

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 10 APRIL 1979

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 10 APRIL 1979

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Criminal Law Amendment Bill;
- Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders Acts Amendment Bill;
- Industry and Commerce Training Bill.

IDENTIFICATION DISCS

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members who have not yet had their photographs taken for the purpose of the preparation of identification discs are advised that the Works Department photographers will be taking photographs in the media interview room, level 5, between the hours of 12.45 p.m. and 1.15 p.m. today.

PROPOSED MOTION FOR
ADJOURNMENTSECOND INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COM-
MITTEE ON EDUCATION IN QUEENSLAND

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received the following letter from the honourable member for Rockhampton—

“Parliament House,
“Brisbane, 4000,
“10th April, 1979.

“The Hon. J. E. H. Houghton, M.L.A.,
“Speaker of the Legislative Assembly,
“Parliament House,
“Brisbane. Q. 4000.

“Dear Mr. Speaker,

“I beg to inform you that in accordance with Standing Order No. 137 I intend this day to move that this House do now adjourn.

“I move this Motion to give the Parliament of Queensland the immediate opportunity to debate The Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland.

“I believe this Debate is urgent because of:

“(1) The implications of the 50 recommendations made by the Committee on:

“(a) The present and future aims of our schools and of social education.

“(b) Future legislative initiatives, amendments and administrative changes.

“(2) The widespread interest shown by individuals, education-oriented groups and community organisations generally as indicated by the constant coverage, comment and debate in the media and the representations made to Members of this Assembly.

“(3) The misunderstanding that has arisen in relation to some recommendations and aspects of the report in particular social education.

“(4) The need for the people of Queensland to be made aware of the attitude of Members of this Assembly on specific aspects of the report, namely: Religious & Ethical Education; Health & Safety Education; Problems in Primary & Secondary Education.

“Yours sincerely,

“(Keith Wright),

“Member for Rockhampton.”

Honourable members, I do not propose to allow such a debate. I believe that there has been ample opportunity in the past and that there will be ample opportunity in the future to debate the matter. I do not think it is of such importance that it should delay the proceedings and operations of the House, and I therefore disallow the move under Standing Order 137.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

Racing and Betting Act 1954–1978.

Harbours Act 1955–1978.

Electricity Act 1976.

Forestry Act 1959–1976 and the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975–1976.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT
ABORIGINAL LANDS POLICIES

Hon. C. R. PORTER (Toowong—Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs) (11.9 a.m.): I draw attention to Press suggestion, as late as yesterday morning in a national newspaper, that there is continuing conflict between the Federal and State Governments on Aboriginal lands policies, which could lead to open and damaging confrontation between the two Governments in the months ahead.

This is not so. The Federal Government is well aware of our policies and we are well aware of their policies, and in the extensive areas of common concern that lie between we are united in seeking common goals of Aboriginal independence, self-respect and self-sufficiency within our society.

The media comment to which I refer does harm to the pursuit of these goals, and it is a matter for regret when the real

interests of the indigenous peoples are sacrificed merely in order to stoke the fires of an artificial inter-governmental conflict, in the hope that a future conflagration will produce headlines.

Equally there are groups in our community—identified on many occasions in this House—who join in fostering the notion that the Federal and State Governments are at loggerheads, for in such conflict they see a better prospect of advancing their own ideology of land rights and cultural and racial separatism.

The co-operation of the State and Federal Governments is real, and productive. It has meant the re-housing of almost 13,000 Aborigines and Islanders in towns and cities throughout Queensland in the last 10 years. The new Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs visited here last week-end, when with my colleague the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, Senator Chaney attended the inaugural meetings of the newly elected Mornington and Aurukun Shire Councils.

Senator Chaney has said—

“The States control the majority of services which are all-important to Aborigines—housing, health, education, police, welfare.”

And—

“We have a clear constitutional responsibility but that can only be carried out with the States, not in a vacuum by ourselves. Conflict is not the answer.”

We all know that for today's journalism, accord is worthless and conflict is the name of the game. But one would hope that where people's intrinsic happiness and security are at stake, then something more would be considered by serious members of a serious profession than just a search for tomorrow's headlines.

It should be remembered that here in Queensland we have machinery for continuing consultation with the indigenous peoples superior to anything else in Australia, and the total degree to which they determine the scope and nature of the laws that assist them is also without equal in Australia. When the Commonwealth Minister said—

“I would like to see as many of the Aboriginal people as possible leading independent, self-sustaining lives . . . independent of Governments and organisations and so on . . . simply able to make their own way”,

He was stating a concept that this Government whole-heartedly endorses and works for.

Speaking at Aurukun last Sunday, Senator Chaney said that “the use in Queensland of the slogan ‘land rights’ was counter-productive.” Senator Chaney continued—

“I think there has been a great deal of sloganising of these people. Unfortunately, people are less concerned with saying to Aborigines, ‘What in practical terms do you want to achieve?’, than they are using the slogan ‘land rights’.”

This State will continue developing policies in accordance with the determinations of all the indigenous peoples—not just any vocal dissident handful—and to those ends will at all times co-operate with the Commonwealth Government.

On returning from Canberra with the Premier on 14 February after fruitful talks with the Prime Minister and Senator Chaney, I said that I looked forward to a new era of Commonwealth-State relations in Aboriginal affairs. That faith remains firm, and media representatives and others who demonstrate a selfish vested interest in discord and disharmony will not shake it.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. **AHERN** (Landsborough) (11.14 a.m.), by leave: I advise that whilst the first and second interim reports of the Select Committee on Education have been tabled, there are still a number of important matters being considered by the committee. I anticipate that our reports on these matters will be completed early in the next session of the Parliament, and I intend to move that all of our reports should be discussed in the House at that time.

PETITIONS

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS TRANSPORTED BY QUEENSLAND RAILWAYS AND ROAD TRANSPORT

Mr. **BURNS** (Lytton) presented a petition from 443 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take the necessary steps to amend the relevant legislation to ensure that animals transported by Queensland Railways and by road

transport are not forced to suffer intolerable pain and suffering due to neglect, lack of water and lack of concern.

Petition read and received.

[Similar petitions were presented by Mr. Houston (293 signatories), Mr. D'Arcy (179 signatories) and Mr. Davis (21 signatories), and these petitions were read and received.]

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. SHAW (Wynnum) having given notice that tomorrow he would move a motion—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that his notice of motion would appear to be in conflict with the personal statement made by the honourable member for Landsborough. I will have a look at it.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police): 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 Mining Act 1968-1976 in certain particulars and for another purpose."

Motion agreed to.

MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police): 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 Mines Regulation Act 1964-1978 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

QUEENSLAND TOURIST AND TRAVEL CORPORATION BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. M. HODGES (Gympie—Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill

to provide for the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, its functions and powers and for purposes related to the tourist and travel industry in Queensland."

Motion agreed to.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Welfare): 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 Adoption of Children Act 1964-1978 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

STATE HOUSING ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS; CONSTRUCTION METHODS, STANDARDS AND COSTS

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

(1) What was his department's involvement in the purchase by the State Government of each of the following buildings—(a) Central Station Redevelopment Stage IB, (b) Central Station Redevelopment Stage IC, (c) Transport House, Brunswick Street, (d) the Theodore Hospital, (e) the Basil Stafford Redevelopment villa complex at Wacol, (f) various similar villa complexes in other areas of the State, and (g) the Mt. Gravatt Hospital?

(2) Which contractor had the overall responsibility for the construction of each of these buildings and which of them were constructed under (a) the traditional method, (b) the design and construction method, and (c) project management?

(3) In relation to the Central Station Redevelopment Stage IB project, did his department find that there were extensive and, in some cases, very serious defects in the building when it was taken over

from the State Government Insurance Office as the owner at the time of completion to lock-up stage, and did his department consider that the overall quality of the work was poor and what could be considered to be substandard compared to what would be expected under normal tendering procedures and departmental supervision?

(4) With regard to the Central Station Redevelopment Stage IC, did his department find that many of the charges, including management charges, were excessively high and that a check based on competitive tenders indicated that the cost of the building should have been \$2,100,000 rather than the \$2,500,000 paid to the contractor?

(5) In relation to Transport House, did his department find that the building was of poor quality and poorly constructed with many defects and was it subsequently considered to be substandard?

(6) Did a check on the cost of the Theodore Hospital by his department show that on a comparative tender basis the cost should have been \$591,000 rather than the \$766,000 paid to the contractor?

(7) As these few examples clearly show that the State Government has been both extravagant and wasteful in its approach to major contracts in this State and that it has been prepared to accept a lower standard of building, would he be prepared to table in this House the report compiled on 14 September 1977 by the former Auditor-General, Sir Allan Sewell, on the methods of construction of public buildings undertaken by the Government, so that the people of Queensland can be made fully aware of the careless attitude adopted by this Government in its approach to building contracts?

Answers:—

(1) Buildings (a), (b) and (c)—A Cabinet decision was taken to acquire these properties from S.G.I.O. on an amortised rental basis.

Buildings (d), (e), (f) and (g)—These buildings were not purchased.

(2) Buildings (a), (b) and (c) were constructed for the S.G.I.O. and that authority does not come under the jurisdiction of my portfolio.

Building (d)—Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd. utilising the concept of project management.

Building (e)—Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd. on conditions as indicated in my answer to question No. 1 on Thursday, 22 March 1979.

Building (f)—Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd.—Design and construct.

Building (g)—Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd.—Project Managers.

(3) It was necessary to take up with the S.G.I.O. various matters during the defects liability period but this is normal practice.

(4) My department considers that the total cost of the building was reasonable. This opinion was arrived at after examination of a copy of a priced simplified bill of quantities for the project and having regard to the fact that due to the specific nature of the system adopted for the provision of this building, it could have presumably resulted in greater efficiency and savings in the total contractual performance.

(5) No.

(6) Any figure prepared by my department did not include design and management fees.

(7) I deny the claims of the honourable member and can assure the House that the Government does manage all contracts in a responsible manner. My department, at all times, ensures that the cost to the State is the minimum level that can possibly be attained for the standard of accommodation required. The report compiled by the former Auditor-General, Sir Allan Sewell, was a confidential document for the information of Cabinet and I do not propose to table a copy.

2. MT. GRAVATT HOSPITAL PROJECT

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

(1) Since the commencement of construction on Stage I of the Mt. Gravatt Hospital by Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd., which is acting, according to his previous remarks made in this House, as project manager, for which contracts and sub-contracts have tenders or quotations for each of the different categories of work been called?

(2) From whom were the quotations and/or tender prices received, and what were they?

(3) Who were the successful tenderers and at what prices were they given the work?

(4) Were such contracts let directly by Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd., or were they referred to the Works Department and/or the client department for prior approval before the letting of the contract?

(5) Is the work being directly supervised by Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd. and does it have the right to make variations to the contracts without prior approval of the Works Department and/or the client department?

Answers:—

(1 to 3) This project is being constructed with the Department of Health being the principal and under the immediate control of a project control group. The honourable member should therefore direct these questions to my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Health.

(4) Tender and/or quotation documents and prices received are referred to my department for review and recommendation to the principal.

(5) See answer to (1 to 3).

Mr. Casey: In accordance with the Minister's intimation, I redirect parts (1), (2) and (3) of the question to the Minister for Health.

