate. I think that answers are necessary if honourable members on both sides of the House are to make correct and informed decisions.

I am deeply concerned that there are purposes in the Bill that might not be clear at first sight, and activities in the House over the last few months give me deep cause for very grave concern about underlying

purposes. From what I have heard, I believe that the bringing of the five river-mouth islands into the city of Brisbane is in preparation for the construction of the deep-water port at the mouth of the river and that the city of Brisbane will be loaded with expenses of various kinds that I am sure honourable members on this side of the House will outline later in the debate. Perhaps it is not necessary to outline them. I am sure that honourable members on both sides of the Chamber know what a tremendous cost the city of Brisbane will have to meet if the port complex goes down there and these islands are included in the city of Brisbane. In fine, I expect that the city of Brisbane will be called upon to pay the major part of the cost of developing this area for the port of Brisbane, which will benefit the whole of South-east Queensland and perhaps even the far south-west of the State and northern areas of New South Wales. If that is what is envisaged, it is an unfair, unjust imposition on the city of Brisbane.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** As usual I get the cachinnations and the gaggles of the geese on the other side who try to interpret what I have said as opposition to a deepwater port. Honourable members on this side have far better memories than honourable members opposite. They know I have been a protagonist for the construction of a deep-water terminal for south-east Queensland and north-east New South Wales. But that does not mean that we have to sacrifice the city of Brisbane. Nor does it mean that we have to sacrifice five bay islands, the environment, the marine ecology, the professional fishing industry or the amateur pleasure fishing of the bay and the river mouth. It is well known—the dogs are barking it—that the proposed plan, which I am sure will be adopted by the Government, will entirely obliterate the river-mouth islands. They will no longer remain in existence as islands. The most important fresh/salt-water barrier for the commencement of the marine-life food chain—the very basis of the fishing industry in Moreton Bay, which is the biggest fish producer in the State—will be irrecoverably ruined if those islands are obliterated, as the port plan indicates they will be.

I appeal to all honourable members of good will who care about the future of the bay environment to oppose the Bill because it is not in the best interests of the environment of the bay islands.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** What is the alternative?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I will answer one of the few sensible questions ever posed by the honourable member for Windsor when I have been making a speech.

**Mr. Bromley** interjected.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** The honourable member for South Brisbane, who has a very good memory, says that he believes that it is the only one.

There is an alternative. We can have the bay islands and river-mouth islands left unimpaired in the areas covered by mangrove growth and available for fish food production. We can have the port of Brisbane complex without having the islands brought into the city of Brisbane if we change the proposed plan for port development.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Where would you put it?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** In a better place where it would not be silted by river floods, and where it would not mean the removal of the very important cyclone tidal barrier on the north-east. If the barrier provided by those islands is removed by deepening the river as part of the port development scheme, the tidal flats and the houses on them right up to Petrie Bight, if not to West End, could be wiped off. As a cyclone drove the tide up the river, the water would spew up the toilets in the residences on the flats. That has happened to some extent already. Once the river channel is opened and deepened for the proposed port development, and the cyclone barrier is removed, an intolerable financial burden will be placed on the establishments in the tidal barrier areas.

**Mr. Chinchin:** What is the alternative?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** To answer the honourable member's question—a plan has been drawn up by marine engineers and port experts who have done a hydrographic and hydrological survey of the whole area. I had the pleasure of going down with them and looking at it. The port should be built not in the mouth of the river but to the south of the islands out of the siltation zone and in the free tidal-swept zone that exists now, that has existed for millions of years and that will continue to exist without heavy dredging cost to the import-export consumers and producers of the south-eastern zone of Queensland.

I do not know just how much pressure, if any, has been put on the Brisbane City Council to accept these islands. I do not even really know whether the council wants them, but I do know—and I will reiterate what was said at the introductory stage—that all the coastal, bay and river-mouth islands should be under a single island-development authority. It should be an environmental authority conscious of preservation and tourist development.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Federal or State?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** It does not matter because the authority will determine, with the best resources at its command, what is best for those islands. It will not be determined by a mob of greedy industrialists wanting monopoly over wharf-side space. It will not be determined by a mob of greedy mud-dredgers wanting a perpetual job at \$7,500,000

a year. It will not be determined by any self-seeking group whatever and the 21 miles of dangerous, shallow-dredged channel, as it now goes up through the western passage, can be and will be removed, with a better complex bringing far lower handling costs and a much quicker turn-round to the port of Brisbane. This will benefit the whole of the south-east zone in every way.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** It will benefit Mr. Kennedy, too.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** Mr. Kennedy's activities and investments on Moreton Island were mentioned at the introductory stage and now they have come up again by way of interjection. I have no doubt that the foreshadowed amendment to include Moreton Island took fully into account his activities there and perhaps other activities as well.

However, what I want to impress on the House is that I see a link between the Order in Council concerning Moreton Island, tabled by the Minister for Lands this morning, the port development survey and proposed deep-water-port complex, and this Bill before us for the inclusion of river-mouth islands in the city of Brisbane. I see a very clear and plain relationship—very necessary, of course, for the plans of the Government and those people and organisations it wishes to assist. It comes in handy as a further endeavour to bring the city of Brisbane into disrepute and debt. When these islands are brought under the city of Brisbane authority and then destroyed, the Labor Council of the city of Brisbane will be forced to bear the brunt of public criticism for this diabolical plan of destruction of the islands at the mouth of the Brisbane River. I see it also as a deliberate plan to bring the Brisbane City Council into disrepute by loading onto the people of Brisbane the cost of development of Moreton Island.

I have no doubt that, unless the ecologists, the preservationists, the conservationists and the fishermen band together, as they did over the Cooloola issue, the proposed development of the new deep-water port and the obliteration of the islands will proceed.

I have noted with interest the recommendations put forward by the officer who conducted the inquiry into the Fraser Island controversy. He urged the establishment of a separate development and preservation authority for the island. This recommendation was put forward by a top man, who had heard submissions from the best brains, as it were, on such a matter.

**Mr. Rae:** Who was that man?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I cannot recall his name, but it was published in the Press. I would not make the comment if I had not read it.

Because of the sympathy that the Opposition has with those submissions made by the people who want to preserve the islands, and because of the great importance that we

attach to the preservation of our environment and marine ecology, I am forced to declare our opposition to the amendment foreshadowed by the Minister.

With the full backing of the Labor Party caucus, I urge all honourable members to be awake to the dangers that confront us and to propose that a full inquiry be held at top level into the merits of the proposal. I ask all honourable members who intend to speak to this measure to urge the Minister to defer further action on the Bill until the report of the Department of Harbours and Marine is made public. I am of the opinion—and if the Minister can prove otherwise I will be very pleased—that it is wrong and dangerous to proceed with this cover-up Bill before such a report on the proposed deep-water port is made public.

**Mr. HOUGHTON** (Redcliffe) (7.38 p.m.): I rise to support the Minister. The Bill is of paramount importance to the city of Brisbane and its environs. I am quite sure that the decision to establish the new deep-water port near the mouth of the Brisbane River is the right one. With the establishment of such a port will come the development of Fisherman Island, Bishop Island, Green Island and St. Helena. I am quite sure that sufficient investigation and research have been carried out into the location of the new port.

Honourable members will recall the controversy that arose over the establishment of a second oil refinery in the metropolitan area. At that time I voiced strong opposition to the establishment of such a refinery near the mouth of the Brisbane River. I was firmly of the opinion that for safety reasons and other factors it should have been established in the Toorbul area. Another sound reason for establishing it there was the proximity of an adequate water supply at Somerset Dam. A refinery in that area would also have minimised traffic and transport congestion, and at the same time it would have serviced the northern part of the city of Brisbane and areas further to the north.

This evening there has been a considerable controversy about environmental control. With due respect to honourable members on both sides of the House I ask what has been done about removing the sewer outfall from Luggage Point. If Opposition members were sincere about environmental control, they would have done something about it before now.

**Mr. Bromley:** We do not know where to put it.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** If Opposition members were sincere about control of the environment, pollution and so on, they would have done something about them ages ago. When confronted with this problem they put their heads in the sand and say that it does not exist. But it certainly exists.

I blame the Government for allowing the Brisbane City Council to get away for years and years with pollution of Moreton Bay. I am quite sure that honourable members would readily agree with me that, in this field, the requirements placed on the city of Redcliffe are much harsher than those imposed on the city of Brisbane. The Brisbane City Council has not been forced to shoulder its responsibilities. It has stressed the fact that sewerage rates are low and so on. I know that the honourable member for Salisbury, being a conservationist, would agree with my submissions. I admire his stand.

**Mr. Sherrington:** That's the end of it; that's the kiss of death.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I am not giving the honourable member the kiss of death, but he knows as well as I do—

**Mr. Jensen** interjected.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** The honourable member will not be here much longer. He should be quiet; he is history.

As the honourable member for Redlands said, control over the islands is necessary because of the development that has taken place and the failure by some developers to observe certain requirements. There are good and bad developers, but I firmly believe that control has been prompted by the problems in the Redland Bay area. The Government is quite right in exercising control. I am sure that no development, other than industrial development, will take place on Mud Island. Anybody with any knowledge of the bay knows that Green Island and King Island will never be developed. There may be tourist development on St. Helena, which is somewhat limited at the moment.

The only island with potential for tourist development is Moreton Island. I congratulate the Minister and the Government on the wisdom displayed in the foreshadowed inclusion of Moreton Island under the legislation.

In view of the population growth of Brisbane and Redcliffe respectively, Moreton Island should be attached to Brisbane. It has a greater number of people to service and develop the island.

**Mr. Bromley** interjected.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** It will be entirely up to the local authority whether it is developed or not. The honourable member implies that odium will flow to the Labor council.

**Mr. Bromley:** Not me.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** An Opposition member referred to that. No-one can convince me that Brisbane will be served by a Labor Council for the next century or two. I should give up if I thought that would be the case, but there is no way in the world that could be so. There will be changes. As Governments come and go, different views and submissions will be put forward. As I have said on other occasions, the sooner

Opposition members realise that we should govern for the benefit of the people and not for that of political parties, the better off we will all be.

**Mr. Bromley:** You talk with tongue in cheek.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** Not at all. The honourable member for South Brisbane would not even know where Breakfast Creek is, let alone Moreton Island.

The Government has been the only one that has benefited at all from any development on Moreton Island. It has gained from the sale of allotments over there, but there has not been any major development. Honourable members will recall that I made a submission to the Minister for Primary Industries that Moreton Island should be declared a national park. I would like to see it established as a wildlife sanctuary, with kangaroos, native birds and so on being put over there. The Labor Party has already decided to protect brown snakes, death adders, goannas, and everything else about the place.

**Dr. Crawford:** And cane toads.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** Yes, and cane toads, but I have not seen any of those over there. I mention, however, that cane toads exist on Fraser Island.

Moreton Island has the potential to be a tourist mecca. With the large number of small craft on the water and the launching facilities that have been provided, many people are now able to scoot across the bay. As a result, Moreton Island will develop. With the growth of population in Brisbane and the increasing pollution of the environment on the mainland, Moreton Island with its natural water resources will become more and more a recreational venue for people at the week-end.

Mr. Kennedy's name has been mentioned. As I said before, in my opinion he has done something for the island that no-one else could do. He has had communications established.

**An Opposition Member** interjected.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** He has it. Good luck to him. All honourable members can benefit from it. Although in my opinion the cost would be astronomical, nevertheless he has been successful in securing it, to the advantage of everybody.

For the benefit of those who do not know anything about bay waters, I mention that Moreton Bay can from time to time be very treacherous. Because of the problems of rough weather, fast and modern transport is necessary. I believe that we will all live to see the day when hovercraft will be plying between the city of Redcliffe and all of these islands.

To the people who have said in this debate that we do not know where we are going, I would simply say that the people

who have been in the Department of Harbours and Marine and the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission through the years must surely have gleaned the necessary relevant data and information. If that has not been done, previous Governments have been at fault. This is a matter that concerns us all. If the Commonwealth Government under the Budget to be handed down tonight were to say, "Here is \$10,000,000 for the Minister for Main Roads and here is \$10,000,000 for the Minister in charge of the Department of Harbours and Marine.", each of those Ministers should have a plan readily available for the development to be undertaken with that money. Even if the amount were \$100,000,000, a plan should be ready. There should be no waiting for surveys, studies or anything else.

The fishing industry in Moreton Bay is another matter that should be taken cognisance of. I am firmly of the opinion that fish in Moreton Bay are just as plentiful now as they have ever been. I used to subscribe to the idea that the bay was being fished out. However, because of the investigation and research undertaken by the C.S.I.R.O., I am now firmly convinced that, in spite of the number of boats fishing in Moreton Bay, the prawn and fish catches are just as prolific.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Where?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** In the bay waters.

I will admit that round the foreshores of the Redcliffe peninsula there are problems on account of the kerosene taint. The C.S.I.R.O. claims it has not been able to discover the reason for it. I am firmly of the opinion that it stems from pollution by detergents of the streams where the mullet breed.

There is an abundance of fish to be taken at Moreton Island. It has been reported in the Press that there are now more fish to be caught at Moreton Island than there have ever been. More people are taking them now. I suppose that this is attributable to the development of the areas closer to Brisbane, which do not have nearly as many fish as they did years ago. More people are trying to catch them in those areas and they have moved out. But further away from Redcliffe, in the Bribie Passage and around Moreton Island where anglers do not go in such large numbers, there is an abundance of fish.

**Mr. Bromley:** You have to give some credit to the patrol officers, too.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I quite agree. I am a firm believer in the control of fishing. Anyone who goes fishing with me will never see me take home a ginny mudcrab, as honourable members opposite do.

**Mr. Wright:** You sold me two, and I gave them back.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** The honourable member would not even pay for a crab. I give full marks to patrol officers for enforcing the rules governing the taking of fish. I am a firm believer in obeying the rules. If prawners, or any others who go into fish nurseries, transgress, they should be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law. The same remarks apply to those who drive cars whilst under the influence of alcohol. If a person wants to drink, he should not drive.

I am very pleased that the Minister and his departmental officers have given serious consideration to the inclusion of Moreton Island in the provisions of the Bill. I am quite sure that progress associations, the council, and other organisations on the Redcliffe Peninsula are in favour of what the Bill proposes.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper** interjected.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** As a matter of fact, even they were in favour of it. But, of course, a person is not allowed to speak his mind over there; he has to whisper in the corridors. Otherwise he will get a bowler hat.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What's a bowler hat?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** What the honourable member will have after the next election.

All the organisations that I have mentioned are firmly of the opinion that Moreton Island should be attached to the city of Brisbane. I compliment the Minister on the legislation, which I am quite sure is a move in the right direction. I am sure that Mr. Kennedy, and all the others on the island, will approve of the legislation. There will be only a small number of ratepayers, or Crown rentpayers, on the island, and they will welcome the attachment of the island to the city of Brisbane instead of the city of Redcliffe.

I commend the Minister on the introduction of this legislation.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (7.53 p.m.): One could almost hear the audible sigh of relief from the honourable member for Redcliffe when he found that Moreton Island was to be loaded onto the Brisbane City Council rather than the Redcliffe City Council. All his pleasantries about how he admires my views and sentiments on conservation are not going to stop me from saying what I intend to say.

I am totally opposed to the incorporation of any of the bay islands in any local authority. My colleague the honourable member for Redlands, who is the Opposition spokesman on local authority matters, has already called on the Minister to delay implementation of the provisions of the Bill until the report by the Department of Harbours and Marine is finalised. He has authorised me to say that we have had considerable discussion on this matter and, because I am a good conservationist, he

asked me to place before the House our views on the way in which this area should be administered.

**Mr. Lickiss:** For whom are you speaking?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am speaking for the Labor Party, as I always do. I am not one who obtains endorsement from a political party and then turns round and says, "To hell with convention decisions. I am not going to take any notice of party policy." Any time that I rise in this Chamber, I speak on behalf of the Labor Party.

**Mr. Rae:** You said that you were speaking for an authority.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I said that the shadow Minister for Local Government (Mr. Baldwin) authorised me to say what I am going to say. If the Minister will only keep quiet, I shall tell him what I was authorised to say. If he had been present during my speech at the introductory stage, he would know what I am going to say. At that time I said I did not think the Government realised the importance of the bay islands. Possibly they are second only to the Great Barrier Reef as a complete ecosystem.

As I said, the honourable member for Redcliffe could not be happier to have Moreton Island unloaded onto some local authority other than the Redcliffe City Council, because whoever accepts responsibility for the island will have a liability on its plate.

**Mr. Rae:** Who is the authority?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I ask the Minister to be patient and listen. I do not intend to have my thoughts distracted. I shall present my case as I want to present it.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Put your finger on the place.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not have to put my finger on the place. Unlike members of the Liberal Party and the National Party, I do not come into the Chamber with a prepared brief.

**Mr. Frawley:** You are one of the few on your side who do not.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not have to go to party headquarters every morning for my hand-out, as do some Liberal members opposite.

**Mr. Wright:** Some honourable members opposite have made only one speech in the last 15 months.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** That is right. In the years to come, anything that is done now will be greatly resented by the people of this part of Queensland who are aware that a Government has carved up a complex of bay islands representing a complete ecosystem and handed them out to any local authority onto which it can dump them.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** How can they change anything?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** If the honourable member is patient, I will tell him. Take Lamb, Garden and Karragarra Islands. Anyone who can make a quid out of subdivision has gone in there and land has been sold as if there is no day of reckoning.

Let us see what has happened, Mr. Speaker. I questioned in this Chamber the Minister in charge of the Bill. I asked him what survey had been made into the possible pollution of the bay area with the great aggregation of houses that will develop, and what safeguards had been implemented to control sewage effluent from the development in future years. His answer was that no survey had been made, and he waffled on and said local authorities would take the necessary steps. He has not even a clue about what will happen in regard to the pollution of the bay area.

I asked the Minister for Primary Industries whether any study had been made into the effect of the intrusion of dwellings on the bay islands. Again, no survey; no information. All the Government wants to do is dump the problem onto somebody else who will have to answer in the long run for what will happen in the bay area.

Let me again state why I place so much importance on the bay area. I reiterate that it is second only to the Great Barrier Reef in complexity, and it is very necessary that the bay islands should be used. I have never been a preservationist—no-one can accuse me of that—and I say that these islands must be used as an outlet for this great metropolis, this concrete jungle in which we live. In doing that, we must ensure that the question never arises of somebody with money going onto these islands simply to make a quick quid out of them. If willy-nilly development of that type is allowed, it will spell the doom of the bay area as an outlet for amusement, fishing, and so on, for the Brisbane area.

I say very seriously to honourable members opposite that the bay will become polluted. While the honourable member for Redcliffe might seek to gain political capital

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Lickiss): Order! I remind the honourable member that we are in the second-reading stage of the Bill and referring to the inclusion of Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I was saying that—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** And we are not dealing with pollution of the bay.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Mr. Speaker allowed the honourable member for Redcliffe to deal with it. What sort of favouritism is this?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! That is a reflection on the Chair. The honourable member will withdraw it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Mr. Deputy Speaker—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member will withdraw it without qualification.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I won't withdraw it without qualification.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Mr. Speaker allowed him to talk about it.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! When I am on my feet the honourable member will remain silent. That was a reflection on the Chair. The honourable member has again reflected on the Chair. Now he has disregarded the authority of the Chair. He will withdraw his remark and apologise to the Chair or I will name him.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I will withdraw it, but merely because I want to finish this speech.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** In his speech the honourable member for Redcliffe dealt with pollution of the bay from Luggage Point. Nobody in his right mind would want to disagree with that. If the Minister allows the Bill to go through, he is making it possible for the same sort of thing to happen all over the bay. Every local authority will seek to turn this land into rateable land.

**Mr. Rae:** Would you not agree that we have acted most responsibly so far as Moreton Island is concerned?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** No, I don't. If the Minister listens he will hear why.

If the Minister for Local Government allows this legislation to go through, he is paving the way in years to come for what is happening at Luggage Point to happen on every island in the bay.

**Mr. Rae:** No, we don't do that.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Just be quiet! You will be off to England shortly, and you won't be worried.

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

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** By passing legislation to place various parts of the bay in local authority areas, the Government will multiply what is happening now at Luggage Point. Every island in the bay will be heavily developed because local authorities will want to recoup their expenses. The development will create problems because of the discharge of effluent from a great aggregation of houses. The Minister knows how much of the various bay islands have already come under subdivision.

**Mr. Rae:** We have turned most of it into park now, as you know. Be fair! I am talking about Moreton Island. We have been very generous.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** No.

**Mr. Rae:** We have been very generous.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** It is no good the Minister saying that the Government has declared most of Moreton Island as a national park. If it had done that, why would it then want to put it into the Brisbane local authority area? There would be no need for it.

**Mr. Rae** interjected.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I ask the Minister to let me make my submission.

**Mr. Rae:** The Labor Government gave them this privilege, not us. That is true.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I suppose the Labor Government gave them kerosene lamps 50 years ago. Surely the Minister is not going to start holding this generation responsible for what happened then. Surely he is not going to start applying theories of 50 years ago in the face of present-day ecological discoveries.

I am very much opposed to this carve-up of the bay islands. If we want to use this complex sensibly and in the best interests of people not only in south-east Queensland but in various parts of Australia, the islands should not be put willy-nilly into a number of local authorities, but should be set up under a sensibly devised committee of experts. Thinking very quickly, I should say that that committee should consist of representatives of the Departments of Harbours and Marine, Lands, Local Government and Primary Industries. All of these have a stake in the assets of our bay islands. I would add to the committee two representatives of people living on the islands, two ecologists and a marine biologist, a representative of the boating clubs that use the bay and most certainly I would include a representative of the tourist industry.

**Mr. Rae:** You would never handle it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The reason the Minister says that is that he has never tried it. He has never gone anywhere else and looked into how places are run. He does not want this State to progress. It was probably a Country Party supporter who said, when electric light was turned on, "It will never work." That is exactly what the Minister for Lands is saying now.

I am saying that this area is too important to be simply parcelled out in the way it is being done under this legislation.

**Mr. Row:** What you are saying is a vote of no confidence in the Brisbane City Council.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am not talking about confidence in the city council. At the present time the whole of this bay

complex is under the Caboolture Shire Council, the Redcliffe Shire Council, the Brisbane City council, the Redland Shire Council, the Albert Shire Council and the Gold Coast City Council. That is the sort of hotch-potch way the Government is managing a very important ecological system that is vital to the people of the area. This is the sort of area that needs proper management.

**Mr. Houghton:** What island will Caboolture control?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Bribie Island.

**Mr. Houghton:** That is under the Landsborough Shire Council.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Then that's another one to add to the list. I thank the honourable member for his correction. The point is that this area is very important to the boating enthusiast, the person who wants to get away for the week-end, the fisherman, the bait industry, the fishing-tackle industry, the motor-boat industry and so on, and if it is not properly managed as a complete ecosystem its doom will be sealed beyond any doubt, because local authorities will want to turn this unprofitable asset into rateable land. It is as simple as that. I claim that this would be a retrograde and pernicious step in managing this complex. As I believe and have said year in and year out, the Barrier Reef should be simply managed as a complex and by a single authority.

A committee such as I suggested should be charged with the authority to properly develop the bay islands, and not let the exploiter in to make a quick quid. We should make sure that any intrusion by human beings into the bay islands is properly managed in the interest of future generations. I cannot stress too much my message to this Parliament. Unless this area is properly managed, there is no doubt whatever in my mind that its ecosystem will be destroyed. What will this mean? For a start, it will mean the loss of a fishing industry. It will mean the loss of recreational fishing, the loss of the boating industry, and loss of all other things associated with the area.

**Mr. Rae:** Don't you cast a slight upon the qualifications of a good shire?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not cast a slight on anybody. I am saying that local authorities are not able to have these lands lying idle and not producing money. The Minister knows that.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I do not accept it. A number of local authorities do accept the responsibility.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am not saying that they do not accept their responsibilities. I am saying that they do not want non-rateable land in their shires. That is not criticism.

**Mr. McKechnie:** They like some of it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I could name some very enlightened local authorities, and it is no criticism of them at all.

**Mr. Burns:** The Redcliffe City Council did not want Moreton Island.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** There is a good example. There is no doubt that the only reason for introducing this legislation to cover Mud, Bishop and other islands is to have someone responsible for the provision of services to the new port.

**Mr. McKechnie:** You would not like to see a recurrence of what occurred on Macleay Island, where there was to have been a pop festival?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** No; I am not saying that at all.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I am glad to have your assurance.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Nor do I want to see a recurrence of what is happening on the other bay islands, where every inch of land is being sold for residential development.

**Mr. McKechnie:** "Was" being sold; we stepped in and it is under control now.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** How is it under control? Will the Government be able to stop all the people who bought land on the islands from erecting huts there?

**Mr. McKechnie:** You said it had been sold.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** How will the Government stop them?

**Mr. McKechnie:** It is now under the control of the Redland Shire Council.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** But how will the Government stop the people who bought this land from erecting huts?

**Mr. McKechnie:** They can't cut it up willy-nilly now.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** It has already been cut up.

**Mr. McKechnie:** Not all of it—there is still some left.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** We always hear, "There is still some left." I say that the Government has already allowed it to go too far, and I have been saying this for years.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I agree. It should have been done 30 years ago.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Fair enough. I would not quarrel with the Minister on that. All I am saying is that, in the light of our knowledge of the ecology and in view of the tremendous importance of Moreton Bay to both the commercial and the amateur fishing industries, any measure that does not provide for the proper management of the resources of the Moreton Bay

islands will be a disaster. And this will not be averted by placing the islands under the control of different local authorities.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I have enough confidence in them to believe a disaster will be averted.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I have never implied any lack of confidence in local authorities.

**Mr. McKechnie:** You've made a fair effort.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** All I am saying is that it is time we looked at the proper way of doing these things.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I believe that is by local authorities.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** That is probably why the Minister and I disagree. I do not have any taxi-drivers whom I can consult. I cannot stress too heavily the importance of Moreton Bay to South-east Queensland. I do not believe for one moment that we should leave the control of the area to separate local authorities, and in saying that I am not criticising local authorities.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I find that hard to believe.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I can understand their problems, because I have gone out among them. For example, the Douglas Shire Council controls an area of which 25 per cent is national park. No local authority wants to be saddled with that sort of non-rateable land in its area.

**Dr. Scott-Young:** Why not?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The shire is isolated, up in the Mossman area, away from the main stream of tourist traffic. It has no hope at this stage of obtaining revenue from the national parks in the area. The shire council does not want to be burdened with this area that does not produce revenue.

I am claiming that the Moreton Bay islands should be properly managed so that the intrusion of people into the area will not react to its detriment. It cannot be properly managed under the control of different local authorities. This legislation is a tragedy and highlights the Government's unenlightened thinking. Fortunately, however, it is not too late to have another look at this matter.