3. PORT OF BRISBANE OPERATIONAL PROPOSALS

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) With reference to a report in the Press on 5 April in which the managing director of the Brisbane Wharves and Wool Dumping organisation, Mr. B. W. Baillie, alleges the existence of "anti free-enterprise elements" working against his company in regard to the new Brisbane port operations and claims also that the port authority was "inexperienced and subject to advice throughout its existence that could be misleading", has Mr. Baillie, as a member of the authority himself, previously made the charges he now alleges to either the port authority or to him, as the responsible Government Minister, and, if so, on what date did Mr. Baillie initiate his complaints?

(2) In any such complaints to the port authority or to him, did Mr. Baillie identify these supposedly anti free-enterprise elements, and who are they?

(3) Since the charges of Mr. Baillie reflect not only on the competency but on the integrity of the members of the authority and those who have shown the interest to tender submissions, will he reject completely on behalf of the Government the insulting, unfounded allegations that Mr. Baillie has made in the Press report?

Answers:—

(1) I am not aware of any charges of the nature referred to being made by Mr. Baillie in the past.

(2) See answer to (1).

(3) I have no hesitation in rejecting the allegations which have been attributed to Mr Baillie. Although the Port of Brisbane Authority is a relatively new authority, it is comprised largely of representatives who have had wide experience in maritime matters over many years and many of its advisers have likewise been involved in port administration for lengthy periods. It is therefore hardly appropriate that the authority should be described as an inexperienced one.

On the question of the port authority nurturing anti free-enterprise elements, I would answer this by pointing out that there has not been any serious view within the ranks of the authority's members that the container terminal should be operated other than with major participation by private enterprise establishments. The differences of opinion which have arisen between the Government and the authority have related to the choice of the free-enterprise establishment to conduct the operation and the manner in which the possible development of any undesirable tendencies arising out of a monopolistic situation can be safeguarded. I wonder if the issues would have been confined to these aspects if the party led by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition had had the responsibility of making the decision.

I would hope that the statements attributed to Mr. Baillie were ones made on the spur of the moment when called

upon for quick comment and not a reflection of his considered assessment of the port authority, and that he will make this clear to his fellow members of the authority, particularly those who like himself have been drawn from free-enterprise organisations, in due course.

4. STUDY OF SOCIETY, SCHOOL COURSE

Mr. Row, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Which State high schools are currently trialing the Board of Secondary School Studies grades 11 and 12 Study of Society course?

(2) Has he examined this course?

(3) Is he in a position to make available to members of Parliament copies of the course to allow them to be equipped to discuss the matter?

Answers:—

(1) The following State high schools are trialing Study of Society in years 11 and 12—

Coorparoo State High School; Oxley State High School; Kedron State High School; Nambour State High School; Mackay North State High School; Ayr State High School; Bamaga State High School.

(2) I am not, as will be appreciated, able to examine such courses in complete detail. I am aware, however, of the broad outlines of this course and in my opinion and in the opinion of my senior officers the course is fully in accord with the statement of principles which the Select Committee on Education in Queensland sets out in its second interim report as guide-lines for handling the issues in social education.

(3) Yes. I have arranged for sufficient copies of the syllabus to be provided for distribution to all members. I have some copies with me now, for members who might like to have them.

5. FERNY GROVE RAILWAY LINE,
ELECTRIFICATION AND STATIONS

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

(1) On what date is it expected that the first electric passenger train will run on the Ferny Grove line for (a) testing

purposes and (b) scheduled passenger services?

(2) Have any plans been made to install boom gates on the Ferny Grove line at level crossings that are not already protected by boom gates?

(3) In view of the number of people using Ferny Grove Station, has the Railway Department any plans to construct a new station building at Ferny Grove?

(4) With the number of pedestrians crossing the railway line at the Grovely Station, will the Railway Department consider the construction of an overpass for pedestrians at this station?

Answers:—

(1) (a) September 1979. Initial testing of electric trains will take place firstly on the Roma Street-Darra section and this is anticipated to commence in June 1979.

(b) It is anticipated that scheduled passenger electric services will be commenced between Ferny Grove and Darra later this year. The actual date, which will be dependent on the contractor's progress with electric car deliveries and the subsequent completion of commissioning trials, cannot be confirmed at this juncture.

(2) Current policy is to provide multi-track level crossings with electrically operated half-booms and single-track crossings with flashing lights, on a priority basis and in accordance with funds available. Whilst the two crossings remaining to be fitted on the Ferny Grove line will be attended to in due course, they are not high in the present order of priorities.

(3) The need of new station facilities at Ferny Grove is recognised and it is hoped that financial and other planning considerations will enable provision of these within two years.

(4) Normal pedestrian crossings at Grovely Station are accomplished via the level crossing at Dawson Parade, which is protected by flashing lights. The need of a pedestrian overpass has not been demonstrated.

6. TABLING OF ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. Milliner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey and Valuation—

(1) Have two Orders in Council made under the Valuation of Land Act—one

dated 27 January 1977 and the other dated 22 June 1977—not been tabled in Parliament as required by section 47 of that Act?

(2) If so, how does he explain his failure to comply with statutory requirements in these two instances?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) No. All Orders in Council have been tabled. However, there were three Orders in Council in recent years which were not tabled at the correct time. The first was sent to me a few days late because the responsible officer had overlooked it. As a result, I asked for a better system to be introduced and for all Orders in Council and regulations made in recent years to be thoroughly checked to make sure there had been no other oversights. This check showed that the department had overlooked two Orders in Council—one in 1977 and one in 1978. Details were immediately brought to the notice of the Chairman of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation. Crown Law advises that the three that were tabled late were none the less quite valid.

7. SPEECH THERAPY SERVICES

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

(1) Is he aware of the urgent need for the provision of speech therapy services, as many children who require this service, which is essential to their development, are being deprived of the service?

(2) Will he direct the Public Service Board to review the matter as a matter of urgency, to enable an increased number of appointments to be made for the benefit of children in need?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I am aware of the importance of speech therapy services. The Public Service Board has recently investigated the question of the employment of speech therapists, occupational therapists, physiotherapists and social workers in the Department of Education in an endeavour to rationalise and improve the existing service. Following this investigation, Cabinet

approved the establishment of an inter-departmental committee to determine an appropriate system of medical supervision for speech therapists and also to determine the appropriate administrative arrangements relating to the employment, deployment and supervision of occupational therapists and physiotherapists. The inter-departmental committee's report is anticipated in the near future.

The question of increasing the number of speech therapists will be considered by the Department of Education and the Public Service Board when reviewing departmental staffing priorities for the 1979-80 financial year.

8. CRISIS CARE SERVICE

Mr. Scassola, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Welfare—

Has there been any increase in the contacts made with the Crisis Care Service since its inception, and what are the activities of the service?

Answer:—

The Crisis Care Service, which is operated by officers of the Department of Children's Services, commenced operation as a full-time service on 11 September 1978. Prior to that, a service had operated with the co-operation of Life Line from February 1978. As a result of this co-operative effort with Life Line, it was decided that a twenty-four hour service should be established.

It is providing a twenty-four-hour-a-day seven-day-a-week service to persons in need. The unit offers telephone counselling, as well as a service for officers to go out and intervene in a crisis which may occur. Very generally the service was established:

(a) to give families already known to the Department of Children's Services and other agencies a twenty-four-hour point of contact and ready access to trained personnel;

(b) to provide an immediately available service to families not known to the department who are in crisis for some reason or another; in other words, to be able to respond to a troubled family at a time when they are experiencing real stress;

(c) to provide a service to juveniles in that Crisis Care workers are able to respond quickly if an adult is required to be present for police interviews.

The number of calls made upon the service is increasing very steadily. In the first week that the permanent service operated 168 calls were received, whereas for the week commencing 26 February 1979 237 calls were received.

9. OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION

Mr. Scassola, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

In view of predictions of shortages in the availability of supplies of petroleum products and particularly locally produced natural gas, what steps are being taken to ensure the effective and expeditious exploration and exploitation of all potentially commercial prospecting areas?

Answer:—

For many years the Queensland Government has actively encouraged exploration for oil and gas in this State, and the exploitation of any field so discovered.

Under the authority to prospect system, titleholders are required not only to carry out an exploration programme, generally involving seismic surveys and exploratory drilling, but also progressively to relinquish portions of the area originally granted. Titleholders are also required to submit technical reports on all exploration, as well as furnish basic geological and geophysical data acquired during these operations. On relinquishment of the authority, these reports and other data are placed on open file for the information of other companies. This information is also used by the Geological Survey branch of the Department of Mines, in conjunction with data from its own stratigraphical drilling operations, as a basis for assessing the prospectivity of the various sedimentary basins. A core library is also maintained by the department to enable further examination and study of core samples from company and departmental drilling.

Recently, with the co-operation of the Commonwealth, four areas in the Gulf of Carpentaria were made available for

application for exploration permits and thus initiate the reactivation of exploration in Queensland offshore waters.

The Queensland Government approved financial guarantees through the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development to enable the construction of pipelines from the Kincora and Silver Springs–Boxleigh gasfields to link with the Roma to Brisbane gas pipeline in 1977 and 1978 respectively, and thereby facilitated the early development of these two fields. It has also suggested that the Commonwealth should consider the reintroduction of drilling subsidies and the granting of additional taxation incentives to assist exploration companies.

Apart from petroleum exploration, the production of alternative liquid and gaseous fuels from oil shales and by conversion of coal, and the production of ethanol from crops, are under active consideration.

10. IDENTIFICATION ON GOODS OF COUNTRY OF MANUFACTURE

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

With reference to an answer given by the Minister for Labour Relations to my question on 29 March—

(1) What are this State's requirements of manufacturers to identify goods by country of manufacture?

(2) What checks are carried out to ensure that goods are clearly marked with the country of manufacture?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I am arranging for the information sought to be collated and I shall write to the honourable member as soon as I am in a position to do so.

11. HOUSING COMMISSION LAND ACQUISITIONS

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

What are the total areas of undeveloped land vested in, purchased, or acquired by the Queensland Housing Commission under

the State Housing Act 1945-1974 in each of the following local authorities:—(a) Brisbane city, (b) Redcliffe city, (c) Pine Rivers Shire, (d) Caboolture Shire, (e) Redland Shire, (f) Logan Shire, (g) City of Gold Coast, (h) Albert Shire, (i) Beau-desert Shire, and (j) Ipswich city?

Answer:—

Brisbane city—139.6 ha; Redcliffe city—121.7 ha; Pine Rivers Shire—95.1 ha; Caboolture Shire—9 ha; Redland Shire—Nil; Logan Shire—29.4 ha; Gold Coast city—24.4 ha; Albert Shire—11.5 ha; Beau-desert Shire—Nil; Ipswich city—132.8 ha.

12. TRAFFIC SIGNALS, GOLD COAST HIGHWAY/GOVERNMENT ROAD/HOLLYWELL ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. I. J. Gibbs, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

When will the construction of channelisation and the installation of signalisation start at the intersection of the Gold Coast Highway, Government Road and Hollywell Road, Labrador?