**Mr. Rae:** You would have to agree that, even with the local authorities making certain determinations and expressing individual desires, the whole thing still has to come back to the Lands Department?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** No, I would not agree with that at all. If the Minister wishes to involve the Lands Department, I point out that I criticised Government policy, not Lands Department officers. The Government has been getting \$30,000 a bid for land on the bay islands. I believe that at one auction the man who bid \$30,000 for Crown land was clapped.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have given the honourable member some latitude. I now ask him to apply himself to the Bill.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not think I departed too far from it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has departed far enough.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Mr. Speaker, I believed that you were very interested in what I had to say. If you had not thought it was vital, you would not have given me any latitude.

I express my disgust and dismay at the provisions in this legislation. It represents a backward step.

**Mr. Rae:** How would you solve this problem?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** If the honourable gentleman comes to my office, I will write it out for him.

**Mr. Rae:** You have not told us yet.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I have suggested the committee that should be charged with the sensible and proper development of the bay islands.

**Mr. Rae:** That would not operate.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am sure it was the Country Party that said a fountain pen would not write. That type of thinking is quite common among its members.

It is obvious that my only hope is that, in future, someone will read in "Hansard" what I have said tonight and realise that in the light of all the muddled thinking on the part of the Government it was left to an Opposition speaker to point to the significance of this area. Such legislation as this is completely off the beam in modern thinking on land management and competing land usage.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG** (Townsville) (8.18 p.m.): I am rather intrigued at the turn of this debate. In talking about the ecosystem the honourable member for Salisbury delivered his speech in the same emotional style as that adopted by the socialist people who started the campaign in 1972. It would seem that the ecosystem is everything in the world—the beginning and the end of everything—but it is not.

The word "pollution" was used in connection with various islands. The only island Opposition members seem to think worth worrying about is Moreton Island. Irrespective of size, so far as I know, the Moreton Bay group of islands are similar to other islands off the coast in that 99 per cent of them have no water supply of their own. All water would have to be carried there.

**Mr. D'Arcy:** Moreton has miles of it.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I said that 99 per cent had no water.

As water would have to be carried to the islands one of the main difficulties would be sewage pollution, but that is not an overwhelming problem.

The honourable member for Redlands referred to a single island-development authority. That smacks of a move by the Federal authorities to embody all the islands off the coast of Australia in one authority. It would be interesting to carry that theme to its logical conclusion. What do honourable members opposite think about another State of islands with its representatives? Like the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory, the islands could have two senators, members in the Legislative Assembly, and local government members. That is a natural development.

**Mr. Wright:** You are a strange person.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I am not strange. I have two eyes, which, admittedly, have become a little dim lately; but at least I can foresee what lies ahead of a socialist-oriented Government.

We should not allow ourselves to become engrossed in the ecosystem and damage to the bay. That is a lot of hogwash and has been raised to cloud the issue. This is good legislation, however it is viewed—down the sewer or across the water. The legislation brings the islands under an authority. One minute honourable members opposite claim that Clem Jones is the God Almighty of local government, yet the next minute they object to his running the islands. Isn't he good enough? Isn't the Brisbane City Council good enough to run them? Do honourable members opposite want to put Moreton Island under the control of the Redcliffe City Council?

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** It is a simple exercise as to what honourable members opposite want. If the Brisbane City Council is not good enough to run these islands, it is not good enough to run the city and it should be dispensed with; it should be dissolved by Order in Council and a substitute arrangement made.

**Mr. Aikens:** They want to sell them to Labor Investments.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** That is right, and run them as tourist resorts.

Much has been said about the development of these islands as tourist resorts. We have magnificent islands right along our coastline. Magnetic Island, a magnificent settlement, is right opposite Townsville. The islands in the Palm group are further up the coast. All sorts of problems are associated with them—many more than occur at Mud Island or Moreton Island. Not one or two people but thousands live on the Palm group—a small ethnic community with a desire to live normally, like ordinary Australians. However, I did not hear anything about that raised by the Opposition. All I heard tonight was

talk about ecosystems, fish, prawns, and waterways. What about the people who want to live on these islands? They will live on them and enjoy island life. It is, after all, a pleasant way of living. If the State Government can arrange under the Bill for these islands to be inhabited by Australians in comfort, leisure and pleasure so that they may live a good, free, open life, then it is commendable legislation and nothing should be said against it.

I continue in my belief that the islands should be under a local government authority. They should be under the authority of the State—not under a central island authority, which could easily be taken over by Federal legislation.

**A Government Member** interjected.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** Yes, socialist legislation could be introduced, and that would be the end of it.

The general rates in most municipal authorities have been increased. In Townsville the rates have risen by 31 per cent, a colossal jump. How can these islands be developed unless they are placed under a local government?

**Mr. Burns:** Why do they have to be developed?

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** The honourable member for Lytton just asked why they had to be developed. The honourable member for Salisbury asked what was the use of bringing undeveloped areas under a shire council. He said that no shire wants the land undeveloped. Those honourable members do not even agree with each other. They do not think along the same lines. They are not on the same wavelength. If people wish to live in these areas, why shouldn't they? Why shouldn't they be able to enjoy all the facilities and amenities of life enjoyed by a person in a high-rise building or along the bank of the Brisbane River? Why shouldn't they be able to earn their living in some other place? Why should I be dictated to because of an ecosystem or pollution or because someone might "poo" in the water? If honourable members opposite only thought about it, sewage is an asset in the country. If money is spent on its processing and distribution, it can be used to the national advantage. Take Japan; sewage can be bought or sold, depending on one's business.

I cannot see any problems associated with the transfer of islands to a local authority, whether they are in the immediate vicinity of Brisbane or further along the Queensland coast, even as far as the top of Cape York Peninsula. The islands in the Palm group, Magnetic Island, Hinchinbrook—they can all be brought into a local authority protection and development scheme. I am quite certain that neither the citizens of Townsville nor the citizens of Brisbane would mind developing islands to balance the development of the coastline and progress from the primitive

establishments that were there originally when some islands were sold and development was minimal. They had no reticulated water. Some were not surveyed correctly. Under local authority control, all development will be controlled. All allotments will be surveyed and given correct titles.

I commend the Bill as an excellent piece of legislation.

**Mr. BURNS** (Lytton) (8.25 p.m.): After hearing the speech of the honourable member for Townsville, I wonder how a person with such a mental attitude could be allowed to use a knife on a patient lying on a table under anaesthetic. He has a Jekyll-and-Hyde personality. Even if he is a good surgeon, he has not carried out much research into the average working man's attitude to life as shown by his words tonight, or should I say those in the brief that was handed to him?

Six islands are mentioned in the Bill, not just Moreton Island. The Minister said in the first few words of his speech at the introductory stage that the prime purpose of the legislation was to include Mud, St. Helena and Green Islands in the city of Brisbane. Moreton Island has been included only tonight when the Minister circulated a list of amendments that is longer than the Bill itself. Let it be noted that the prime purpose of the Bill was to include those three islands within the control of the city of Brisbane.

Shortly after, the Minister went on to say as an afterthought that there was some doubt about the status of Fisherman and Bishop Islands, so they had been included to put the matter beyond doubt. Now five islands are under consideration.

Finally, as the Minister was concluding his speech at the introductory stage, he made this point—

"It is my intention to consider before the second reading of the Bill whether Moreton Island should be included in the city of Brisbane or the city of Redcliffe."

We find tonight that it is to be included in the city of Brisbane. We are therefore finally made aware that the Bill covers six islands, not just one.

Looking at the first three islands mentioned by the Minister, namely, Mud, St. Helena and Green, it is clear, as the Minister pointed out at the introductory stage, that they are not part of the city. In fact, they have never been part of it. He also made the point that the Brisbane City Council welcomes their inclusion within the city boundary. I ask: what benefit can St. Helena, for example, gain from local authority control? The island is 500 acres in size, and all of it is leased to a canvas goods manufacturer, who announced in December 1973 that he would develop a tourist resort to promote the island and the 108-year-old ruins of the penal settlement established there in 1866.

Some time ago, the tourist promoter was seeking a new 30-year lease to replace the current lease, which, to my knowledge, has another nine years to run. The decision on St. Helena therefore has already been made. The Government has already decided the zoning for planning purposes by issuing the lease. It is a tourist lease, and the decision has been made. The only time that council planning will be important in the future will be if the Government proposes to convert the lease to freehold. Council zoning will then be most important. To rezone now would destroy the lease and the owner's plans. Let us hope that freeholding of St. Helena never occurs. It was once known as the Alcatraz of Moreton Bay. It is part of our history, and it should be preserved for posterity.

Over the years vandals have made grave attacks on St. Helena, and I am hoping that, by bringing the island under the control of some authority, it might be possible to do something to help the many service clubs who have been to St. Helena and tried to do something in the past to help preserve the church, the cemetery, and some of the old gaol buildings that are wonderful parts of the history of the island for all to see.

Now let us look at Green Island. Queensland Cement and Lime, the company owning the Darra cement works, holds a dredging lease to high-water mark on the island. The supply manager of that company has indicated that the coral deposits are regarded as reserves. While test drilling has taken place in the area to determine the value of the deposits, no major development is expected in the near future. The plans include dredging for the coral and construction of a boat channel to allow easy access right to the heart of the island.

The trustees of Green Island are the Apex Club of Wynnum-Manly. The club holds a lease over 4 acres of dry ground from the Queensland State Government. This local service club received the trusteeship in 1960. The Apex Club, which maintains a mown park in the area, has the only piece of dry land there, and the rest is zoned. And does the House know what it is to be? It is zoned for extractive industries. The Government has made that decision and it has given the lease to Queensland Cement and Lime. What control therefore will the Brisbane City Council, or any other local authority, have over zoning? The decision has been made.

Let us now look at Mud Island, an island that should have been named Coral Island. The percentage of mud to coral under this island is small indeed. I am told that surveys have shown that 50,000,000 tons of coralline material are available for cheap, economic dredging on the island's foreshores. Anyone who has been in the bay lately will have seen the dredges working there now. Our city has only one cement plant at

present, and it depends for its existence on its right to exploit the whole of the Moreton Bay coral. Have we really given the city council planners anything to plan on Mud Island? Can they really plan it other than as an extractive-industry zone once a long lease has been granted to the cement company?

Let us look at the other two islands—the ones that the Minister added as afterthoughts, the ones that are in my electorate. Bishop is the first. It contains a tourist business, and it is a popular terminal for down-river tourist trips. It is one of the largest man-made islands in Australia.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Built by dredging.

**Mr. BURNS:** Yes; that is right. It was created from millions of tons of mud, sand and rubbish when the channel for shipping was cut between 1909 and 1912.

Man created Bishop Island, and man now plans to destroy it. The strategic plan for Brisbane's new port makes it quite clear that Bishop Island will disappear as a tourist resort and as a separate entity. Wharves will join Bishop Island to Fisherman Island.

I see the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs skulking around in the lobby. Let him come into the House. I will read to him from the report that he will not table in the House, and I will begin to tell honourable members why we have this Bill before us, why we are handing the control of these islands over to the Brisbane City Council. The people of Brisbane are going to pay for the development of the water, electricity, sewerage, the roads—in fact, for all the services for the \$90,000,000 port that is to be built at the mouth of the river. These low-lying flats were never considered to be of any value. They were useless land until the decision was made in the early part of this year that this was to be the new port area. The decision we are asked to make here tonight is to hand them to the Brisbane City Council and make the citizens of Brisbane pay for the provision of services.

Why plan for Bishop Island as a separate entity and bring it into the city of Brisbane when it is already planned to join it to Fisherman Island and make it part of the mainland? That is a fact of life. If honourable members opposite do not believe that, let them come down to my office. I will show them a copy of the secret port report and they can read it there.

**Dr. Scott-Young:** The port is not under the control of the local government.

**Mr. BURNS:** The port is going to be on these two islands, and they will be under the control of the Brisbane City Council. I really worry about the honourable member. I should hate to be on a table under anaesthetic while he had a knife in his hand. If he had to take my tonsils out, I

would probably have a squeaky voice for the rest of my life because he had cut in the wrong place. Mud Island is the place where the honourable member should go. He has lost his ability to see clearly.

The report shows that the tourist resort on Bishop Island will be eliminated by the final port development. "Eliminated" is what the report says.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** What's wrong with that?

**Mr. BURNS:** What is the use of including it here? Why are we bringing it into the Brisbane City Council area when it is to be joined to the mainland? It will then be part of the mainland, not an island.

The report says that the main feature of development with respect to boating is that the boat passage will close, thus forcing the smaller boats into a more exposed journey around Fisherman Island when proceeding from the river towards Manly. The safety of such craft in the future will be ensured by the provision of a storm haven at the southern end of the boat passage. At the northern end of the boat passage there is to be a tug harbour, and across the centre of the boat passage there is going to be a causeway. So Fisherman Island will be part of the mainland, and it will not be necessary to make any decision about it as an island once it has become part of the mainland. It will then be under the control of the Brisbane City Council; it will be part and parcel of the Brisbane City Council area. Why are we putting it in? Why, as an afterthought, was it included with the other three islands? Why, as another afterthought, was an additional island included?

What I have tried to get across to some of the people who have spoken about the bay and who really know nothing about it is that the greater part of Fisherman Island is below spring high-water mark. Apart from areas along the river frontage where dredging by the Department of Harbours and Marine has raised levels by about 20 feet, the area is extremely flat. It goes under water with the tides. Anyone who has had any problems with a boat and tried to stand on Fisherman Island before the dredging took place knows that he had to stand up to his knees in water and mud.

Above high-water mark the vegetation is mostly groundsel, and below high-water mark it is predominantly mangroves.

The port report makes it clear that Bishop Island and Fisherman Island as separate islands will disappear. I can show honourable members the map. It is available for anyone to see. So why are they being included in the local authority area? I can tell honourable members why. The citizens of Brisbane are going to pay for the services provided there. That decision will be stuffed down our throats, and clearly we will have to pay. Let me read what the port report

says. It makes some pertinent remarks. The report itself will not give the city council any authority to control the two islands. Even though we are going to place them in its area, it is not going to have any authority to control them. The report states—

"That the development of new port facilities at the Fisherman Islands at a cost of \$35.5 million proceed forthwith. This site meets the requirements for overseas shipping operations without any real restrictions and is proved to be a viable project and the most economical for development of all the sites examined.

"The limits of the Port of Brisbane be redefined to include those parts of Moreton Bay and the Brisbane River necessary for efficient, commercial port operations."

Here is the nigger in the woodpile—

"Special legislation be introduced vesting the management of the port in a Board of seven (7) Commissioners selected by the Government and having experience in commerce, finance and industry."

It goes on to make these points—

"Many objective studies of port administration come to the conclusion that autonomous port trusts . . ."

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is getting away from the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. BURNS:** I am talking about Fisherman and Bishop Islands, which are to come under the authority referred to in the Bill. If we are going to talk about the future of these islands and how they are going to be run, we should clearly spell out the fact that at the very time the Government is bringing this decision about the two islands before us, it has a report produced by its experts which clearly says that we should have an autonomous body, an independent authority, to run these islands. That report says that the authority should be independent of the day-to-day Government decisions so that it may bring the best techniques of private management to the operations of a self-supporting or revenue-producing public enterprise. It also says—

"Under the present Queensland legislation, Board members at Queensland ports other than Brisbane are appointed as representatives of Local Authority interests. Each Local Authority within Harbour Board Districts appoints one or two members to the Board. Whilst this can be regarded as democratic in that the members represent the community they serve within the Harbour Board Districts, it does not ensure that the men appointed to the management of the Authority are necessarily qualified by their experience to manage such an important public undertaking."

The type of management that is envisaged would require a change in the Harbour Board Act. What we are going to do is to bring

Bishop Island and Fisherman Islands under the control of the Brisbane City Council, and then take that control away from it and give it to an independent authority—an autonomous body. We are going to set up this body separate from the day-to-day demands of Government operation and separate from local authority control. We are not going to have a harbour board with local authority representation. Then we will say to this port authority, "Operate that port. Run it as a business enterprise. The citizens of Brisbane and their representatives can go jump in the lake." That is the message here.

We now come to the last of our six islands. The Minister said tonight, "Well, I have made up my mind. Redcliffe doesn't want Moreton Island so Brisbane can have it whether the council likes it or not." What does that mean to the citizens of Brisbane?

I love Moreton Island. I have fished it all my life. I knocked around there as a lad.

**Mr. R. E. Moore** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** I knew that as soon as I started to talk about Moreton Island the honourable member would talk about Jim Kennedy. Jim Kennedy is a mate of mine. I have fished and worked Moreton Island with him. I lived opposite him on the Gold Coast. I have spent many enjoyable times with Jim fishing in and around the bay. I will tell the honourable member in a moment what I would do with Tangalooma. It is something that Jim would not do with Tangalooma, but I will give the honourable member my personal view on that.

Tonight when the Minister for Lands was in the Chamber and he was talking about Moreton Island, he said something that shows he is not aware of what has been happening in relation to one of the islands under his control. In August 1970 Cabinet set up a committee that produced a report in March 1972 called "Major Islands in Moreton Bay." That report is available in the Parliamentary Library. It listed mining authorities or leases over approximately 27,000 of Moreton Island's 38,000 acres of vacant Crown land. Once again the new local authority—whether it is Brisbane, Redcliffe or Redland—will be confronted with a fait accompli. Three-quarters of the vacant land will be mined, and the council will have nothing to say about it. What will this mean to the local authority? It will have to supply council services to the miners.

Will the citizens have the right to object to any of the leases or authorities to prospect already granted? I am a citizen of Brisbane. Do I now get some backdated right to say, "I object to the mining of these areas in my city. They were not in my city before"? Remember that our decisions here tonight will make this a council responsibility, and will give me some rights as a citizen living in that area, paying rates in

that area and electing people in that area. Surely that comes with the authority the Council is being given over the island. Such a responsibility should bring with it certain rights. One of those should be the right of objection to any proposed mining venture that would destroy the possible enjoyment of the area for the residents who make up the local authority's citizens.

The Government is adding the island to our area. That is part of our playground area now. If we want to keep it as a national park, if we do not want to develop it, if we do not want high-rise development, if we do not want to make it another Magnetic Island, we do not have to. If we do want to make it another South Molle Island, we can. If we want to make it another Magnetic Island, we can. If we want to keep it as an unspoiled area to which 800,000 or 900,000 people live in close proximity, where they can take their children and show them what the bush used to be like years ago, we should be able to. We can show them beautiful sand dunes, the highest sand mountain in the world, beautiful blue lakes and the freshest, bitterly cold running water on any island around this coast. One has only to put a spear down anywhere on the island to get the most beautiful, fresh, clear, clean water than one has ever tasted. And when one drives along the beach after a bit of a fresh, one will find time after time, new streams of fresh water running down.

Few animals can be seen in the area. It is one of the best fishing beaches one can imagine. One has only to read the newspapers to see where the champion fishermen have caught the most fish during the fishing competitions.

Are we going to destroy that? Are we going to put the land under high-rise buildings? Are we going to give it to the developers like the honourable member for Townsville, who, when I asked why we needed to develop it, said "That is what we are going to do, develop it"?

As for Jim Kennedy's resort on Moreton Island, if I were the State Government I would take it over; I would buy it back from him. He has done a marvellous job on that resort but I would develop it as an Outward Bound type of resort owned by the tourist industry in this State, developed for the benefit of the people in the area. I would allow all the freehold blocks on the island now to pass on to sons and daughters of the future, but I would not allow any speculation in relation to them. As soon as speculators wanted to buy in I would buy the land back.

I would reserve that island as a playground of the future for the people of Brisbane. Anyone who has never been there, driven around it and seen its natural beauty, will not realise what we are possibly destroying. I am sure that is not Jim Kennedy's idea. He

would be unhappy at the idea of the State Government taking over Tangalooma, but it seems to me that that is what we need.

The Government should develop Tangalooma as the city's island resort. At various times during the year some of the richer schools in this city take their pupils out to the islands for a week-end. Why can't children from the State schools have State camps on Moreton Island? Why can't we have reserves set aside for Scouts and others to go over there and have a get-away-from-it-all holiday?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is getting away from the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. BURNS:** I am talking about Moreton Island.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! You are getting away from the Bill.

**Mr. BURNS:** Very well, to get back to Moreton Island—the Minister for Lands said that all the national park areas have been taken up as national parks. The report of the Cabinet-appointed committee on the major islands of Moreton Bay had this to say in March 1972—

"There has been considerable debate over national park proposals on the island since 1951."

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I am not going to allow the honourable member to develop anything on that.

**Mr. BURNS:** Then let me develop this idea: I am saying that the Government is giving the city council control over the island, but the Minister said tonight, "We have made all the decisions about parks." I say that there are available here in a book recommendations to the Government about Moreton Island, the island we are debating tonight. Those recommendations are to the effect that large sections of national park should be extended. It says that the national park should be extended to the beach. What rights is the Government giving the council to control that island when it already has recommendations from its own people? When the Minister says tonight, "We have done it," I think what he means is, "We are going to do it." These things are going to be done after the council gets control of the island.

As citizens of Brisbane, what control are we getting? What are we saying to residents of Day's Gutter, people who have lived there for years and have built shacks and camps? Will the Minister, in his reply, state whether those people will be required to submit to the building by-laws and ordinances that now apply in the city of Brisbane? I will tell the Government what is going to happen. A small fishing village at the other end of the island will be wiped out. They built a settlement, and although it is a bit of

a shanty town—I think they will admit that—it is an established area that was there before we came along and decided we would hand it over. It's not really developing any more. It's not a new town. No new blocks of land are being sold by the Government through the Lands Department. What will happen to those people? Will they in the future be placed under the gun because a health inspector or a building inspector from the Brisbane City Council, or whichever council it is—I am not arguing the case of the councils, because I have just said I am against putting the island under local authority control—

**Mr. McKechnie:** I have confidence that the Brisbane City Council would act in a responsible and reasonable manner.

**Mr. BURNS:** Following up the same point—if we are going to give an island of this size—and it is a large island—to a council such as this, will the Government make a financial grant to help develop it, or are we going to say to the council, "Get whatever money you need from the rates."? There are a few people living at Bulwer, a few at Cowan Cowan, a few at Day's Gutter, and one resort. The council will not get enough money from the rates paid by those people to cover the cost of air fares to and from the island for those people who will be sent over.

If we are giving this responsibility away we should also give a substantial sum of money, perhaps by way of subsidy, because it is no good saying to the Brisbane City Council, "You made \$5,000,000" or "\$1,000,000 on your electricity operation, so take it out of that." This will be an additional unplanned charge.

Moreton Island needs certain facilities. I do not know that it needs bitumen roads, but most certainly one problem that calls for control, whether by a local authority or someone else, is the dumping by campers of tin cans, bits of paper and other rubbish. In many instances the people who use the island are the ones who abuse it. It is now left to the resorts to clean up.

As you have ruled, Mr. Speaker, that I am not able to speak about certain matters in relation to the island, my final point has got to be this: what will happen to the people on these bay islands will be what happened on 10 January 1973, when the first thing that the Redland Shire Council did after it took over certain other bay islands was revalue them so that it could levy rates on the landowners. The first thing done by that council was not something for the good of the people on the islands. The first thing Mr. Wood, who used to represent the Country Party in this Chamber, did was ask to have the lands revalued and then charge rates on them. He said, "We might be lucky in that some people will walk off

their blocks and we will get them that way." That was its attitude to the development of the islands.

**Mr. Marginson:** Shocking!

**Mr. BURNS:** It was shocking. The point I make finally is that in relation to every one of these islands the decisions have already been made. Mud and Green Islands will be used for extractive industries; the long-term tourist lease on St. Helena, is, I believe, to be extended, but I do not know whether the present lessee has obtained the extra 30 years; and Bishop and Fisherman Islands are to be part of the mainland, whether we like it or not.

I cannot see why we are rushing in tonight and making a decision to pass the islands over in this way when we could have sat back and closely studied some of the reports that obviously have not been acted upon. At a time when the Premier is announcing the implementation of a major study in the Moreton coastal region and investigations of the Moreton Bay area so that the future of the whole area can be determined, we are contemplating handing over the islands to a local authority so that they will be under its separate control. It just doesn't make sense to me.

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumba) (8.49 p.m.): We have certainly heard some great contributions to this debate. Certain honourable members have tried to cloud the issue by talking a lot of tripe about ecology and the environment. One could not be blamed for thinking that the honourable member for Redlands was carrying a brief for Jack Munday. It has been claimed that by including Mud, St. Helena, Green, Bishop and Fisherman Islands in the area administered by the Brisbane City Council we are going to force it into debt. I do not believe that is so, nor do I believe that the inclusion of Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane area is anything other than a wise decision.

Honourable members have spoken about the environment and the ecology. Surely they are aware that for years the Brisbane City Council has been discharging raw, untreated sewage into Moreton Bay and polluting its waters. It does not give two hoots about the environment and the ecology. In Dayboro, moreover, the Brisbane City Council has done an about-face in delaying the development of land within two miles of the high-water mark. It is knocking back applications to subdivide even though they have been approved by the Pine Rivers Shire Council.

I shall concentrate on Moreton Island because I live fairly close to it. It should certainly be placed under the control of the city of Brisbane, which has the facilities to develop it and look after it in a much better way than any other local authority.

**Mr. Gunn:** It is quite willing to do that.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** That is so.

When the Brisbane City Council takes over control of Moreton Island, it should take immediate action to prepare a town plan for the island. Heaven knows it is badly needed. The island should be under the control of a local authority. Problems in practical planning are already large in such an undeveloped area. Extensive areas are covered by mining leases, a great length of coastline is subject to wind and sea erosion and poorly planned development has taken place in the three existing townships. The council should decide the extent to which urbanisation will be permitted in future. That may allay the fears of the honourable member for Lytton. In my opinion Moreton Island would best be kept as a recreation and tourist facility under the control of the Brisbane City Council. If further urbanisation takes place, the council would have to provide services.

The extent of dedicated roads on Moreton Island is very hard to determine. Within the townships of Bulwer, Cowan Cowan and Koorngal, there are approximately 395 chains, or roughly five miles, of roads. None of these roads are constructed. They can be described only as sand tracks. All existing lots are not accessible by motor vehicle. In some cases major drainage problems will have to be overcome to provide vehicular access. If existing town lots are to remain, properly constructed roads to service them will be required.

Existing dedicated roads on the island total 23 miles in length. A three-chain road traverses the island from the resort, through the national park to the east coast. A search of the Lands Department and Survey Office has failed to reveal any evidence of dedicated roads on Moreton Island outside the townships. It is therefore reasonable to assume that all the existing tracks are located on vacant Crown land.

Motor traffic on the island uses the ocean beach from Koorngal to Cape Moreton and the bayside beach from Bulwer to the sandhills. A cleared, formed and lightly gravelled road extends approximately seven miles from Cape Moreton to Bulwer and a cleared and formed road of approximately three miles runs from Tangalooma to the ocean beach. If the island is placed under the control of the Brisbane City Council, the council will be expected to maintain these existing roads. There are declared roads under the Main Roads Act on both Bribie and North Stradbroke Islands, but there appears to be little prospect of having any roads declared on Moreton Island.