Answer:—

It will no doubt be recalled that on 7 December last year I advised the honourable member that work on this project would commence in February of this year. As a result of an unexpected delay in the processing of a small resumption, this anticipated commencement date was not achieved. However, the scheme has now been released, and it is anticipated that work on the site will commence by the end of the month.

13. LAND AND WATER FOR VEGETABLE GROWERS, LOWER BURDEKIN AREA

Mr. Yewdale for Mr. Wilson, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

(1) As vegetables to the value of approximately \$2,000,000 are grown in the Lower Burdekin area and as quite a considerable amount is grown on land leased from cane growers, will he take steps to have Crown land in the Lower Burdekin

area released to vegetable growers in the Home Hill area on a freehold basis?

(2) Will Crown land near the Clare Weir be released to vegetable growers, and will he also make provision for the irrigation of the area from the Clare Weir?

Answers:—

(1) There are no large areas of vacant Crown land in the Lower Burdekin locality which are available for leasing or purchase for the purpose of vegetable-growing. However, if the honourable member indicates to me any specific area which he has in mind, I will have the area in question investigated.

(2) There is no vacant Crown land currently available that can be served by the Clare Weir, and that is suitable for vegetable-growing.

Proposals for future extension of the Burdekin irrigation development based on Clare Weir do include soils that are suited to vegetable-growing, and it is intended that some farms will be designed to suit this purpose.

Farm sizes and water allocations will be planned for a variety of crops best suited to the soils that will be commanded by the channel system. However, it is not the policy of this Government to limit the use of land in irrigation areas to any particular cropping regime. That is considered to be the prerogative of the farmer.

14. SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES

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

(1) With reference to dental health services to schools, why do some schools have a dental surgery whilst others of equal size have not?

(2) Why is the dental surgery at the Wulguru State School not available to the children from the Stuart and Oonoonba State Schools?

(3) Why is the dental surgery at the Hermit Park State School not available to children from the West Townsville State School and the Special School at West Townsville?

(4) Why is transport not available to children from the Stuart, Oonoonba, Railway Estate, South Townsville, West Townsville State Schools and the Special School to allow the children to have dental treatment at the school dental therapist centre at Vincent, as is the case to children at the Mundingburra State School?

(5) As concrete pads with proper drainage and electrical points for dental caravans are to be installed at Stuart, Oonoonba, Railway Estate, South Townsville, West Townsville State Schools and the Special School at West Townsville, when will this work be carried out to enable the children at these schools to receive dental health care?

Answers:—

(1) As a matter of policy the School Dental Service is undergoing expansion so as to provide regular dental care to all primary school children in the State as soon as possible dependent upon the availability of funds from both Commonwealth and State sources.

This service will be extended progressively to individual schools utilising static school dental clinics and mobile dental clinics within schoolgrounds, or in the case of schools close to training centres by transporting children to those centres.

In the main, static clinics are being established only at larger schools but where practicable these static clinics will serve as full-time bases for the mobile clinics, which will visit smaller schools in the general area. Although the programme is an ambitious one it must take some time to reach all schools.

(2) The capacity of the Wulguru School Dental Clinic is limited by the staffing of that clinic. As that clinic is now adequately covering its immediate responsibilities at Wulguru, it is proposed to progressively offer treatment at this clinic to children attending Stuart Primary School.

(3) Hermit Park Primary School Dental Clinic which was established later than the Wulguru clinic is progressively offering treatment to children attending that school and the Hermit Park Infants School but has not as yet achieved full coverage of those schools.

It has been decided that, at least as an interim measure, treatment will be offered for children attending the Townsville West

Primary School at a mobile dental clinic soon to be established at Railway Estate State Primary School.

Those children from the Special School at West Townsville, whose parents have given their consent, are currently receiving treatment at the Townsville Central School Dental Clinic.

(4) The training centre at Vincent is already fully committed with its existing coverage of schools.

(5) Approval has been granted and funds are available for mobile dental clinic facilities to be provided this financial year at the Garbutt, Oonoonba, Railway Estate, South Townsville, Stuart and St. Josephs Primary Schools. These projects, which are in the hands of the Department of Works, are expected to be completed within two months.

Arrangements which are in hand for children attending the West Townsville Primary and Special Schools are mentioned in my answer above.

15. COMPLAINTS AGAINST POLICE
SERGEANT, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. Yewdale for Mr. Wilson, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) Has the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders' Legal Service, Townsville, lodged a number of complaints against a certain sergeant of police, alleging harassment and bashing of Aboriginal and Islander people?

(2) When were complaints of this nature first made against the police officer?

(3) How many complaints have been received regarding this police officer's actions against black people in the Townsville watch-house and during transportation to the watch-house?

(4) Have these complaints been investigated and, if so, what action has been taken regarding the complaints?

(5) If no investigation or inquiry has been made, will he initiate one immediately?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) Complaints have been received over the past several months. All complaints

either have been investigated or are in the process of investigation by a senior commissioned officer of police.

(3) (a) One. (b) Nil.

(4 & 5) See answer to (2).

16. INSURANCE OF HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES

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

With reference to regulation 18 (1) under the State Housing Act, which provides that all houses purchased with Housing Commission loans must be insured with the S.G.I.O. unless the commission otherwise approves, and in order to demonstrate that the Government does not use these 1946 A.L.P. regulations to restrict competition in insurance, will he outline the circumstances under which the Housing Commission will approve insurance taken with a company other than the S.G.I.O.?

Answer:—

Special conditions to be met to accept an insurer other than S.G.I.O. are:—

(1) Must be a company acceptable to the Queensland Housing Commission.

(2) The insurance company must undertake, in writing—

(i) to hold the property insured, to the extent of the amount outstanding under the mortgage or contract of sale, upon default in payment of premium by the mortgagor or purchaser, until the premium is paid;

(ii) to advise the commission that the premium is unpaid, after allowing a reasonable time for payment; and

(iii) not to cancel, lapse, or reduce the cover under the policy, without the prior written consent of the Commission.

These conditions protect the purchaser and give the commission extra cover to the extent it receives from State Government Insurance Office.

17. QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FUND RAISERS

Mr. Gygar, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) With reference to his statement in the House on 6 December 1978 regarding his investigation into the organisation known as Queensland Volunteer Fund Raisers, who is the owner or owners or principals of Queensland Volunteer Fund Raisers?

(2) Did his investigation show that this organisation operated at a profit or apparent profit in the period under examination and, if so, to his knowledge, did the organisation as an entity or any of its owners or principals declare that profit to the Taxation Department for the purpose of payment of company tax or personal income tax?

(3) Did his investigation reveal the source or sources of income of this organisation and, if so, what were these sources and on what dates and in what amounts was this income paid into the accounts of Queensland Volunteer Fund Raisers?

(4) Who were the authorised signatories of the cheque accounts of the Queensland Volunteer Fund Raisers at all relevant times?

(5) To whom was each of the over 230 cheques drawn on Queensland Volunteer Fund Raisers' accounts, and uncovered in his investigation, made payable to, and on what dates and in what amounts, and whose signatures appeared on each?

Answers:—

(1) The records at the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs show that as at 11 October 1977, the date of cancellation of the business name Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers, the persons carrying on the business under the business name were—

John Alfred Roy Egerton;
James Gordon O'Sullivan;
George Henry Bohlsen;
Magdalene Valadia Barraud;
Bartholomew Roger Lourigan.

On 3 May 1977 a statement showing a change of persons in relation to whom the business name was registered was lodged. This statement showed that the persons carrying on the business were—

James Gordon O'Sullivan;
Thomas Stephen Burton;
Norman Francis Jones.

As the statement did not contain the signatories of all those persons who were carrying on the business, it was not accepted.

(2) The investigation was conducted by officers who were appointed authorised officers under the Art Unions and Amusements Act 1976 and inspectors under the Collections Act 1966-1977. Accordingly, their investigation was limited to certain records which recorded funds received in or resulting from an appeal for support conducted in the name of the Australian Pensioners' League.

Such funds received by the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers from the Australian Pensioners' League were deposited to a separate bank account number 440-753 with the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, Fortitude Valley.

The department has no information as to the profitability of the organisation known as the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers.

(3) I have had tabulated details of the income of the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers deposited to account number 440-753 with the Commonwealth Trading

Bank of Australia, Fortitude Valley, during the period 1 November 1976 to 31 October 1978.

Because the details are so extensive, I seek leave to have them incorporated in "Hansard".

(Leave granted.)

DETAILS OF CHEQUES DRAWN ON THE QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FINANCE RAISERS ACCOUNT NO. 440-753 AND SIGNED BY BOTH GERRY JONES AND G. O'SULLIVAN DURING THE PERIOD 1 NOVEMBER 1976 TO 31 OCTOBER 1978

Date Drawn	Payee	Amount
		\$
3-11-76	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	59.76
6-12-76	Kalinga-Woolloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	54.68
6-12-76	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	133.32
6-12-76	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	85.80
6-12-76	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	118.40
6-12-76	North Booval Branch of A.L.P.	26.56
6-12-76	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	37.72
6-12-76	Windsor E.E.C. of A.L.P.	29.36
6-12-76	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	118.20
6-12-76	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	56.20
6-12-76	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	56.60
6-12-76	Sandgate Branch of Y.L.A.	140.32
6-12-76	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	68.04
6-12-76	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	67.08
7-12-76	Australian Labor Party	1 000.00
7-12-76	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	150.96
7-12-76	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	94.80
15-12-76	Sandgate E.E.C. of A.L.P.	46.20
16-12-76	Kalinga-Woolloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	31.08
16-12-76	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	52.04
16-12-76	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	46.96
16-12-76	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	86.80
16-12-76	Everton E.E.C. of A.L.P.	95.24
16-12-76	North Booval Branch of A.L.P.	43.12
16-12-76	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	14.80
16-12-76	Windsor E.E.C. of A.L.P.	11.44
16-12-76	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	64.10
16-12-76	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	23.16
16-12-76	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	52.13
16-12-76	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	128.28
16-12-76	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	139.92
23-12-76	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	39.08
5-1-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	31.56
5-1-77	Sandgate Branch of Y.L.A.	140.46
14-1-77	Australian Labor Party	3 000.00
21-2-77	Kalinga-Woolloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	51.74
21-2-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	108.28
21-2-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	114.48
21-2-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	122.00
21-2-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	37.68
21-2-77	Windsor E.E.C. of A.L.P.	18.48
22-2-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	92.16
22-2-77	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	5.52
22-2-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	110.90
22-2-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	204.76
22-2-77	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	21.84
1-3-77	Sandgate Branch of Y.L.A.	210.36
1-3-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	54.72
25-3-77	Kalinga-Woolloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	48.44
25-3-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	53.36
25-3-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	56.56
25-3-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	89.60
25-3-77	North Booval Branch of A.L.P.	21.60
25-3-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	18.16
25-3-77	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	43.30

DETAILS OF CHEQUES DRAWN ON THE QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FINANCE RAISERS ACCOUNT
No. 440-753 AND SIGNED BY BOTH GERRY JONES AND G. O'SULLIVAN DURING THE
PERIOD 1 NOVEMBER 1976 TO 31 OCTOBER 1978—*continued*