A problem associated with roads on Moreton Island is the extent to which motor vehicles are used. To my knowledge no motor vehicle count has been carried out, but the problem is known to be increasing. The problem is caused by the illegal use of dedicated roads by unregistered vehicles and the damage they cause, particularly in the dunal area. There are many abandoned

motor vehicles on Moreton Island and those in use lack roadworthiness. Two fatal accidents have occurred on Moreton Island in recent times. The solution to these problems will probably involve co-ordinated action by the Brisbane City Council, the Police Department and the Main Roads Department.

The council will also have to provide sanitary and garbage services, because there are none on the island at present. In view of the extensive underground water supplies on the island—I agree with the comments of the honourable member for Lytton on this—a fairly careful investigation will be required before any night-soil or garbage disposal area is selected. All existing buildings need inspection for dangerous and neglected conditions. I do not advocate that people living there should be forced to move out, but existing buildings should be upgraded. Water and waste-water installations will have to be investigated. There are several water bores on the island and the pollution potential is high if septic tanks are installed.

Groundsel is prevalent on Moreton Island. This problem should be looked into.

**Mr. Houston:** There is plenty of groundsel in your electorate, but nothing has been done.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Plenty has been done about it in my electorate. The Redcliffe City Council, the Pine Rivers Shire Council and the Caboolture Shire Council are all doing their best to control groundsel.

**Mr. Houston:** The councils are doing their best but the State is not making money available.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The honourable member for Bulimba does not even know about the groundsel beetle that has been introduced by the Alan Fletcher Research Station. It is already in the Caboolture Shire and is slowly destroying the groundsel.

**Mr. Houston:** Slowly.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Yes, very slowly, but it is doing its job. It will be as successful as the cactoblastis was with prickly-pear. One would think that the previous Leader of the Opposition was groundsel, the way he was shifted by the groundsel beetles on the other side of the Chamber.

**Mr. Houston:** There is no need to get personal.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The inclusion of Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane places only that part of the island above high-water mark under local authority control. The foreshore, which is the area between the high-water and low-water marks, is considered to be vacant Crown land. However, it should be placed under the control of the Brisbane City Council, because with the control of

the foreshores goes the responsibility for litter and debris removal. There could also be instances of oil-spill clean-up.

There are no public reserves on the island. The areas of land between the foreshore and the allotments at Bulwer and Koorngal and between the foreshore and the Tangalooma lease are dedicated esplanades. Elsewhere the areas adjacent to the foreshore are Crown land and are generally subject to mining leases.

Both of the existing jetties located at Tangalooma are privately owned and there is no public landing facility on the island. Although it is a local authority function to provide jetties and landing places, financial assistance should be available through the Department of Harbours and Marine for small-boat facilities, depending upon the priority of the project and the availability of funds.

There are two aerodromes on the island, both of which are privately owned. An authorised landing ground is in service between Tangalooma and Cowan Cowan and another is under construction. If there is any future development of the island, it could be necessary for at least one airstrip to be in public ownership.

The present demand for electricity would not justify the high capital expenditure of bringing a supply across from North Stradbroke Island. It is unlikely that a supply will become available unless the demand associated with any venture on the island justifies the expenditure.

After considering all of the facts, I am of the opinion that the Brisbane City Council is the best suited of all local authorities to control Moreton Island. It could well be that in the future the Redcliffe City Council may regret its decision not to insist that it take Moreton under its control. However, the consensus of opinion in Redcliffe at present in that control of Moreton Island is not desired. As the Minister suggested, it would be in the best interests of all that it be placed with the other bay islands under the control of the one authority, which I believe should be the Brisbane City Council.

**Mr. D'ARCY (Albert) (8.58 p.m.):** It was evident that the honourable member for Murrumba knew little of what he was taking about. Of course, as we have come to expect, he shows scant knowledge even of his own electorate. As usual, he wandered all round the subject of the Bill. However, one thing he did was rubbish the Opposition for defending the ecology of this area. I have seen areas in his electorate, for which he has no interest at all, that are affected. I speak of the Bribie Passage area, which, unfortunately for the people living there, he represents.

**Mr. Frawley:** It is not in my electorate.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Bribe Passage is. I realise that Bribe Island is in the electorate of the honourable member for Landsborough. It is in the Caboolture Shire. I correct the member for Redcliffe on that. He claimed that it was not. It is in the Caboolture Shire, not the Landsborough Shire, although as a result of the State Government's gerrymander it comes within the electorate of Landsborough.

The previous speaker showed little knowledge of the ecology of these areas and little knowledge of the ecology of his own electorate, the foreshores of which are similar to the foreshores on the islands we are discussing tonight.

**Mr. McKechnie:** Which shire did you say Bribe was in?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Caboolture.

**Mr. McKechnie:** I don't think the member for Landsborough agrees with you.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** The southern area—where the township and the development are—is in the Caboolture Shire: I did say that the island itself is in the Landsborough electorate. I know it a little bit better, perhaps, than the member for Redcliffe. Certainly the township and the development are in Caboolture Shire. I am sure the member for Landsborough knows the area quite well. Unlike the member for Murrumba, he visits it and would know it well.

It is interesting to note that the members who have spoken on this Bill tonight represent areas along the coastal fringe that are affected. The honourable member for Murrumba showed little knowledge of the problem, and the honourable member for Landsborough has not yet spoken.

The honourable members for Lytton and Redlands and I, representing electorates on the southern side, share very much the same view. We ask why the Minister introduced the Bill. What value has it to the local authorities concerned? We have heard a great deal about local authorities and their control, and we have been told that these islands should be under local authority control. But the Minister has not explained why. Perhaps it is because, as the honourable members for Murrumba and Redcliffe have said, Moreton Island is not wanted by the Redcliffe City Council. One possible interference is that the Redcliffe City Council could not afford the administration of Moreton Island. However, I think the honourable member for Salisbury was more correct when he said that the bay islands are being broken up in order to be destroyed.

I think the concept of an islands authority, as was mentioned by the honourable members for Lytton and Redlands, is the most admirable solution to the problem. The question that must continue to be asked is this: why is the Minister introducing this legislation? The Minister said that we have seen what has happened to the islands in the

central area, and the islands now mentioned are to come under the control of the Brisbane City Council. But he has not pointed out that for many years most of the islands in my electorate have been under the control of the Gold Coast City Council or the Albert Shire Council. The islands further north have also been under the control of local authorities for some time. Bribe Island, for example, has been under the control of the Caboolture and Landsborough Shire Councils.

Let us now look at what has happened in the over-all concept. Many of the islands are subject to leases for mining, or the extraction of material such as coral. We have been here long enough to know that under State law the local authority is always the meat in the sandwich. In an area that is being developed, the Minister for Lands may decide that he will take a lease over some of the land for a specific purpose. We know what happens when the need for the land arises. The wishes of the local authority are always subordinate to those of the Lands Department. When the matter comes before the Land Court, who wins? Is it the local authority, which is in effect part of one small Government department, or is it the Government that controls local authorities? Of course, it is the Government that wins. This has happened time and again on islands where development has taken place.

The Government has paid very little attention to the development of the bay islands. It has made previous reference to the central bay islands that are so important to the ecology of the area. It is well known that these islands will be subjected to considerable pressure from the population of Brisbane. Perhaps this is why the Minister wants the central and largest islands under the control of the Brisbane City Council so that when there are sewerage and pollution problems, the people cannot complain. That is how it appears to me.

In the bay area, there is at present a reasonably well-controlled ecology. We heard the honourable member for Redcliffe talking about fishing and the general ecology of the area. The mangroves around all these islands are most important in their ecology. I quote from a document that I have in my hand—

“Mangrove swamps are now seen to play an essential part in the balance of nature in that vital zone where land and sea run into each other.”

That is a statement by Prince Philip, and honourable members opposite are keen to quote in this Chamber what he says. He is president of the Australian Conservation Foundation.

Let us look at the fringe areas of the island that the Government is so intent on passing to local authorities. It is not the value to the ratepayer that is of such importance at present. A good theory has been advanced

from this side of the House that the ratepayers will not be able to afford to maintain islands such as these. How can the small number of ratepayers living on these islands possibly afford the cost of the upkeep? How can they withstand the pressure of big business and the developers and preserve the islands as they are today, that is, as a tourist attraction, and prevent their pollution?

One very good argument comes from the head of a Queensland Government department. He said—

“On this basis it will be seen that it is to the advantage of the community to preserve such lands in their natural state as far as possible.”

The article that I have here goes on to say—

“Mr G. G. T. Harrison, Director of the Fisheries Branch of the Queensland Department of Primary Industries, made a rough estimate in 1968 of the value in cash and kind arising out of the exploitation of fish resources dependent upon the mangrove swamps of Moreton Bay. His figure was of the order of \$300 per acre per year which compares closely with the American estimate.”

I am looking at the value of this land to the people of the whole area. In 1968 the Director of Fisheries said that it was worth \$300 per acre per year. Yet the Minister for Lands, who left the Chamber after making some inane interjections (it is fortunate he is going to London), allowed the Government and his department to sell land in this area as freehold for \$10 an acre. It has gone for all time. As I said, the statement by the Director of Fisheries was made in 1968. What would the area be worth at the turn of the century or to future generations, if Mr. Harrison's estimate is anywhere near correct? The Minister is not only having it sold for \$10 an acre and subdivided; he is having every form of wildlife and every section of the ecology on the island destroyed for all time.

That is probably the major argument against the proposal. It is certainly the argument that worries members of the Opposition. We have seen what councils have been able to do to these islands in the past. Therefore, we must be worried about the Government's underhandedly giving control of them to the Brisbane City Council.

I do not know whether the Minister thought that the Brisbane City Council would welcome the handing over of these islands, which must impose an additional burden on it. It is another of the ecological blunders of the Government. The Government has failed abjectly to develop this area. It has been the greatest rapist of the Moreton Bay area, and has shown no concern whatever. Now, by subjugating these islands to various local authorities, it is committing an even greater rape and, in addition, shedding the financial burdens that must come from the area in the future.

The honourable member for Redcliffe referred to the possible destruction by pollutants of fishing in the area. He had little conception of the over-all value of what he said. He tried to tell the House that, on the one hand, the Redcliffe City Council did not want the area because it could not afford it and that, on the other, the Brisbane City Council should have it because it could afford it. That was the basis of his argument. Then he changed the direction of his argument and told us that the area had not declined over the years. He failed to bring out the fact that the great destroyer of the fishing industry had been the Government itself. Those Government members who understand what their Government has been doing to that area—I presume that most of them don't—must be worried that their Government will be looked upon by future generations as a Government that lacked imagination and that completely and utterly destroyed the future of that area.

Honourable members opposite have been hypocrites in the way they have doled out land to developers. Now that the councils are taking over, they will be stuck with leasehold arrangements, whether they like it or not. The Government will overrule the councils if they try to object. That has been proved with so many of the island leases granted in the past. The local authority has no real power before the Land Court to make any changes.

The islands which already demonstrate so many of the past follies of this Government, such as lack of national parks and lack of a centralised authority to control them, are being subjugated into council areas. The leases already existing, such as those on Fisherman and St. Helena Islands mentioned by the honourable member for Lytton, will stand. They will stand against the challenge of the Brisbane City Council or any other local authority that tries to do anything about them.

We must condemn the Minister for the Bill and his attempt to fool the Parliament by introducing such a piece of legislation. There must be many sinister things behind it. He has been fooled before by the Premier. Possibly some members of the Cabinet know exactly what is being done under this piece of legislation. They may be fooling some of the yes-men on their side of the House, but they are not fooling the Opposition with this piece of legislation, which so subjugates those islands that the councils' powers will be completely controlled by a Government that has already sold out to the developers and is intent on the destruction of this area for future generations.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (9.13 p.m.), in reply: The Opposition has very successfully supported my claim that the protection of local authorities is essential to the preservation of these islands.

The Opposition has attacked local government as being inefficient, irresponsible and incapable of accepting its responsibilities and of acting in a manner that would not be beneficial to the islands. I regard local authorities as being very capable bodies. I refute the claim of the honourable member for Albert that they are inefficient and not capable of handling their own affairs.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** I rise to a point of order. I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that remark because it is offensive to me. I did not say that the local authorities were inefficient. I said the Government was inefficient.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to accept the honourable member's denial.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I accept the honourable member's denial, but he and other members of the Opposition demonstrated by their attitude, that this is what they believe. It was very clear to me tonight that this was an attack on local authorities and on the Brisbane City Council in particular. It was rammed home that the Brisbane City Council was thieving from people, and that it wanted every piece of land under its control to be rate-returning.

**Mr. D'Arcy:** You have been asleep.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I have been wide awake. I listened very carefully to a concentrated attack on local government, particularly the Brisbane City Council, by honourable members opposite.

The honourable member for Salisbury stressed that he wanted a type of bureaucratic control by some nebulous board with no responsibility in preference to control by the elected representatives of the local authorities throughout Queensland. He thought that it would do a better job than local authorities and that it was inadvisable to entrust local authorities with the ecology of this area. I believe that local authorities are looking after our ecology and, contrary to the thoughts of Opposition members, I have confidence that local authorities will continue to do so and adopt a responsible attitude to it. I deny that they want every piece of land within their control to be rate-bearing and that they are grasping after money all the time. Some of the most beautiful parks in this city and in local authorities elsewhere in Queensland are the brainchild of the local authorities and have been paid for by them. I refute the implication that they act in the manner claimed.

Let me return to contributions by individual members. First of all the honourable member for Redlands said that the ecology would be endangered by the fragmentation of Moreton Bay islands among various local authorities. The position is just the opposite, we are bringing these islands within the protection of local authorities. We are going to stop the holding of pop festivals such as the one that would have destroyed Macleay Island

had we not stepped in. It would have caused the residents of that island to live in fear and terror of perhaps 5,000 visitors because they did not then have the protection of a local authority.

The honourable member went on to say that the mainland mentality of local authorities and people generally means the utter destruction of the bay islands. I do not think that the Brisbane City Council would set out to create utter destruction.

At the introductory stage the honourable member for Sandgate said that he believed that these islands were the heritage of the people of Brisbane and, by implication, he welcomed their inclusion within the city of Brisbane so that Brisbane people would have access to them and so that protection would be given to the ecology of this part of the State.

The honourable member for Redlands questioned whether the port of Brisbane would be a cost to the city. No, it would not. It would be a matter for the harbour board and would not be any cost to the city in this way at all.

He talked about the development of these islands. This is one of the main reasons for including them in local authority areas. Local authorities will be able to town-plan the areas. Town plans have to be advertised and this gives people the opportunity to record their approval or disapproval. Under the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act, the Brisbane City Council has to prepare a new town plan for the city and place it on exhibition by February next year. In its preparation, the council will be able to properly plan the development of these islands.

Diverting for a moment, I should like to refer to the statement of the honourable member for Lytton that local authorities could do all sorts of things. He was concerned that the existing houses would be classed as substandard and could be condemned. I inform him that it is common policy in local authorities, while they might not approve of similar buildings being built in the future, to allow existing buildings to remain as long as they are in a safe condition and do not endanger health. I am confident that any local authority—in this case the Brisbane City Council—would abide by this general attitude.

The honourable member for Redlands spoke as a prophet of doom about the development of the port of Brisbane—the diabolical plot that will destroy the ecology. I am confident that the whole set-up will help to protect these islands and I am sure that the honourable member for Sandgate would applaud our attempt to preserve our heritage and the ecology of this area. I am sure that he would be prepared to entrust this to the city of Brisbane, as were two members of the Brisbane City Council (Ald. Shaw who represents Waterloo Bay and Ald. Ryan who represents The Gap) who went into

print in "The Courier-Mail" with a plea that the islands be included within the city of Brisbane, I had discussions with the Lord Mayor on the matter and he said, "If you push the islands into our local authority, we are prepared to accept them." In effect I can say that he reluctantly agreed. This week the council held a meeting and, whilst I have not been officially advised of the outcome, I understand that generally speaking the council is not keen to welcome Moreton Island into its area, although many of the aldermen are anxious to have the opportunity of developing and preserving the island to a degree.

**Mr. Burns:** What about a bit of financial assistance? There will be a lot of extra work.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** The honourable member raised this matter in his speech. The subsidies that are provided by the State Government will be applicable once the islands come under the control of a local authority. Naturally the Brisbane City Council will receive a flow-on through the State Government's present subsidy scheme, which, over the whole year, provided a total of \$21,000,000 to local authorities.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Did the Brisbane City Council as a body pass a motion accepting all of this?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** No, it did not. However, certain aldermen—I have named two of them—expressed their views. Whilst I have not been officially advised, I understand that the attitude of the Brisbane City Council is that it would rather not have Moreton Island in its area. I also understand—I may be wrong—that it is prepared to accept the other islands. I have been given this advice over the telephone.

I believe that the city of Brisbane has a wonderful opportunity in gaining Moreton Island. In the future I am sure it will be regarded as a jewel belonging to the city. It will be similar to what Long Island is to New York—a wonderful breathing space for its people. As the Minister for Lands has said, quite a large portion of Moreton Island has been set aside as a national park. Here is an opportunity for Brisbane, and some aldermen are wise enough to see it as such and to try to seize this opportunity of gaining for the people of Brisbane a playground which will be under the control of the city of Brisbane. Through boat transport there is a community of interest between Brisbane and Moreton Island.

The second speaker was the honourable member for Redcliffe, who expressed support for the inclusion of Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane. In relation to his remarks I point out that the Water Quality Council is working in co-operation with the Brisbane City Council and other local authorities to improve the quality not only of our rivers but also of our ocean waters. It is now common knowledge that over the past two

years the Brisbane River has improved tremendously. It needs further improvement, however, and the Water Quality Council, under my jurisdiction, is doing its utmost to improve its quality as well as that of all waters in Queensland.

**Mr. Burns:** What research have you done in Moreton Bay? You haven't done much there.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** We are working with the Brisbane City Council to eliminate the Luggage Point outfall. I believe that between the Brisbane City Council and the Water Quality Council a solution will eventually be evolved. I am sure that those people who term themselves Brisbanites and also other Queenslanders are concerned at the situation that exists at Luggage Point. I am sure all honourable members will agree with me that the Water Quality Council must do all in its power to assist the city of Brisbane to overcome this pollution problem.

The honourable member for Salisbury made it very clear that he is opposed to the inclusion of Moreton Bay in any local authority area. In my language he is therefore opposed to the preservation of the Moreton Bay islands. I know, of course, that he does not see it that way. However I believe that the inclusion of Moreton Bay within a local authority area will be of great benefit to it.

The honourable member claimed that Moreton Island would be a liability to any local authority. I cannot accept such a contention because, as I said earlier, I believe it will be a wonderful playground for this city. He also said that if we allow every local authority to do what the Brisbane City Council is doing at Luggage Point the bay will be destroyed. To a certain extent I agree with him and for this reason a situation such as Luggage Point should never again be allowed to occur.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I rise to a point of order. I did not say that at all.

**Mr. Hinze:** Of course you did.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not mind the Minister having a go at me, but he is not to misconstrue what I said. He ought to get the wax out of his ears.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** The honourable member apparently believes my remark to be offensive and I am prepared to withdraw it.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Don't tell lies!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I am confident about what I said, but in deference to the honourable member I withdraw it.

I made a note that if other local authorities were allowed to act as at Luggage Point, the bay could be destroyed. I assure the House that the Water Quality Council is working with all local authorities to prevent further occurrences of this nature.

The honourable member for Townsville said "The A.L.P. claims that Clem Jones is the God Almighty of local government, but not fit to look after the bay islands." He may have summed up accurately the context of what honourable members opposite were saying. He said that the honourable member for Salisbury would deny urban facilities to people in these relatively remote areas—that is, if Moreton Island could be called remote. He summed up the situation and was guided not so much by the words that were said as by the implications in each case.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Sherrington:** Surely you will not allow him to quote implications.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I will not allow the honourable member to continue his persistent interjecting.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** The honourable member for Lytton asked what benefit St. Helena would receive from inclusion in the Brisbane City Council boundary. For a start, the people there, though few in number, could be placed in the unenviable position that the residents of Macleay faced but for the action of this Government. They could be in a situation where they were terrorised by an uncontrolled mob.

**Mr. Burns:** But St. Helena is leased completely by one family so there's no comparison.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** That could have happened on Macleay, though, were it not for the actions of this Government. I give the honourable member for Redlands credit for working with me. I do not say that he brought it to my notice, but we worked together on it and I give him credit for that.

I made it clear earlier to the honourable member for Lytton that I believe the local authority would allow substandard dwellings to remain provided they were not in a dangerous condition and were not a hazard to health. He said that if he were in control of the State Government he would take Tangalooma back from Jim Kennedy. I do not wish to comment on that because I have not been a guest of Jim Kennedy's at Tangalooma. I presume it is a well-run resort, and I will leave it at that.

The honourable member for Murrumba supported handing over control of Moreton Island to the Brisbane City Council and drew attention to the fact that it would control the litter that is accumulating on the island and that it would protect the beach front. There is a peculiarity here that the honourable member is not aware of. All local authorities, except the city of Brisbane and other local authorities in special circumstances, control the land to high-water mark. The position is somewhat different in the city of Brisbane. The Brisbane City Council has control of land to the high-water mark within the Brisbane River and its tributaries. However, under the City of Brisbane Act, the city of Brisbane has control of the land on the bayside down to low-water mark. I do not know why that distinction was made many years ago, but that is the situation under the Act. Consequently, on the ocean side as distinct from the river side, the Brisbane City Council would control the land down to the low-water mark.

The honourable member also directed attention to the misuse of the island beaches by motor vehicles and hoped that it could be brought under control by the local authorities. He said that the island had much groundsel, which required control.

The honourable member for Albert made quite a song about the islands being broken up to destroy them. I have reiterated several times that it is the control of local authority that will protect them. To leave them without the protection of local government would be to destroy them. He continued to make the quite amazing statement that everybody is aware of what happened after the Redland Shire Council assumed responsibility for the Moreton Bay islands. However, what happened there occurred before the Redland Shire Council took them over. That is why we stepped in and gave them to Redland.

I readily concede that there was ill-advised, unwanted, and misrepresented development. Subdivisions took place on Macleay, Karragarra and other islands in that area. As I agreed with the honourable member for Salisbury when he was speaking, this should have been cleared up 30 years ago. Whether it was the A.L.P. or this Government does not matter. It should have been done long ago. The fact that it was not done makes it more necessary and urgent that it should be done as quickly as possible. When one finds something wrong, one does not sit bemoaning the fact that it should have been done years ago. One regrets it, yes; but one moves to do something about it. That is precisely what this Bill is designed to do.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I support it with full confidence.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time (Mr. McKechnie's motion)—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 41

Ahern	Lane
Alison	Lee
Armstrong	Lickiss
Bird	McKechnie
Bjelke-Petersen	Moore, R. E.
Camm	Muller
Campbell	Neal
Chinchen	Newbery
Cory	Porter
Crawford	Rae
Edwards	Row
Fletcher	Scott-Young
Frawley	Small
Gunn	Sullivan
Herbert	Tomkins
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tooth
Hewitt, W. D.	Wharton
Hodges	
Hooper, K. W.	
Houghton	
Hughes	
Knox	

NOES, 29

Aiken	Melloy
Baldwin	Moore, F. P.
Blake	Newton
Bousen	O'Donnell
Bromley	Sherrington
Burns	Tucker
D'Arcy	Wallis-Smith
Davis	Wood, B.
Hanlon	Wood, P.
Hooper, K. J.	Wright
Houston	Yewdale
Inch	
Jones, R.	
Jordan	
Leese	
Marginson	

PAIRS

Chaik	Harvey
Hartwig	Jones, N. F.
Kaus	Harris
Low	Dean

Resolved in the affirmative.

#### COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Lickiss, Mt. Coot-tha, in the chair)

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s.4; City of Brisbane—

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (9.38 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“On page 1, line 13, after the word ‘Green,’ insert the word—  
‘Moreton.’”

The purpose of the amendment is to include Moreton Island with the other islands being included in the City of Brisbane.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Redlands) (9.39 p.m.): The stand taken by the Opposition obviously demands, for consistency, that we also oppose clause 2.

In the first place, the amendment that proposes the insertion of the word “Moreton” at this late hour is indicative not only of the attitude of the Government but also of its methods in bringing legislation before

the Chamber. I think it shows also its uncertainty and timidity in dealing with problems of real importance.

I should say that obviously the Minister has been engaging in the dangerous practice of going through unofficial channels, because in answer to my question in the debate at the introductory stage, he admitted that the Brisbane City Council, as a council, had not made any decision on any of these questions.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I rise to a point of order. The statement of the honourable member for Redlands is not quite correct, and I take objection to it. If he wishes me to do so, I will elaborate on the matter later in the debate.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I trust that the honourable member for Redlands will accept the statement of the honourable gentleman.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I accept the Minister's denial. I was merely stating that I had asked him whether the Brisbane City Council, as a council, had made a decision on the matter.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** It has made a decision, but I have not been advised of it in writing; I have been advised only by telephone.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** That is information additional to that given in the answer to the question, and I accept it in the circumstances. Nevertheless, the Minister's own admission makes it obvious that the major part of my contention is valid, that is, that the whole escapade was embarked upon before the matter had been submitted to the Brisbane City Council and before it had made a decision.

I think it is obvious that, no matter what the Brisbane City Council decided, the Minister was going to use his power under the Local Government Act and the City of Brisbane Act to foist these islands, including Moreton Island (once he received the decision of the Redcliffe City Council), onto the city of Brisbane. On that basis, I believe that the Opposition is justified in opposing the proposed amendment, as it would be justified in opposing the whole of clause 2.

I will not be able to verify much of what I am saying, any more than the Minister can verify it officially, till I see it in black and white in the council minutes or receive a copy of electorate advice from the council. The Minister is operating under the authority of a telephone call; I have not even that knowledge. Until the Opposition receives advice in black and white, which is the only legally acceptable form as far as I am concerned, it has no alternative to declaring its opposition to the proposed amendment.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (9.44 p.m.): I join with the honourable member for Redlands in opposing the inclusion of

Moreton Island in the clause, particularly in the circumstances in which it has been included.

It is obvious that, when preparations were being made for the introduction of the legislation, a survey had not been carried out to establish the most desirable area in which Moreton Island could be included. One would have thought that the Minister, when he belatedly introduced this proposed amendment to the Bill because he had not been able to make up his mind at the introductory stage, would have given some valid reason for including Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane.

Previously the Minister has largely based council wards on the geography of the city of Brisbane, yet we suddenly find that a large portion of the electorate of Redcliffe, which includes Moreton Island, is now to become part of the Brisbane City Council's area. I question why this is being done. If the argument is advanced that local authority control and administration of the islands is the only sure and sensible way of preserving them, why should the Minister suddenly reverse the electoral processes and include Moreton Island in the electorate of Redcliffe within the Brisbane City Council area? If it can be argued that local authority administration will guarantee the preservation of the islands, why is the Redcliffe City Council not given that responsibility?