Date Drawn	Payee	Amount
		\$
25-3-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	35.76
25-3-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	36.38
25-3-77	Aspley Branch of A.L.P.	26.24
25-3-77	Sandgate Branch of A.Y.L.	57.42
25-3-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	59.62
25-3-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	101.04
14-4-77	Kalinga-Wooloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	45.44
14-4-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	50.24
14-4-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	42.00
14-4-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	88.60
14-4-77	North Booval Branch of A.L.P.	20.76
14-4-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	22.38
14-4-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	40.92
14-4-77	Aspley Branch of A.L.P.	26.24
14-4-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	45.13
14-4-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	103.76
4-5-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	40.56
4-5-77	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	32.60
4-5-77	Sandgate Branch of A.Y.L.	77.08
5-5-77	Australian Labor Party	36.96
10-5-77	Kalinga-Wooloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	51.52
10-5-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	49.40
10-5-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	61.04
10-5-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	120.60
10-5-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	28.28
10-5-77	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	128.44
10-5-77	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	27.76
10-5-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	119.60
10-5-77	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	100.68
10-5-77	Australian Labor Party	37.24
28-6-77	North Booval Branch of A.L.P.	18.88
28-6-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	30.32
28-6-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	53.44
28-6-77	Sandgate Branch of A.Y.L.	87.19
28-6-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	37.74
7-6-77	Kalinga-Wooloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	78.96
6-7-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	106.96
6-7-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	99.00
6-7-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	165.00
6-7-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	69.32
6-7-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	59.92
6-7-77	Strathpine Branch of A.L.P.	6.12
6-7-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	53.67
6-7-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	232.63
6-7-77	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	245.36
19-7-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	71.32
19-7-77	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	26.96
19-7-77	Sandgate Branch of A.Y.L.	253.95
15-8-77	Kalinga-Wooloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	64.08
15-8-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	59.30
15-8-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	82.64
15-8-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	127.40
15-8-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	46.08
15-8-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	56.12
15-8-77	Strathpine Branch of A.L.P.	41.96
15-8-77	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	112.12
15-8-77	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	196.72
15-8-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	37.87
15-8-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	150.80
15-8-77	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	143.52
19-8-77	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	156.73
5-9-77	Kalinga-Wooloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	40.84
5-9-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	49.80
5-9-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	95.20
5-9-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	25.80

DETAILS OF CHEQUES DRAWN ON THE QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FINANCE RAISERS ACCOUNT
No. 440-753 AND SIGNED BY BOTH GERRY JONES AND G. O'SULLIVAN DURING THE
PERIOD 1 NOVEMBER 1976 TO 31 OCTOBER 1978—continued

Date Drawn	Payee	Amount
		\$
5-9-77	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	48.24
5-9-77	Strathpine Branch of A.L.P.	13.78
5-9-77	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	38.98
5-9-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	46.11
5-9-77	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	147.03
6-9-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	56.36
6-9-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	20.00
9-9-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	75.20
9-9-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	106.75
8-11-77	Coopers Plains Branch of A.L.P.	5.00
8-11-77	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	5.00
15-11-77	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	122.12
15-11-77	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	104.84
15-11-77	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	155.00
15-11-77	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	202.60
15-11-77	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	71.56
15-11-77	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	109.18
95-11-77	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	179.88
15-11-77	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	98.54
15-11-77	Railway Estate Branch of A.L.P.	67.20
15-11-77	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	90.89
15-11-77	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	12.44
28-11-77	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	77.72
28-11-77	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	195.94
12-12-77	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	94.80
9-1-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin R.H.C. of A.L.P.	51.56
9-1-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	112.52
9-1-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	88.20
9-1-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	130.60
9-1-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	56.32
9-1-78	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	38.24
9-1-78	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	84.44
9-1-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	213.24
9-1-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	63.16
17-1-78	Maryborough Branch of A.L.P.	178.80
18-1-78	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	75.02
24-1-78	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	53.80
13-2-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	22.92
13-2-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	45.40
13-2-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	19.68
13-2-78	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	58.64
13-8-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	107.68
13-2-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	31.02
16-2-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	28.28
10-4-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	17.60
10-4-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	56.00
10-4-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	52.96
10-4-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	91.00
10-4-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	24.32
10-4-78	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	56.16
10-4-78	Keperra Branch of A.L.P.	51.40
10-4-78	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	63.36
10-4-78	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	9.44
10-4-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	101.20
10-4-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	46.13
12-5-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	79.82
12-5-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	100.28
12-5-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	85.72
12-5-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	215.00
12-5-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	35.96
12-5-78	Rode Branch of A.L.P.	22.92
12-5-78	Ashgrove E.E.C. of A.L.P.	15.00
12-5-78	Mitchelton Heights Branch of A.L.P.	70.84
12-5-78	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	20.80
12-5-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	206.77

DETAILS OF CHEQUES DRAWN ON THE QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FINANCE RAISERS ACCOUNT
 No. 440-753 AND SIGNED BY BOTH GERRY JONES AND G. O'SULLIVAN DURING THE
 PERIOD 1 NOVEMBER 1976 TO 31 OCTOBER 1978—*continued*

Date Drawn	Payee	Amount
		\$
15-5-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	62.21
8-6-78	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	36.36
12-6-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	36.24
13-6-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	47.40
13-6-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	44.70
13-6-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	100.40
13-6-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	24.24
13-6-78	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	27.60
13-6-78	Mitchelton Heights Branch of A.L.P.	42.32
13-6-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	107.53
13-6-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	51.50
28-6-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	32.92
28-6-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	53.60
28-6-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	71.92
28-6-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	99.20
28-6-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	24.88
28-6-78	Mitchelton Heights Branch of A.L.P.	56.24
28-6-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	70.40
28-6-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	48.46
31-7-78	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	28.80
22-8-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	123.99
22-8-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	34.20
22-8-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	55.36
22-8-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	75.96
22-8-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	143.40
22-8-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	36.28
22-8-78	Mitchelton Heights Branch of A.L.P.	75.48
22-8-78	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	35.52
22-8-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	56.80
20-9-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	25.96
19-9-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	42.12
19-9-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	51.76
20-9-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	115.80
20-9-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	17.80
20-9-78	Mitchelton Heights Branch of A.L.P.	29.60
20-9-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	77.51
21-9-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	56.10
21-9-78	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	17.84
21-9-78	Mitchelton M.E.C. of A.L.P.	69.76
26-10-78	Kalinga-Wooloowin Branch of A.L.P.	30.40
26-10-78	Geebung Branch of A.L.P.	62.16
26-10-78	New Farm Branch of A.L.P.	73.40
26-10-78	Wavell Heights Branch of A.L.P.	140.64
26-10-78	Ithaca E.E.C. of A.L.P.	25.60
26-10-78	Mitchelton Heights Branch of A.L.P.	91.88
26-10-78	Sherwood No. 1 Branch of A.L.P.	27.40
26-10-78	Redcliffe Branch of A.L.P.	129.70
26-10-78	Clontarf Beach Branch of A.L.P.	29.50
17-3-77	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section	152.52
23-3-77	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section	71.68
7-4-77	Australian Pensioners' League	71.68
5-5-77	Australian Pensioners' League	73.92
5-8-77	Australian Pensioners' League	301.20
3-5-77	Ansett Airlines of Australia	160.00
25-11-76	Australia Post	666.00
29-11-76	Australia Post	315.00
24-11-76	Telecom Australia	291.35
7-1-77	Telecom Australia	315.45
7-3-77	Telecom Australia	114.59
9-5-77	Telecom Australia	285.77
13-12-77	Telecom Australia	372.37
6-3-78	Telecom Australia	123.92
23-5-78	Telecom Australia	404.55
4-9-78	Telecom Australia	114.10

DETAILS OF CHEQUES DRAWN ON THE QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FINANCE RAISERS ACCOUNT
No. 440-753 AND SIGNED BY BOTH GERRY JONES AND G. O'SULLIVAN DURING THE
PERIOD 1 NOVEMBER 1976 TO 31 OCTOBER 1978—*continued*

Date Drawn	Payee	Amount
		\$
14-1-77	Cash	220.00
20-1-77	Cash	80.00
3-2-77	Cash	60.00
2-3-77	Cash	71.68
1-4-77	Cash	71.68
13-4-77	Cash	50.00
13-4-77	Cash	71.68
3-5-77		25.00
17-5-77	Cash	50.00
26-5-77	Cash	110.88
26-5-77	Cash	431.20
5-7-77	Cash	50.00
2-9-77	Cash	136.00
19-12-77	Cash	50.00
23-2-78	Cash	50.00
16-3-78	Cash	230.00
22-5-78	Cash	50.00
22-6-78	Cash (Cheque cashed through Queensland Fish Board)	500.00
26-7-78	Cash	50.00
10-8-78	Cash	60.95
19-9-78	Cash	50.00
29-9-78	Cash	1 000.00
25-10-78	Cash	50.00
22-8-78	Breakfast Creek Hotel	500.00
24-11-76	Queensland Hire Service Pty. Ltd.	28.10
26-10-78	Frank Melit	251.00
24-1-77	Queensland Athletic League	118.60
14-1-77	B. Richards	95.00
14-1-77	S. Davis	33.25
14-1-77	J. A. McDonald	23.75
14-1-77	D. Fitzgerald	19.00
14-1-77	D. Browne	14.25
14-1-77	D. Blazely	57.00
14-1-77	D. Harrold	28.50
14-1-77	J. A. McDonald	23.75
14-1-77	G. Gabbett	9.50
14-1-77	R. Phipps	5.00
14-1-77	C. Peters	95.00
15-1-77	B. Walker	28.50
15-1-77	P. Gumbley	475.00
15-1-77	T. Keegan	23.75
15-1-77	P. Gumbley	33.25
Undated	P. Finlay	5.00
15-1-77	R. Riethmuller	19.00
15-1-77	M. Maher	57.00
15-1-77	G. Taylor	33.25
15-1-77	G. Wallace	14.25
15-1-77	J. Voght	9.50
15-1-77	L. Paterson	285.00
15-1-77	D. Fitzgerald	95.00
15-1-77	R. Henderson	33.25
15-1-77	D. Furlong	19.00
15-1-77	J. A. McDonald	14.25
15-1-77	D. Browne	11.40
15-1-77	J. Wilcox	8.00
15-1-77	K. Henschen	8.00
15-1-77	R. Donovan	190.00
15-1-77	T. Batch	76.00
15-1-77	K. Silver	42.50
15-1-77	T. Batch	95.00
15-1-77	M. Brennan	57.00
15-1-77	F. Rissman	28.50
15-1-77	M. Storey	23.75
15-1-77	A. Sinclair	95.00
15-1-77	R. Phipps	28.50

DETAILS OF CHEQUES DRAWN ON THE QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER FINANCE RAISERS ACCOUNT
 NO. 440-753 AND SIGNED BY BOTH GERRY JONES AND G. O'SULLIVAN DURING THE
 PERIOD 1 NOVEMBER 1976 TO 31 OCTOBER 1978—*continued*