The reason we see this queer, distorted sort of administration emerging is that the honourable member for Redcliffe, at the request of the Redcliffe City Council, opposed the inclusion of Moreton Island in that local authority area. It bears out what I said at the second-reading stage.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Apparently it is not a matter of legislating in this Parliament in the best interests of the area but a matter of shoving the island onto whatever local authority the Government cares to give it to. I notice that the honourable member for Redcliffe is strangely silent. He does not deny that he made representations, and that there would have been open revolt in the Cabinet if Moreton Island had been included in the Redcliffe City Council area. As a matter of fact, his very benign smile confirms what I am saying. If that is the way the Government of the day decides the fate of resources, it confirms the suspicions I have had all along that it was a case of carving up the bay islands and giving them to whatever local authority the Government could load them onto. Certainly the Bill is not designed in the best interests of the use of this area for future generations.

**Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (9.48 p.m.):** I feel impelled to rise to support honourable members on this side in their objection to the amendment to the Bill, particularly as it affects Moreton Island. I support the remarks

of the honourable member for Salisbury about the attitude of the Redcliffe City Council. I say without any hesitation that this is the end of Moreton Island as we know it today. With all due respect to the Brisbane City Council, it has no hope of doing the right thing by way of protecting this wonderful asset in Moreton Bay. It has not the financial resources. It has not had sufficient resources to look after Cribb Island, let alone Moreton Island. I put it in blunt terms when I speak from past experience.

I am very disappointed. At the introduction of the Bill I thought that something was going to be done for the preservation of Moreton Island. I share the fears and disappointment of the honourable member for Salisbury. He knows Moreton Island as well as I do. If it was not good enough for the Redcliffe City Council to take over Moreton Island, why should it be unloaded onto the Brisbane City Council?

I am not doubting the sincerity of the Minister but I do doubt some of the negotiations that may have taken place between the city council and the Minister's department. I am not casting any reflection on the Minister but I would like to see in black and white, as the shadow Minister was saying as I walked into the Chamber tonight, some tangible proof or other evidence to show that the Brisbane City Council is willing to take over this asset in Moreton Bay. I repeat that I am very disappointed because I know what is going to happen. As a matter of fact at the present time the island is not receiving the protection it should receive. It is being run over by every vandal who can get down there in his beach buggy or any other contraption he can use to destroy not only the sandhills of the island but also the natural fauna of the island. Their actions endanger the people who use the resort for fishing purposes.

That is all I have to say at this stage but I must express my disappointment and disgust at this action to foist responsibility onto the Brisbane City Council. I reiterate that I would like to see some tangible evidence that the council is willing to take over the island. There is something wrong with the proposal or some motive behind it.

**Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (9.51 p.m.):** I think it is indeed regrettable that, in order to get some sort of orderly supervision by local authorities over off-shore islands, this beautiful island of Moreton should be placed under the very heavy and ruthless hand of the Brisbane City Council—an administration holding an overwhelming majority of 20 ruthless socialists with only one Liberal in opposition. I do not think these people are capable of showing any real compassion or of understanding the need for conservation of this island.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Are you going to vote against it?

**Mr. LANE:** The honourable member for Salisbury is a well-known loud-mouth in this place and I think we can ignore any contribution he may wish to make.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Are you going to vote against it? Why don't you answer? You are all wind.

**Mr. LANE:** The honourable member will have to wait and see. It seems a great pity to me—and I should like to place it on record—that this beautiful island is to be placed under such a ruthless administration. I have visited the place and I think a lot of work needs to be done on that island by the local authority to preserve the foreshores and the sand masses for generations to come.

I am interested in the conservation of this area as well as that of all the natural resources throughout the State and I do not think the administration of the Brisbane City Council has any real feeling for this. The Brisbane City Council finds it very difficult to understand the needs of people within a couple of miles of the City Hall, let alone areas right across the bay. It would not be concerned about this tract of land. Its exploitation made of the land mass it currently controls has not brought it any credit. I can only see the present council administration looking at Moreton Island and saying, "How can we make a buck out of this?" It will not have any real concern for the ecology or environment of the area.

I can see the dilemma in which the Minister has been placed in trying to place this island under some responsible authority. The Redcliffe City Council, of course, has not the facilities to handle it and it is being placed in the hands of this great bureaucracy centred at City Hall, which spends most of its money within 100 yards of the City Hall itself. The Minister has no alternative to the action he is proposing. I would just like to place on record my alarm and concern about this aspect.

**Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (9.54 p.m.):** In the Minister's introductory speech he said that between the introductory stage and the second reading he would make up his mind about Moreton Island and, at that stage, he informed us that the Redcliffe City Council had declared that it did not want it. Its opposition is one of the reasons for tonight's amendment. I think the Minister will agree that this is an unsatisfactory way to introduce legislation. If a provision is included in a Bill when it is read for the first time, the Parliament is given the opportunity of debating that provision on two subsequent occasions. However tonight we are given a copy of the Minister's proposed amendments at the second-reading stage of this Bill, and

for the first time we are asked to consider the inclusion of Moreton Island within the city of Brisbane.

I support the honourable member for Salisbury. Between the introductory and second-reading stages I cut the following extract from an issue of "The Redcliffe Herald"—

"Both Mr. Houghton, M.L.A. for Redcliffe, and Mr. Frawley, M.L.A. for Murrumba have notified the newly-formed Kippa-Ring-Rothwell Progress Association that they are not in favour of the State Government's proposal that Redcliffe City Council take over Moreton Island."

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Lytton is misleading the Committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will state his point of order.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The honourable member for Lytton stated that the article appeared in the paper after the introductory stage. That is not true; it appeared before the introductory stage. The honourable member should get it right.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Lytton will accept the denial of the honourable member for Murrumba.

**Mr. BURNS:** I accept his denial. I don't intend to argue about dates; I shall just read what he said.

The article continues—

"The progress association asked its secretary, Mr. Peter Morris, to write to both Members, pointing out that there was still much work to be done on the Peninsula with strained finances, so that taking over Moreton Island would be an added burden to Peninsula ratepayers."

I make the point that the State Government's proposal, as reported in this article, is that the Redcliffe City Council take over Moreton Island. Tonight, however, the Minister proposes that the Brisbane City Council take it over.

To continue—

"Mr. Houghton's view is in accord with that of the progress association. He has asked the State Government to make Moreton and Fraser Islands into National Parks and in so doing to carry the cost of any servicing which may be necessary.

"If this was not done, Mr. Houghton said, Moreton Island would become another Thursday Island which had only 32 ratepayers to meet the added responsibilities of local government.

"Mr. Frawley's views are much the same as Mr. Houghton's and he has already written to the Minister for Local Government, Mr. McKechnie, pointing out that Kippa-Ring and Clontarf in particular,

need large sums of money spending on them to enclose open drains and provide kerbing and channelling, sealed roads, etc.

"He said there was insufficient money available for fully developing and servicing the Peninsula without taking over Moreton Island. Such would be an imposition on Peninsula ratepayers."

I agree that that is the sort of submission that the honourable member should put forward on behalf of his ratepayers. But if his ratepayers would be disadvantaged if they took over Moreton Island, so would any other ratepayers who took it over.

I come back to my point that the Government has decided that Moreton Island will be included in the city of Brisbane. It has declared that 80 per cent of the island will be mined and that other areas will be set aside for use as national parks. It has also decided upon the establishment of certain little villages. It is going to say to the Brisbane City Council, "You take over the ratepaying problems. You try to levy the few people who are over there or alternatively charge the people of Brisbane a few more dollars so that you can provide facilities on the island." My argument is no different from that put forward by the honourable members for Redcliffe and Murrumbidgee. I do not believe this is the way to protect Moreton Island. This is simply passing the buck again to somebody else.

**Mr. Houston:** The Country Party hates Brisbane.

**Mr. BURNS:** That's true. In many ways it conducts a "hate Brisbane" campaign. The honourable member for Merthyr has just poured a little bit of hatred onto the Brisbane City Council. We have been told by the Liberal members in this Chamber that they did not want the area or the responsibility of the Brisbane City Council extended at all. Yet tonight, after years of that sort of talk from the back corner on the other side of the Chamber, we discover these are the very members who are going to give to the Brisbane City Council the responsibility of saving the islands in the bay.

**Mr. Miller** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** The honourable member for Ithaca has risen in this Chamber on several occasions in defence of a piece of parkland at Bardon, the trees along the riverbank, and other things. Although he believes the Brisbane City Council will destroy them, tonight he will vote to allow the Brisbane City Council to protect Moreton Island. The honourable member should make up his mind. Day in and day out he has been attacking the Brisbane City Council and claiming it has no sense of responsibility towards the ecology, conservation, trees and parks. Now, however, because a couple of members on the Redcliffe Peninsula do not want Moreton Island—remember that the electoral boundaries set by this Government extend the Redcliffe electorate right over to Moreton

Island—he will vote in favour of the Brisbane City Council taking control of the island. It is being brought within Brisbane.

The State Government originally told the Redcliffe City Council that it wanted Moreton Island to be included in that local authority's area. The Government has now twisted to such a degree that it is giving Moreton Island to the people it hates. Some fights and arguments must have taken place in the Government joint-party meetings. The article states—

"The Redcliffe City Council is opposed to taking over the island and lodged an appeal against the proposal."

Obviously the proposal went a long way if the Redcliffe City Council lodged an appeal. The article went on—

"Some aldermen believe that on a long-term basis acquisition could be an advantage but not if money had to be spent on the island at an early date. The more general view is that a national park would be the best solution."

We have the honourable member for Redcliffe believing in a national park, a Press article saying that the member for Murrumbidgee held the same belief, and now we find the Redcliffe City Council expressing the same view. We also have the three of them saying that they do not want it in Redcliffe. When the Minister introduced the legislation he said, "I have not yet made up my mind, but Redcliffe is against it." Tonight, in the second-reading stage, we were told that Moreton Island is to go to Brisbane. It will be given to the people that Government members hate. I am amazed.

**A Government Member** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** I have said at all times that I support the proposal that this island ought to be a tourist island—an area for tourist development under a trust. I agree with the submissions made by the honourable members for Murrumbidgee and Redcliffe that we should have national parks on the island. I support the two National Party members who say this is what they want. That is what they told their electors, but they may be telling us something different here tonight. I support their submission that it should be a national park.

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumbidgee) (10.2 p.m.): I agree that Moreton Island should be included in the city of Brisbane and I have not said otherwise. I agree with the statements made by the honourable member for Lytton. I did not make them. The chairman of the Kippa-Ring Progress Association or somebody else wrote to me and asked me if I agreed and I said that I did. I am not frightened to say that I agreed with what is contained in that report.

**Mr. Houston:** Why foist it on to Brisbane?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Because the Brisbane City Council has a bigger vote than Tasmania. There are more people in the Brisbane City Council, better facilities and more money to control the bay islands. The city of Redcliffe has only 40,000 people and could not possibly do it.

**Mr. Wright:** You are passing the buck.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Not at all. The Brisbane City Council is in a far better position to provide the services required on Moreton Island.

**Mr. Wright:** You are always criticising its services.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I have not criticised them. I am one of the best friends of the Lord Mayor. He recently wrote me a letter inviting me to lunch at Dayboro to discuss the settlement of land compensation payments for the dam.

It is interesting to note that the possible inclusion of Moreton Island within the Brisbane City Council has been opposed by Mr. Jim Kennedy. He has the resort on the island and he said that he had objected to the Local Government Department about the proposal. He said that the inclusion of Moreton Island within the Brisbane City Council would destroy the island's uniqueness. He said he was happy with the island's present administration by the Lands Commission and does not want the island to come under the control of any local authority.

I commend the Minister on having the foresight and intestinal fortitude—in other words guts—to include this amendment so that the island goes into the area of the city of Brisbane.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.3 p.m.): A few years ago it was decided after the fiasco at Macleay Island that it was necessary and desirable that every one of the thousands of islands off the Queensland coast should come within the protection of local government. Cabinet instructed me to negotiate with all the adjacent local authorities to bring this about. We have succeeded very well. All of the Torres Strait islands are now included in the Shire of Torres. We are proceeding with islands in the Cook electorate. Honourable members know that recently the Palm group was included in the city of Townsville. Aldermen of that city accepted the responsibility of taking the Palm group into the city area.

When I introduced this Bill about a month ago, the Redcliffe City Council informed me in discussions that it was unanimously opposed to the inclusion of Moreton Island within the boundaries of the city of Redcliffe. At the same time two members of the Brisbane City Council, that is, Ald. Ryan and Ald. Shaw, went to print in "The Courier-Mail" castigating me for denying Brisbane the opportunity of including what could be,

in the future, a jewel similar to Long Island opposite New York. They asked me through the Press why I slighted Brisbane by not including this very desirable island within the council area. As a consequence of that article I had discussions with Aldermen Shaw during which he expressed the wish that I should include it within the area of Brisbane. I had discussions with the Lord Mayor, who, as I said earlier in this debate, said that he was prepared to accept the five islands of Mud, Green, St. Helena, Fisherman and Bishop into the city of Brisbane.

I told the Lord Mayor at the same time that I would be placing Moreton Island under the control of either the Redcliffe City Council or the Brisbane City Council. As I had total opposition from the aldermen of Redcliffe and as some Brisbane aldermen—the only ones who had approached me—said that it should be included in Brisbane—

**Mr. Houston:** Did they go to you? Did those two aldermen personally speak to you?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Yes. In fairness, I spoke to Alderman Shaw, who said he was speaking on behalf of Ald. Ryan also.

First of all, they castigated me in the Press for not including Moreton Island within Brisbane. As a result of the ensuing discussions, Ald. Shaw told me that he and Ald. Ryan—and there could be others; he had not had a chance to discuss it with them—supported, welcomed, and desired the inclusion of these islands in the city of Brisbane. As a consequence, I quite openly told the Parliament that I had not made up my mind at the time of the introduction of the Bill but that I was keeping my options open to see which council most desired Moreton Island.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You were desperately trying to unload it somewhere.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** There was no desperation. If the honourable member for Salisbury had been listening, he would have heard me say earlier that it was my responsibility to see that the thousand-odd islands off the coast received the protection of local government to prevent the deterioration and the destruction of their environment.

As the honourable member for Sandgate said at the introductory stage, it was to preserve the heritage of the people. I believe, as I said during the introduction, that by this action relative to Moreton Island we are ensuring the heritage that is rightfully that of the people of Brisbane.

After my informal discussions with the Lord Mayor, I wrote a formal letter to the council on 19 August this year, asking for an official expression of opinion and quoting what the aldermen had said to me, namely, that they thought it should be included in Brisbane. I waited a month for a reply, knowing that a council meeting had been held and, consequently, assuming that a

conclusion had been reached, before causing a phone call to be made to the City Hall yesterday afternoon.

Till that stage I had made no decision. Should honourable members check, they will note that it was only yesterday afternoon that I requested an amendment to include Moreton in the city of Brisbane. I was informed by telephone from the City Hall that the council had debated the matter for some considerable time and that I would eventually receive an official letter saying that the council as a whole was opposed to the inclusion of Moreton Island. I have not received the letter yet and, although the honourable member for Redlands says that I cannot regard it as official, I know there was considerable dissension in the council. However, I understand that the official attitude of the council is opposed to the move. I understand also that a large minority would like to see it. I can only say that Ald. Ryan and Ald. Shaw supported it, whereas in the Redcliffe City Council the aldermen were unanimously opposed to it. It is my belief that both councils were unwise not to welcome with open arms the inclusion of Moreton Island in their area. As I said earlier, one of these days Moreton Island will be to Brisbane what Long Island is to New York—a playground, and an outlet for the people. I believe that any far-sighted council would welcome it. The Townsville City Council, for example, faced with greater difficulties in taking over Palm Island than face the Brisbane City Council in taking over Moreton Island, welcomed Palm Island to its territory. That transfer has now gone through, and the Palm group has been allotted to the city of Townsville.

The honourable member for Sandgate quite fairly said that there were undesirable conditions on Moreton Island at present. I accept that statement. I have not been there recently, but I have received reports that support the honourable member. The honourable member for Murrumba said that unregistered vehicles were causing problems on the island. Whilst I respect the views of the honourable member for Sandgate, I believe that I am assisting Moreton Island by having it included in the local authority area of Brisbane in order to overcome the problems mentioned by the honourable member.

The honourable member for Lytton said that there were no opportunities for debating this issue at the introductory stage, and that I should then have made the situation clear. I made such an opportunity by introducing into the debate in my speech at the introductory stage the fact that the inclusion of Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane was being considered. My final decision was not made until late yesterday afternoon, and at that time I instructed the Parliamentary Draftsman to prepare the amendment now before the committee.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Redlands) (10.12 p.m.): I had intended to let the matter rest after giving notice of the Opposition's intention to oppose the amendment. However, because of what has been said by other speakers, particularly the Minister, I feel that I have to repeat some matters relating to this clause.

I feel sure that honourable members will agree with me, in the light of what has been proposed and the manner in which the information has been given, that none of us on either side of the Chamber can feel sure what made Ald. Shaw and Ald. Ryan say that they would agree to the inclusion of Moreton Island in the city of Brisbane. We do not know what inducements were offered to them. The Minister failed to answer the question that I asked at this stage of the Bill. I particularly asked if any conditions were imposed, and the Minister has not given an answer to that question.

He now says that the proposal was opposed by a majority of the Brisbane City Council, but he felt that the minority was large enough to allow him in all conscience to proceed with the inclusion of the island in the city of Brisbane. That might be so. Nevertheless, I want to make it quite clear that I feel that that more than justifies the stand taken by the Opposition tonight. I feel better now that the Minister has made it clear that we were not guessing, having unofficial conversations with certain people by telephone, or reading certain things in newspapers. We were talking of what we knew at the time, and now, following the Minister's statement, we are talking of something even more definite when it is known that the majority of the Brisbane City Council oppose what the amendment is designed to do. Therefore, more than ever, we are justified in our opposition to the clause.

I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to an obvious misunderstanding, or a point that has been missed. At no time have I, as the Opposition spokesman on local government matters, or any other speaker on this side of the Chamber, insinuated that any shire council could not do a good job and would not try to do the very best that it could with any of these islands.

The Opposition has suggested that because these islands are unique in the coastal complex of this State, it believes—and Opposition members have as much right to state their beliefs as the Minister has to state his—that a specially constituted authority, with the representation proposed by the honourable member for Salisbury, would do a better job. That is all the Opposition has suggested; to read anything else into it, or to try to twist and misrepresent what has been said as an attack on the Brisbane City Council or any other council, or as saying that the Lord Mayor could not or would not do this or that, is entirely mistaking its intent.

At this stage, I am more than ever convinced that the Opposition has acted correctly in opposing the proposed amendment.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (10.16 p.m.): The Committee has seen an extraordinary set of circumstances in the debate tonight. Certainly it has been proved that the Opposition was correct in saying that, instead of planning for the sensible administration of these islands, it has been a case of, "Parcel them out to whoever we can."

The Minister admitted a few moments ago that the great majority of the members of the Brisbane City Council opposed the proposal, but he said that a large minority of aldermen were in favour of it. In fact, he said that he had had a telephone conversation with two aldermen, one of whom, apparently, acted as interpreter for the other. He was then able to decide what was in the best interests of Moreton Island and its future administration. I can only say that statements such as these can be paralleled only by the statement of Billy Snedden after the last Federal election, when he said "Although we lost the election we were not defeated."

If ever I have seen a game of Russian roulette played with the resources of this State, I have seen it as the story unfolded tonight. I ask the Minister this question: If Moreton Island lies within the State electoral boundary of Redcliffe, and if the Redcliffe City Council is totally opposed to its inclusion in its local authority area, by what mathematical calculation has the Minister, confronted with a similar attitude on the part of the Brisbane City Council, been able to reach a conclusion on the telephonic advice of an alderman acting as interpreter for another alderman of the Brisbane City Council? I ask the Minister to tell me on what occasion legislation has ever been introduced in this Chamber when two members of the Government were in favour of it and everybody else was against it. That is virtually what is being done tonight.

By the amendment already proposed, you are saying—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am addressing the Chair.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Well, the Chair is not involved.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** You are saying—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair is not saying anything. Will the honourable member please address the Chair.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am speaking to the Minister through you, Mr. Lickiss.

The Minister is saying that, on the advice of two people, he is introducing legislation that will decide the future of this wonderful tourist asset. I question the advisability of including it in the Brisbane City Council area

when the council is aware of the great responsibility that will be placed on it to endeavour to preserve the island and use it as it should be used for the benefit of future generations.

I repeat that I have seldom heard in this Chamber such Baron Munchausen-type thinking as I have heard from the Government benches tonight.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.20 p.m.): The honourable member for Redlands said that he felt my statement vindicated his argument.

**Mr. Baldwin:** My opposition.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** His opposition. While he said very clearly that he went along with the responsibility and authority of local authorities, Opposition members generally did not express that in their contributions.

The honourable member for Salisbury asked, "When Moreton Island is in the electorate of Redcliffe, what is the justification for including it in the Brisbane City Council area?" No more justification than for Palm Island, which is in the electorate of Hinchinbrook, being included in the area of the Townsville City Council, which has welcomed it. That answers his question.

The honourable member denigrated two aldermen of the Brisbane City Council by saying that one was the messenger boy for the other. He virtually implied that I should not have discussions with local authorities or their members on these matters.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I said that one alderman spoke for the other.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Yes, but the honourable member denigrated him by the way he presented his argument. I believe in having discussions on these matters at every opportunity. I had discussions with the Lord Mayor, too. At the time of our discussions he did not commit himself on the inclusion of Moreton Island. That is precisely why I wrote to him. One month is a fair period to allow a Bill to lie on the table of the House while I am waiting for a reply from the Brisbane City Council. I waited one whole month. Surely I would be lacking in my duty at that stage if I did not ring up and make inquiries. I have still not received the Lord Mayor's reply. I have communicated that information frankly to the House tonight.

The Opposition talks about not including Moreton Island in the Brisbane City Council area. The thousand-odd islands along the coastline need the protection of a local authority. Honourable members opposite talk about putting the islands under the control of some nebulous bureaucratically controlled board, contrary to the desires of most people in Queensland who wish to be under the control of a democratically elected local authority. The Opposition would have a bureaucratic board of control that

would tell the people on the islands, "You will do this, and you have no right to vote for this body." Consequently I think the Government is doing the correct thing in ensuring that every island is placed under the control of a local authority elected by the people, so that the people on those islands also have the right to take part in the election of their representatives.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If I have to warn the honourable member for Salisbury again, I will do so under the provisions of Standing Order 123A.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I will lose a night's sleep over that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I now warn the honourable member under the provisions of Standing Order 123A.

Question—That the word proposed to be inserted in clause 2 (Mr. McKechnie's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

†

**AYES, 39**

Ahern	Lane
Alison	McKechnie
Bjelke-Petersen	Miller
Camm	Moore, R. E.
Campbell	Muller
Chinchen	Neal
Cory	Newbery
Crawford	Porter
Edwards	Rae
Fletcher	Row
Frawley	Scott-Young
Gunn	Small
Herbert	Sullivan
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tomkins
Hewitt, W. D.	Tooth
Hinze	Wharton
Hodges	
Hooper, K. W.	<b>Tellers:</b>
Houghton	Bird
Hughes	Lee
Knox	

**NOES, 30**

Aiken	Marginson
Baldwin	Melloy
Blake	Moore, F. P.
Bousen	Newton
Bromley	O'Donnell
D'Arcy	Tucker
Davis	Wallis-Smith
Dean	Wood, B.
Hanlon	Wood, P.
Hanson	Wright
Hooper, K. J.	Yewdale
Houston	
Inch	<b>Tellers:</b>
Jensen	Burns
Jones, R.	Sherrington
Jordan	
Leese	

**PAIRS:**

Chalk	Harvey
Kaus	Jones, N. F.
Hartwig	Harris

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.32 p.m.): I move the following further amendment—

"On page 1, line 14, after the word 'in' insert the words—

'or adjacent to.'"

The reason for this amendment is to indicate that Moreton Island is an island adjacent to Moreton Bay. The other islands, namely, Bishop, Fisherman, Green, Mud and St. Helena, which are being included in the city, are situated in Moreton Bay itself.

Amendment (Mr. McKechnie) agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of s. 14P; Proclamation of electoral wards—

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.33 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 2, line 1, after the figure '4' insert the words—

'(other than Moreton Island as so specified).'"

The reason for this amendment is that Moreton Island is excluded from inclusion in the electoral ward of Waterloo Bay. The other islands being included in the city by the Bill are to be included in that electoral ward.

Amendment (Mr. McKechnie) agreed to.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.35 p.m.): I move the following further amendment—

"On page 2, after line 3, insert the following subsection—

'(7) The electoral ward of Bramble Bay as constituted immediately before the commencement of the City of Brisbane Act Amendment Act 1974 includes, on and from such commencement but subject to any complete or partial redistribution made under this Act, Moreton Island as specified in subsection (3) of section 4 and the electoral roll for that electoral ward shall, as the circumstances may require, be amended accordingly.'"

The purpose of this amendment is to provide that Moreton Island is included in the electoral ward of Bramble Bay on and from the commencement of the amending Act and future electoral rolls for the electoral ward will have to make provision accordingly.

**Mr. BURNS** (Lytton) (10.36 p.m.): I wonder why, after the Minister has had discussions with Alderman Shaw, he did not place Moreton in Alderman Shaw's ward. Alderman Shaw happens to be a colleague of mine and works hard in our area. I

know he is very enthusiastic about achieving something for the Moreton Bay islands. He co-operates fully with those people associated with them. Why should a special move be made to include Moreton Island in Sandgate, which is part of Bramble Bay under the control of the alderman representing that ward, when an alderman in the city is interested in having it included in the city? If all the other islands are coming into Eric Shaw's area, why not have Moreton Island in the ward of Waterloo Bay? Why should the Minister pick on Bramble Bay and move an additional amendment when it is not really necessary?

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.37 p.m.): As one proceeds down the Brisbane River, the Waterloo Bay ward is on the right bank of the Brisbane River and adjacent thereto are Bishop, Fisherman, Mud, Green, and St. Helena Islands. As one goes outside the Brisbane River into the bay, the most north-easterly ward is Bramble Bay, which is adjacent to Moreton Island. Geographically, the Bramble Bay ward is the closest ward to Moreton Island and that is why the island was so placed.

Amendment (Mr. McKechnie) agreed to.

**Hon. H. A. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Local Government and Electricity) (10.38 p.m.): I move the following further amendment—

“On page 2, after line 24, insert the following paragraph—

‘(c) the office of the alderman of the Council (as constituted immediately before the commencement of the City of Brisbane Act Amendment Act 1974) representing the electoral ward of Bramble Bay, and that alderman shall hold and continue to hold office as the alderman representing the electoral ward of Bramble Bay in all respects as if he had been duly elected at an election for that electoral ward as constituted on the commencement of this Act until he dies, resigns his office or his office as alderman is otherwise vacated, or the triennial election of aldermen next held after the said commencement is concluded whichever first occurs.’”

The purpose of this amendment is to provide that the office of alderman of the council presently representing the electoral ward of Bramble Bay will not be affected by the inclusion of Moreton Island in that electoral ward. The alderman concerned will hold, and continue to hold, office as the alderman representing that electoral ward until his office becomes vacant or until the next triennial election of aldermen.

Amendment (Mr. McKechnie) agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

The House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.