Date Drawn	Payee	Amount
		\$
15-1-77	J. N. McDonald	28.50
15-1-77	G. Taylor	19.00
15-1-77	G. Reaves	14.25
15-1-77	M. Batch	5.00
8-11-77	N. Smith	5.00
8-11-77	E. Allwood	5.00
8-11-77	A. Day	5.00
8-11-77	David Alexander	5.00
8-11-77	G. M. McPherson	5.00
8-11-77	M. Campbell	5.00
8-11-77	D. Daley	5.00
8-11-77	E. Prochniak	5.00
8-11-77	L. Barrett	5.00
8-11-77	Wayne Luchterhand	5.00
8-11-77	M. C. Hasemann	5.00
8-11-77	Chris Watson	5.00
8-11-77	K. Thorpe	5.00
8-11-77	A. Urquhart	5.00
8-11-77	W. Fisher	5.00
8-11-77	Harold Love	5.00
8-11-77	S. Pearl	5.00
8-11-77	Kevin Kluver	5.00
8-11-77	M. Ahearn	5.00
8-11-77	Fay Walter	5.00
8-11-77	M. Kleidon	5.00
8-11-77	Eve Jeffers	5.00
8-11-77	P. Brophy	5.00
8-11-77	Margaret Keyworth	5.00
8-11-77	P. Jordan	5.00
8-11-77	W. Richter	5.00
8-11-77	G. Humrich & C. Jacobi	5.00
8-11-77	B. Somers	5.00
8-11-77	Gordon Ries	5.00
8-11-77	S. & L. Rosser	5.00
8-11-77	H. Mitchell	5.00
8-11-77	J. Gallety	5.00
8-11-77	G. Quinn	5.00
8-11-77	Ethel Seaby	5.00
8-11-77	B. Read	5.00
8-11-77	Stephen Kiscock	5.00
8-11-77	D. Horn	750.00
8-11-77	N. Smith	150.00
8-11-77	Jacque Hare	50.00

(4) Such investigation shows that during the period 1 November 1976 to 31 October 1978 the signatories of account number 440-753 in the name of the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers were Thomas Stephen Burton, James Gordon O'Sullivan and Gerry Jones.

(5) I have had tabulated details of cheques drawn on the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers account number

440-753 and signed by both Gerry Jones and G. O'Sullivan which were presented for payment during the period 1 November 1976 to 31 October 1978.

Again I seek leave to have the information incorporated in "Hansard".

(Leave granted.)

The income of the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers deposited to account number 440-753 with the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, Fortitude Valley, during the period 1 November 1976 to 31 October 1978 was as follows—

Date of Deposit	Amount		Drawer of Cheque
	Cash	Cheque	
	\$	\$	
2-11-76		274.90	Townsville Pensioners' League
12-11-76		1 196.40	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
		151.30	Maryborough Pensioners' League
26-11-76		160.80	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
7-12-76		1 000.00	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
16-12-76		188.70	Maryborough Pensioners' League
22-12-76		1 133.45	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
7-1-77		160.36	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		260.46	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
14-1-77		315.45	A.L.P.
		2 500.00	4KQ
19-1-77	120.00		
28-1-77		174.90	Townsville Pensioners' League
		229.90	
4-3-77		118.50	Townsville Pensioners' League
		744.24	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
		884.18	
		71.90	North Chermiside Branch
11-3-77		255.96	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		240.74	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
		401.57	
31-3-77		65.60	Aspley Branch
7-4-77		27.80	Townsville Pensioners' League
		126.30	Maryborough Pensioners' League
22-4-77		536.75	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
		65.60	Aspley Branch A.L.P.
4-5-77		146.30	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
6-5-77		512.18	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
16-5-77		129.70	Maryborough Pensioners' League
31-5-77		149.50	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		152.77	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
		246.40	Q.C.E. of A.L.P.
1-8-77		712.11	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
3-8-77		290.79	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		540.70	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
8-8-77		445.00	Ashgrove E.E.C.
18-8-77		306.70	Townsville Pensioners' League
31-8-77		188.50	Maryborough Pensioners' League
30-9-77		179.40	Townsville Pensioners' League
		985.35	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
		133.44	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		241.43	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
11-11-77		1 155.00	Q.C.E. of A.L.P.
21-11-77		838.04	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
16-12-77		1 845.79	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
6-1-78		244.92	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		348.03	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
		293.24	
17-1-78		84.00	Townsville Pensioners' League
31-1-78		863.38	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
9-2-78		345.50	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
28-2-78		107.90	Maryborough Pensioners' League
		76.80	Q.C.E. of A.L.P.
16-3-78		230.00	Berserker Street Branch
23-3-78		173.38	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
26-4-78		273.20	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
4-5-78		32.00	E. J. Humphreys
22-5-78	770.00	874.63	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
		184.16	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
13-6-78		336.25	Australian Pensioners' League Redcliffe

The income of the Queensland Volunteer Finance Raisers deposited to account number 440-753 with the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, Fortitude Valley, during the period 1 November 1976 to 31 October 1978 was as follows—

Date of Deposit	Amount		Drawer of Cheque
	Cash	Cheque	
	\$	\$	
27-6-78		473.25	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
31-7-78	500.00	90.00	Berserker Branch
10-8-78		478.30	Australian Pensioners' League Queensland Section
		474.04	
		60.95	Maryborough Pensioners' League
23-8-78		347.38	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
28-8-78		22.00	R. B. Barron
	478.00		
21-9-78		225.99	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League
2-10-78		586.25	Australian Pensioners' League
9-10-78	1 000.00		
27-10-78		167.03	Redcliffe-Scarborough Pensioners' League

18. AUSTRALIAN PENSIONERS LEAGUE

Mr. Gygar, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Who are the trustees of the Australian Pensioners League, Queensland Branch?

(2) Who are the members of the executive or other governing body of the Australian Pensioners League, Queensland Branch?

Answers:—

According to returns lodged with this department by the Australian Pensioners League, Queensland—

(1) The sole trustee is Ms. M. V. Barraud.

(2) The governing body is—President: Sydney A. Hansen; Secretary: Ernst George Goulet; Treasurer: Stefanie Walker; Other office bearers are—Mr. F. X. Cooke; Mr. A. H. Dyke; Ms. M. V. Barraud; Mr. C. Barker.

19. FILMS BOARD OF REVIEW MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Yewdale for Mr. Underwood, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation—

As the 1977-78 report of the Films Board of Review listed the members of that board, has there been any change of membership of the board since the report was presented and, if so, what are the names and qualifications of the new members?

Answer:—

There has been only one alteration in the membership of the Films Board of Review since 1 July 1978, and I refer the honourable member to the public notification thereof on page 923 of the Government Gazette of 11 November 1978 which sets out the name and legal qualifications of the new board member.

20 & 21. QUICK BRICK PTY. LTD.

Mr. Bertoni, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Who are the directors of Quick Brick Pty. Ltd., formerly of 451 Lutwyche Road, Lutwyche?

(2) What is the last known address of Quick Brick Pty. Ltd?

(3) Is he aware that Quick Brick Pty. Ltd. has been issuing useless 20-year guarantee forms stating that the manufacturer guarantees the material for a period of 20 years and will replace faulty material free of charge?

(4) Has any legal action been commenced or judgments given against Quick Brick Pty. Ltd., or any of its directors or associated companies?

Answers:—

(1 & 2) The records contained in the public register at the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs reveal—

Peter Cowan Austin and Oliver Dean Payne were appointed directors of Quick Brick Pty. Ltd. on 6 April 1973, and no change of directors has been lodged; and

The registered office of the company as from the date of incorporation, that is 6 April 1973, was 471 Lutwyche Road, Lutwyche, and no change of registered office has been lodged.

(3) Any offence in relation to a warranty would be a matter for my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Labour Relations.

(4) The Commissioner for Corporate Affairs advises me that he has not taken any action against the company or any of its directors. He is not aware of which companies may be associated companies.

The records of the Magistrates Court, Brisbane, show that Peter Cowan Austin was convicted of a breach of the City of Brisbane Acts on 18 December 1974 and fined \$20 and ordered to pay certain costs.

The following civil matters have been lodged at the Magistrates Court, Brisbane—

Plaint 11157/72 Albion Press v. Peter Cowan Austin;

Plaint 11442/72 Stuart Archer v. Austin & Dean trading as U.S. Chemicals;

Plaint 12051/74 Hyne & Son v. Peter Cowan Austin trading as Austbuilt Constructions;

Plaint 18452/75 Gill & Co. v. Peter Austin carrying on business as Austbuilt Constructions;

Plaint 20827/75 Brambles Ltd v. Austbuilt Constructions;

Plaint 25354/75 Isa Timbers Pty. Ltd. v. Peter Cowan Austin & Oliver Dean Payne;

Plaint 27096/75 Queensland Railfast Express Pty. Limited v. Peter Austin trading as Austbuilt Constructions;

Plaint 12947/78 Commercial & General Acceptance Limited v. Peter Cowan Austin.

According to the records, only one judgment by default was entered. This related to the claim by Isa Timbers Pty. Ltd. against Peter Cowan Austin.

Mr. Bertoni, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

(1) How many complaints have been received by the Consumer Affairs Bureau regarding Quick Brick Pty. Ltd., formerly of 451 Lutwyche Road, Lutwyche?

(2) What is the last known address of Quick Brick Pty. Ltd.?

Answers:—

(1) Six.

(2) 60 George Street, Mt. Isa.

22. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

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

(1) Does he share Sir Charles Court's reservations about the proposed new International Economic Order, which is sponsored by the United Nations?

(2) Has the Commonwealth Government indicated whether any such agreement might infringe State rights, as the Australian Labor Party Federal spokesman for Primary Industry is reported to have claimed that a future Federal Labor Government would use the agreement for this purpose?

Answers:—

(1) All international trade negotiations must be entered into from a critical and responsible point of view. Australia should not be a party to any international trade agreement unless it is in the long-term interests of producers and the nation.

Certainly I share Sir Charles Court's reservations about the so-called new International Economic Order, and would call on the Federal Government—indeed, I rang the Prime Minister several months ago on this particular point—to continue to be mindful of the long-term interests of the rural sector as well as of the Australian economy as a whole during any relevant negotiations.

(2) As the honourable member is aware, the Commonwealth has complete responsibility over matters relating to exports.

However, State statutory marketing boards have responsibility for the internal marketing of their respective commodities including receipt, grading, storage, transport and financing.

In the past, close and effective co-operation has been evident between State marketing boards and Commonwealth and State authorities, and I would expect such co-operation to continue in the future.

In the interests of the Australian economy, both urban and rural sectors, it would be hard to imagine any Australian Government taking international or domestic action which would damage financially the rural sector, which makes a major contribution to the overall economic well-being of the Commonwealth.

23. PLANT PATENTS

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

What are the latest developments regarding the possibility of bringing about plant patents in Queensland and in Australia?

Answer:—

The Minister for Primary Industry, the Right Honourable Ian Sinclair, M.P., has advised that he is preparing legislation

which is expected to be put to the August sittings of Federal Parliament. State Departments of Agriculture and Primary Industries and other organisations have been closely consulted on the technical issues involved.

24. STATEMENTS MADE IN TRANS
AUSTRALIA PROPERTY AND FINANCE LIMITED
ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. Mackenroth, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) I draw his attention to a circular letter from Trans Australia Property and Finance Limited dated 4 December 1978, wherein it states that it has a full copy of the "Environmental Study Advice" compiled by the Main Roads Department, and ask is such an Environmental Study Advice available and, if so, is it available to the public?

(2) If not, where did this company receive the report?

(3) As the company is using statements made by him and the member for Redlands in relation to the Stradbroke Island bridge in its advertising of Russell Island land, will he take immediate action to stop this company from misleading people and warn the company that, if it persists, legal action will be taken?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) No doubt the honourable member for Chatsworth will recall that, on 1 February this year, there appeared in "The Courier-Mail" a claim by the honourable member for Lytton that in a company letter dated 4 December 1978 a Sydney-based real estate firm used a confidential State Government report to promote Russell Island through a proposed bridge development. The honourable member for Lytton went on to claim that the company had a copy of this so-called confidential report, yet he and some of his colleagues had been unable to obtain one.

As the letter of 4 December 1978, which the honourable member has attached to this question, contains exactly the quotations used by his colleague in February, one can conclude that he is affording me the opportunity to say in the House what I told the media in February, which was as follows—

(a) The report referred to appears to be a copy of a report prepared for discussion at a public meeting on the North Stradbroke Island crossing, held on 9 March 1979.

(b) Copies of the report were made available to the public at that meeting and copies were subsequently made available to organisations which requested it. No record of a request for a copy

from the honourable member for Lytton or his parliamentary colleagues was ever found.

(c) The company referred to in this question could have obtained a copy or a reproduction from a number of sources, as it had been made public months previously.

(d) The company is incorporated in New South Wales.

(e) In November 1978 the New South Wales Commissioner of Consumer Affairs sought advice on the status of the proposed crossing. He was advised that information available to the Main Roads Department indicated that the proposal would not be economically feasible under present economic circumstances. He was further advised that it would be misleading to suggest that there is any prospect of a bridge link being provided to Russell Island in the foreseeable future.

On 5 November 1978, prior to the company's letter of 4 December 1978, I made a public statement that investigations had shown that the proposal to finance a crossing to North Stradbroke Island by development of land on the island would not be economically feasible at this stage.

In the light of all these factors, I propose no further action.

25. QUEENSLAND CEMENT & LIME
COMPANY LTD.

Mr. Mackenroth, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services—

With reference to The Queensland Cement & Lime Co. Ltd.'s new financial arrangements for the Gladstone project and his answers to the member for Salisbury on 5 April, under this agreement has Holderbank, an overseas company, been given a 25 per cent share in this Queensland company and also a guarantee of always maintaining at least that share and, if so, is that not in conflict with his claim that he is helping a Queensland-owned company?

Answer:—

The honourable member would no doubt appreciate that the expansion being undertaken by the Queensland company he has mentioned is on a large scale, requiring considerable funds in both equity and loan financing.

Holderbank of Switzerland, which is internationally recognised in the cement industry, has been actively associated with the company since 1972 in a technical assistance role. It has played, and will continue to play, a major role in the technical aspects of the Gladstone project. In addition, it is demonstrating its confidence in the venture by also participating directly in the financing programme.

Holderbank has not been "given", to use the honourable member's expression, a share in the Queensland company, but will be contributing equity funds and receiving a share placement. The actual percentage shareholding will vary according to the amounts taken up as financing of the project proceeds. The funding programme for the project is fairly complex and is set out in the statement recently forwarded to shareholders by the chairman of the company. I am arranging for a copy of this statement to be forwarded to the honourable member for his information.

I again repeat that the Government is encouraging a Queensland company to utilise and process Queensland resources to supply the needs of the Queensland market and provide continuing and increased employment for Queenslanders.

26. COMMONWEALTH-STATES HOUSING AGREEMENT FINANCE

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

What moneys were (a) claimed and (b) received from the Commonwealth Government under the 1945 Commonwealth-States Housing Agreement in each of the years from 1969-70 to 1974-75?

Answer:—

Year	Amount Claimed \$	Amount Received \$
1969-70 ..	151,312	151,312
1970-71 ..	141,877	141,877
1971-72 ..	123,399	123,399
1972-73 ..	239,190	239,190
1973-74 ..	482,163	430,387
1974-75 ..	895,277	230,511

27. PEST AUTHORITY DECISION ON DINGO FENCE

Mr. Turner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

Is he aware of the ever-increasing number of dingoes entering the dingo-free sheep areas of south-western Queensland through the deteriorating dingo barrier fence and, as this constitutes a very serious problem, what steps will be taken to induce the newly appointed single pest authority to make a speedy decision on the very important question whether the dingo barrier fence is to be repaired and retained or abandoned?

Answer:—

Yes, I am aware of the increased interest being shown in the future of the dingo barrier fence and I know that the chairman of the newly constituted Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board, Mr. R. W. Wicks, is also concerned about the condition and the future of the fence. It was only a few days ago that Mr.

Wicks and Mr. Donohue, the executive director of the board, mentioned the matter to me in conjunction with other discussions. I understand that the dingo barrier fence will be one of the major issues to be considered by the new authority and I think I can assure the honourable member that the board has every expertise within its membership to come up with a decision which would be in the best interests of the landholders who may be affected.

28. COST TO COMMERCIAL STATIONS OF A.B.C. NEWS BULLETINS

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

(1) Is he aware that from 1 April the Australian Broadcasting Commission increased charges to commercial radio stations that wish to broadcast A.B.C. radio news bulletins and, as this cost has been so excessive in the past, that many smaller radio stations in Western Queensland have been unable to purchase A.B.C. news bulletins and consequently people living in remote areas are being denied access to A.B.C. radio news?

(2) As 4ZR Roma was to discontinue this service as from 1 April owing to the astronomical cost increase from \$4,160 to \$14,550 annually, what steps will his Government take in an endeavour to secure a substantial reduction in these charges?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I am grateful to the honourable member for Warrego for bringing this matter to my attention and I have made representations to the appropriate authorities in regard to it.

29. COUNTRY FIRE BRIGADE BOARD COSTS

Mr. Turner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) Is he aware of continuing pressure to abolish country fire brigade boards and set up one State authority as is recommended by the United Fire Fighters Union, supposedly because of the cost of administration of the 81 fire brigade boards?

(2) As most country fire brigade boards would be similar to the Blackall board where total administration costs for 1977-78 were \$716.80 and no fees or expenses were paid to members of the board, how could any decrease in administration costs possibly occur through the abolition of country fire brigade boards?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I am aware that the secretary of the United Fire Fighters Union has made some ridiculous statements in connection with his union's proposal that there should be one State fire authority. In one television appearance, the view was expressed that most of the \$27,000,000

spent on fire brigades was for overheads. The fact is that about 83 per cent of the cost is involved in salaries, wages, superannuation contributions and pay-roll tax. Although there would be very few boards where members' expenses were not paid to some degree, administration costs for country boards represent 2.88 per cent of their 1978-79 budgets. Such costs include remuneration for full-time or part-time secretaries, board expenses, printing, stationery, telephones, postage and miscellaneous items. Local administration of boards is a great incentive to auxiliary fire brigade services upon which a large proportion of country towns are dependent and which cost less than 3 per cent of the salaries of full-time brigades.

30. NORMANTON HOSPITAL MATERNITY WARD

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

(1) Is he aware that the Normanton Hospitals Board has closed the maternity ward at the Normanton District Hospital to other than emergency cases?

(2) Why has the ward been closed?

(3) Does he realise that in an area in which almost 2,000 people live, excluding Kowanyama and Edward River, mothers-to-be are required to leave their homes and travel to either Cairns or Mt. Isa for several weeks for confinement, thus causing family disruption and hardship?

(4) When will the situation be remedied in order to restore to people in a remote area a service to which they are entitled?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) I have been informed by the Normanton Hospitals Board that since April 1978 maternity cases have gone to Cairns for delivery. These have numbered 12, of which only three were normal delivery, six were caesarean section and three were forceps delivery. There is no resident medical staff at the Normanton Hospital and it is unreasonable to expect nursing staff to accept the responsibility of dealing with complicated deliveries most of which would not become apparent prior to the onset of labour. The board has stated that the maternity section is still open for emergency cases but during 1978 there was no call for its use for such purposes. It is not proposed to disturb existing arrangements whilst there is no resident medical staff in Normanton.

31. EMERGENCY POWER SUPPLY FOR RICHMOND, JULIA CREEK AND COOKTOWN

Mr. Scott, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) As he stated in answer to a question on 22 March that augmentation of the generating capacity at Julia Creek will be

carried out to enable both Julia Creek and Richmond to be supplied with electricity during periods of interruption to transmitted supply, what is the total estimated cost of this proposed augmentation and when is the work expected to be completed?

(2) As a decision has been made by State Electricity Commission officers not to have similar augmentation work carried out at Cooktown, a centre that is in a worse position in terms of loss of transmitted supply than the above western centres, was the cost of carrying out the emergency generator installation at Cooktown estimated as part of the investigation of that proposal?

(3) What was the estimated cost?

(4) What are the various transmission voltages between Townsville and Julia Creek and have any estimates been prepared for increasing the transmission voltage between Hughenden and Richmond or Julia Creek?

(5) What are the numbers of consumers beyond Hughenden on the Julia Creek transmission line and beyond the Bloomfield River on the Cooktown transmission line?

(6) What is the maximum demand in kilowatts beyond each of these two points?

Answers:—

(1) The estimated cost of providing additional generating plant at Julia Creek Power Station is \$49,000. The work is expected to be completed by 30 June 1979.

(2) Yes.

(3) \$150,000.

(4) The transmission voltages are 66 000 volts between the coast and Hughenden and 33 000 volts between Hughenden and Julia Creek. The North Queensland Electricity Board has not formally investigated the question of increasing the transmission voltages between Hughenden and Richmond or Julia Creek.

(5) There are 785 consumers beyond Hughenden on the Julia Creek transmission line and 384 consumers beyond the Bloomfield River on the Cooktown transmission line.

(6) The maximum demand beyond Hughenden is 1 500 kilowatts and beyond the Bloomfield River is 500 kilowatts.

32. SPECIAL PROGRAMME SCHOOLS; DIMBULAH ACTIVITIES CENTRE

Mr. Scott, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Will he advise as to funds allocated in the last Budget as a specific Vote to his department for special programme schools, under which materials are purchased for use in facilities such as the Dimbulah Activities Centre?

(2) Is he aware that funds will not be available before 30 June for purchase of items such as art materials and journals and that there is concern about the availability of funds after that date?

(3) As the Dimbulah Activities Centre has been placed in an invidious position through the lack of these materials, what action is being taken to alleviate the situation?

Answers:—

(1) The amount separately appropriated through the last Budget for special programme schools was \$1,055,719.

(2) Yes, I am aware of the cash flow situation and that there has been some local concern about ongoing funding for certain consumable materials and journals.

(3) In all discussions preceding the establishment of the Dimbulah Activities Centre, there was never any agreement to provide such materials. However, some supplies of consumable materials and journals were made to ensure the initial success of the programme. As for all other special programme projects, it has always been expected that the community will assume some responsibility for such expenditure.

33. RUST DISEASE IN SUGAR-CANE

Mrs. Kippin, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) As it has been reported that pathologists with the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations expect rust disease to spread to all Australian sugar-growing areas this year, has the bureau made an assessment of the economic effect of this disease on the Australian sugar crop?

(2) Will the bureau recommend a treatment for the disease and, if so, does the bureau consider that it would be advantageous for farmers to attempt to combat rust disease?

Answers:—

(1) The economic assessment of the effect of rust on the Australian sugar crop has a high priority with the bureau. Evidence to date indicates that there have been few losses in the 1979 crop due to rust disease. However, the next few months are critical for sugar accumulation in the cane stalk. The incidence of rust is low at present, but it will be monitored carefully during the next few months, as it is possible that the rust may get worse in the maturing crop as cool, dry weather returns. The bureau will continue to monitor the situation throughout 1979 and 1980 so that a proper evaluation of the effect of the disease on sugar-cane can be made.

(2) The bureau does not recommend attempted treatment for the disease. At

present, the best method of combating rust disease is considered to be by the use of resistant varieties. A number of sugar-cane varieties, approved for planting in Queensland, show resistance to rust disease and the bureau will be releasing more resistant varieties. The first of these is Q113, which is being released in some far northern mill areas in 1979.

34. INCLUSION OF GYMNASTICS IN COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mrs. Kippin, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation—

(1) Is he aware that Queensland National Fitness clubs are concerned that gymnastics may not be included in the 1982 Commonwealth Games to be held in Brisbane?

(2) As the standing of Australian gymnastics was boosted when our competitors won a silver and a bronze medal in Edmonton last year and as it would now be a great setback not to take this opportunity to conduct in Queensland events of international standard, will he make every effort to have gymnastics included in the 1982 Commonwealth Games?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The honourable member will appreciate that the sports to be included in any Commonwealth Games programme are determined by the Commonwealth Games Federation well in advance of any Games year. The programme for the 1982 Games was put forward by the Australian Commonwealth Games Association to the federation at its meeting in Montreal in 1976, at which the 1982 Games were allotted to Australia and then to Brisbane. The Australian Commonwealth Games Association, in selecting the sports to be included in its recommendation to the federation, did give consideration to gymnastics but decided not to include it. As determined by the federation at Montreal, the 10 sports for Brisbane will be archery, athletics, badminton, boxing, cycling, lawn bowls, shooting, swimming and diving, weightlifting and wrestling. The two demonstration sports, which are not competitive events, will be Australian Rules football and table tennis. The decision made by the Commonwealth Games Federation on the Brisbane programme was entirely within its competence to make. All international sporting bodies were subsequently informed and arrangements have since proceeded accordingly. It might be observed that gymnastics as a sport is conducted in only seven out of the 48 countries which were eligible to compete at the 1978 Edmonton Games and that only five countries actually competed there.

35. NEW SOUTH WALES STREET-CONTROL
LEGISLATION

Mrs. Kippin, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) Has he had time to have examined the recently passed New South Wales legislation covering the control of people on the streets and, if so, is there any resemblance between the New South Wales legislation and the Queensland Statutes?

(2) Is the New South Wales legislation far more restrictive and despotic than the legislation of any other Australian State and, if so, can we expect to see an exodus of the professional agitators who attempt to disrupt life in Queensland, as they go to the rescue of the so-called "civil liberties" of New South Welshmen?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) On the information available to me, the New South Wales legislation would appear to be more restrictive than the corresponding Queensland Traffic Regulations, but I am not in a position to comment as to the position in other States. Based on Press reports, the New South Wales legislation involves substantial fines for obstructing traffic, power for police to forcibly move vehicles, automatic disqualification of a driver's licence and confiscation of offending vehicles.

The Schedule to the Queensland Traffic Act prescribes a variety of matters as subject-matters for regulations, including the improper use upon roads of vehicles and the prevention of obstruction of traffic on roads.

There is some resemblance to the obstruction provisions in the Queensland Traffic Regulations which in regulation 144 prohibits a driver of a vehicle upon any road from wilfully obstructing, hindering or preventing the free passage of any person, vehicle or train and in regulation 151 prohibits the placing upon any road of anything to the obstruction or danger of persons or traffic.

36. LOCAL AUTHORITY ROAD-WORKS
ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Lester, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) What guarantee can I give shires in the Peak Downs electorate that their road allocations will not be reduced?

(2) In view of the abolition of the road maintenance tax, will the allocations be increased?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I can assure the honourable member that there is no need for the concern which is evident in his question. As I indicated last week outside this

House, none of the local authorities in the Peak Downs electorate, nor any other local authority in Queensland, will be disadvantaged by the Government's decision to abolish the road maintenance tax.

37. BENEFITS TO LIVESTOCK HAULIERS
FROM ROAD TAX ABOLITION

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

In view of my continuing representations to him in trying to get a better deal for livestock operators and hauliers, what benefits will they gain from the abolition of road maintenance fees?

Answer:—

The carrier's operating expenses on any journey will be reduced by the amount which he would have had to pay by way of charges.

38. UPGRADING OF EMERALD-CAPELLA
ROAD

Mr. Lester, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

What urgent action will be taken to upgrade the road between Emerald and Capella, as sections of it have been destroyed by heavy transport vehicles taking mining equipment along the road, causing it to be dangerous to the extent that in some places the bitumen is as narrow as a family car?

Answer:—

The Main Roads Department is taking action to strengthen and widen sections of the highway which have deteriorated badly under the increased traffic. Work will commence as soon as the necessary plans are finalised and the resources and approvals obtained.

39. T.A.F.E. COLLEGES; PRINCIPALS AND
INCORPORATION OF ADULT
EDUCATION OFFICERS

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

With reference to the colleges of technical and further education and the incorporation of Adult Education—

(1) Were the former Adult Education district organisers promised major promotional opportunities and a reclassification of gradings prior to the take-over of Adult Education on 1 January 1977?

(2) How many applications for promotion have been received from former Adult Education officers since 1 January 1977 and how many such applicants have been successful?

(3) Is it impossible for these officers who have been reclassified at least in name as officers in charge of extension

programmes to ever achieve the position of principal of a college unless they return to Brisbane and progress through the ranks of Senior Education Officer and Principal Education Officer?

(4) What are the qualifications for appointment as a principal of a college of technical and further education?

(5) Can a deputy principal be promoted directly to principal and on how many occasions since 1 January 1977 has this occurred?

(6) How many (a) principals of technical and further education colleges and (b) officers in charge of extension programmes have tertiary degrees?

(7) Are there any grounds for the fear held by a number of former Adult Education officers that they are marked for no further promotion?

Answers:—

(1) Former Adult Education district organisers were not promised major promotional opportunities in specific terms, but were informed of the considered career promotional opportunities which would exist following the integration of Technical and Adult Education and that further promotions would be possible on the major bases of efficiency and suitability. They were also advised that following integration and the establishment of district colleges the classification of officers-in-charge would be reviewed with respect to the classified positions of the Technical Teachers' Award—State.

(2) Of former Adult Education officers who were transferred to positions within Technical and Further Education, 12 officers have applied for promotion and consequential positions. Four officers have been promoted and two officers have been appointed to consequential positions.

(3) No. It is not impossible for these officers to be appointed to the position of principal without returning to Brisbane. However, there is greater probability if they do so. Promotion for any T.A.F.E. position will be in open competition with other applicants and will depend on qualifications, aptitude, merit, diligence and good conduct, as for any other promotion in the State Public Service.

(4) Qualifications for appointment as a principal of a College of Technical and Further Education are as stated hereunder. The qualifications will be interpreted in respect of the particular activities existing in each particular teaching institution.

1. Possession of a suitable tertiary or other appropriate qualification reinforced by wide experience in technical and further education activities.

2. Knowledge of the Queensland education system generally with which is combined a particular and specific knowledge of technical and further education activities within the system.

3. A thorough knowledge of the activities and practices related to the various types of education associated with teaching institutions in technical and further education, together with experience in the administration and expert technical direction of several phases of such activities.

4. Proven ability to organise and administer the various sections and functions of a teaching institution in technical and further education.

5. Proven ability to stimulate, co-ordinate, control and direct staff associated with teaching in various fields of technical and further education.

6. Personal qualities and interests indicative of a capacity and suitability for the position.

(5) On occasions where this has occurred, it is considered the exception rather than the rule. Nevertheless, one deputy principal has been promoted directly to Principal Grade II.

(6) Eight principals of colleges of technical and further education hold tertiary degrees and 12 others hold tertiary qualifications. Six officers-in-charge hold tertiary degrees.

(7) No. There are no grounds for the former Adult Education officers to fear that they are marked for no further promotion.

40. IWASAKI PROJECT; INTERNATIONAL HOTEL LICENCE

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Has an application been made by the Japanese developer Mr. Iwasaki for an international hotel licence for his proposed tourist centre near Yeppoon?

(2) Was provision within the Queensland liquor laws for an international licence dropped in 1973 after there had been only one application, which did not proceed?

(3) Is provision for an international licence to be re-included in the Act and, if so, what advantages will it entail over and above the ordinary and existing hotel provisions in Queensland?

(4) When making an application for an international licence, what prerequisites must be met and reasons given?

(5) What stage has been reached in relation to the Iwasaki application?

Answers:—

(1) No application has been received by the Licensing Commission to this date.

(2) The provision for a licensed victualler's premises of an international standard was repealed by the Liquor Act Amendment Act 1973 which came into force on 18 February 1974.

(3 & 4) An amendment to the Liquor Act 1912-1978 relating to licences will be introduced into Parliament at the appropriate time.

(5) See answer to (1).

41. LATE LODGEMENT OF VALUATION OBJECTION

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey and Valuation—

With reference to the Valuation of Land Act and its provisions for a land-owner to lodge with the Valuer-General an objection within 60 days of issue of the revaluation of the unimproved value of the property in question, are there any circumstances under which an objection lodged after the statutory 60 days can be valid and, if so, what are the full details?

Answer:—

There are no circumstances under which an objection posted to or lodged with the Valuer-General after the statutory period of 60 days from the date of issue of the notice of valuation can be valid.

However, the Valuation of Land Act, in section 13 (2), does give the Valuer-General authority to amend valuations other than upon objection and/or appeal. I table a copy of the subsection.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

In tabling the document, I particularly draw attention to paragraphs (g) and (h). Under paragraph (g), the Valuer-General can alter a valuation if “in the opinion of the Valuer-General, circumstances affecting the valuation of the land are such as to render an alteration necessary or desirable for preserving or attaining uniformity in values between that valuation and subsisting valuations of other comparable parcels of land”.

Under paragraph (h), the Valuer-General can alter a valuation if “the valuation is affected by error or omission which the Valuer-General considers it necessary to correct.”

The Valuer-General does at times act under paragraph (g) to amend a valuation where an “out of time” objection has been lodged, or even when no objection against the valuation being amended has been made.

It is the practice of the Valuer-General to have an investigation made under section 13 (2) (g), even though an objector is out of time, when it seems just to do so. The honourable member for Rockhampton brought a case to my attention on 4 April 1978 and it was investigated in this way. And, of course, this has also been the practice when such cases were brought to the attention of my predecessors. For example, I refer to action taken at the honourable member's request in a letter of 7 March 1972.

Such requests are automatically passed on to the Valuer-General who can take corrective action under section 13 (2) (g) where investigations reveal that a particular valuation is out of line with a valuation of other comparable parcels of land. The Valuer-General can do this at any time.

Sometimes after objection proceedings or court decisions this position is discovered or created as a result of the decisions upon objection or appeal. If the Valuer-General considers that the reason underlining a reduction in the objection or appeal properties applies to other properties as well, he reduces the valuations of the other properties concerned. If he did not do so, inequity in rating would result.

Action under section 13 (2) (g) is recognised elsewhere in the legislation. Section 21B, inserted by the amending Act of 1974, provides that “an owner has no right of objection or appeal under this part against an alteration in a valuation made by the Valuer-General pursuant to paragraph (g) of Subsection 2 of Section 13 of this Act where such alteration constitutes a reduction in the valuation.”

There are differences between the Valuer-General's considering and giving a decision upon a valid objection and his acting under the provisions of section 13 (2) (g). In the case of the objection, the Valuer-General is obliged to consider the objection with all reasonable dispatch and may either disallow or allow it in such manner and to such extent as he deems proper. The land-owner can appeal to the Land Court against the Valuer-General's decision upon the objection but he must do so within 60 days of the issue of the notice of decision.

On the other hand, in the case of section 13 (2) (g) action is dependent in the first instance upon “the opinion of the Valuer-General”. If he does not so act, or if he does reduce a valuation under the provision being discussed, there can be no objection or appeal against his decision.

Under paragraph (h) of section 13 (2) the Valuer-General can amend a valuation because of error or omission. The Valuer-General must believe an error has occurred and he must consider it necessary to correct it. In an instance of this nature he issues a new notice of valuation, which carries the normal rights of objection or appeal. My earlier remarks also apply to section 13 (2) (h).

42. RETURN OF NORTHERN DIVISION RAIL WAGONS

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

(1) Is he aware of the cancellation of at least two cattle sales in North Queensland as a result of a shortage of “K” wagons in the Northern Division?

(2) Is he also aware that nearly 100 Northern Division wagons were being held and used in the Southern Division at the time of these cancellations?

(3) Whilst I am aware that he has moved swiftly to rectify this situation, will he ensure that in the future this discriminatory and unfair practice is not repeated and that all Northern Division wagons are immediately returned?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The Railway Department is faced at present with an unprecedented demand for livestock wagons and, as a result, has not been able to meet every request for the supply of these wagons. The Northern Division, in common with the remainder of the railway system, is sharing in this disability. It is anticipated that the problem will be overcome within the next one or two weeks.

43. DECREASE IN BARRAMUNDI CATCHES

Mr. Katter, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) Will he visit North Queensland to discuss at first hand the plight of land-based fishermen, who see our prime seafood, barramundi, slowly vanishing because of the lack of any control over sea-going fishermen who net barramundi during that fish's breeding season because the Gulf is closed to prawn trawling during this period?

(2) Is he aware that many leading seafood restaurants in Brisbane are serving king salmon as barramundi because of the impossibility of securing barramundi supplies, and that at least one shire council in the Gulf has already spoken out strongly on the issue of the vanishing barramundi?

Answers:—

(1) I regret that other commitments will prevent me from visiting North Queensland until some time after July. However, my Director of Fisheries will be going to Karumba and Cairns at the end of April and I have asked him to make time available to speak to land-based barramundi fishermen on their problems.

My Fisheries Service is aware of the increasing pressure being put on barramundi stocks and is currently carrying out a research programme on the fishery. This investigation is being co-ordinated with other barramundi research projects being conducted by the C.S.I.R.O. and the Northern Territory with a view to the introduction of sound management measures.

Pending the completion of these research programmes, interim closures were imposed in 1977 on many rivers in the Gulf of Carpentaria and Cape York regions and

patrol activities in these regions are being stepped up. It must be remembered, however, that the area involved is vast and difficult of access.

(2) I have received no authentic report of king salmon being served as barramundi in Brisbane restaurants.

44. LABOR GOVERNMENT MARKETING LEGISLATION

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

As the A.L.P. is presently trying to woo farmers in rural areas, will he, for the benefit of the newer members of the Opposition, put into proper perspective the real regard Labor has for the man on the land by quoting the iniquitous provisions of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts Amendment Act of 1951, more commonly known as the "Stand and Deliver" Act?

Answer:—

I do not propose to quote the somewhat lengthy and repugnant provisions of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act Amendment Act of 1951—the Act which was at the time commonly referred to as the "Stand and Deliver" Act. However, I table a copy of that amendment Act for the information of honourable members who are not familiar with it.

In his question, the honourable member refers to the fact that the present A.L.P. Opposition is endeavouring to woo the farming community, and I believe that it is desirable that that Act be made available to the farming community. We know that the A.L.P. is wooing without any response at present, and after a perusal of the Act and three years' experience under the Whitlam Government, the farming community will see that the present attitudes of the A.L.P. are no different from its attitudes in 1955.

I would point out, however, that the Act in question was introduced by the Labor Government of the time in an endeavour to compel marketing boards and their producers to supply produce to the Queensland market at prices which were unrealistically low because of the manner in which price control was administered in this State by the Labor Government. The net effect of the stand-and-deliver attitude of the then Government was that Queensland consumers were denied supplies of essential commodities. Producers quite justifiably, forwarded their produce to other States where price control measures were not applied in such an iniquitous fashion.

I would also inform honourable members that owing to an outcry by both producers and consumers the so-called stand-and-deliver provisions were repealed in 1955.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

AMENDMENTS TO JUSTICES ACT

Mr. CASEY: In view of the fears that have developed, particularly within the legal profession, in regard to last week's amendments to the Justices Act, the obvious division within Cabinet itself, and the fact that from last Thursday the changed law has enjoyed Royal assent, I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Will he, as a matter of urgency, recommit to this Parliament the contentious sections that relate to the changes to the Justices Act, with recommendations either of amendment or of withdrawal?

(2) Will he also recommend to the Minister in charge of the House that more time be allowed for consideration before debate after legislation is introduced in the Parliament, as has occurred in Canberra for more than 20 years, where a minimum of one week's adjournment is normally allowed between first and second readings?

(3) Will he undertake in future, in cases such as this involving complicated changes to law, to present to the Parliament at the time of introduction the opinion of the relevant Government experts, particularly where such an opinion expresses concern for aspects of the legislation, as we now learn it did on this occasion?

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn all honourable members on both sides of the House that the next member who interjects will be dealt with under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. LICKISS: I only wish that my vocal capacity was better than it is this morning as I answer the honourable gentleman's question. However, I welcome the question. It is passing strange that the honourable gentleman has seen fit to go outside of this place and say that he didn't know anything about the legislation passing through it. May I just put the record straight, because this is relevant to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition knew full well that that Bill was going through. I am informed that he was so advised at the time by the Justice spokesman for the Opposition.

Mr. Casey: Not the contents.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition that I will deal with him under Standing Order 123A if he interjects while a Minister is on his feet.

Mr. LICKISS: I am not breaching a confidence when I say that the honourable member for Rockhampton asked me, "Is it intended that the second reading of the Bill will proceed on Wednesday afternoon?" I said, "Yes, that is the clear intention." "Good", he said, "it is only a simple matter and the Opposition will be supporting it." I take it that within that period there was

ample discussion between the honourable member for Rockhampton and his leader. In fact discussion was taking place not only inside this Chamber but also in the lobby. That was observed by most honourable members.

That legislation was introduced into this Assembly in a normal manner. It went through all the requirements of the Government to be presented as Government legislation in this place. It was thoroughly supported in its formative stages, and it became Government legislation in the normal way. I stress that. The legislation was introduced into this Chamber in the normal way. It went through all the stages, and there was no member who could not have spoken at any stage of the debate—the introductory stage, the second reading, during the Committee stage and the formal third reading. In fact, at the formal third reading the Opposition could have moved for the disallowance of the whole Bill.

It is passing strange that this Parliament has to tolerate a situation where the Leader of the Opposition can come in here and pass off one front but go outside and pass off a holier-than-thou attitude by telling distinct untruths to the community at large. There would be harsher words for it, but parliamentary privilege will not allow it.

In direct answer to the honourable gentleman, let me say this: any Bill I, as Minister, introduce into this place will come into the Chamber in the normal way; it will be treated in the normal way; and every opportunity will be given for honourable members on both sides of the Chamber to fully debate it, and amend it if necessary.

I deplore the honourable gentleman's attitude. I only wish that for once in his life he would tell the truth for a change.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for questions has now expired.

PRIVILEGE

LEAVE TO MAKE PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (12.18 p.m.): I seek leave to make a personal explanation on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no debate on questions. The honourable member knows that as well as I do.

Mr. WRIGHT: I believe that when something that involves a member is raised the honourable member has to rise on that point immediately. I do not intend to prosecute a quarrel with the Minister, but I think that as my name has been used in his answer—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I assure the honourable member that he is not going to.

Mr. WRIGHT: I don't intend to, but I seek leave to speak to this matter on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! As far as I am concerned, there is no debate on questions, and I rule that there is no point of privilege. The honourable member can disagree with my ruling if he so desires.

Mr. WRIGHT: I don't intend to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I have been fair to both sides. I allowed time for the question to be asked and answered. I allowed the Minister time to finish what he had to say. If I had acted strictly, I should probably have chopped him off before the answer was completed, and then there would not have been any point of privilege to take. I tried to be fair. I have always done that while I have been Speaker, and I have no intention of changing that attitude now.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prosecute a quarrel with you, but I draw your attention to Standing Order 115, which clearly states—

“A Member may rise to speak to Order, or upon a matter of Privilege suddenly arising.”

I believe I do have a right to speak to this matter on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that there is no point of privilege.

REVOCATION OF STATE FOREST AREAS

Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT (Auburn—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources): I move—

“(1) That this House agrees that the proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act of:—

(a) All that piece or part of State Forest 168, parishes of Bendidee and Moogoon described as Area ‘A’ as shown on plan FTY 962 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of 884 hectares;

(b) All that piece or part of State Forest 28, parishes of Bailey, Bingmann, Clonmel, Coomnglah, Coppin, Rawbelle and Selene described as portion 61, parish of Clonmel, as shown on plan R.w.486 deposited in the Office of the Surveyor-General and containing an area of about 675 hectares;

(c) All that piece or part of State Forest 299, parishes of Conway and Dryander described as Area ‘A’ as shown on plan FTY 969 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 2 140 hectares;

(d) All that piece or part of State Forest 561, parish of Bribie described as portion 426, parish of Bribie as shown on plan Cg.3985 and portions 536 and 550, parish of Bribie as shown on plan Cg.3815, both plans deposited in the Office of the Surveyor-General and containing an area of about 1 251 3 hectares;

(e) All that piece or part of State Forest 461, parishes of Ellerbeck, Glenbora and Meunga described as Areas ‘B’, ‘C’, ‘D’, ‘E’, ‘F’, and ‘G’ as shown on plan FTY 936 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and portion 29, parish of Ellerbeck, as shown on plan C.wl.1773 deposited in the Office of the Surveyor-General and containing in total an area of about 119·03 hectares.

(f) All that piece or part of State Forest 611, parishes of Beerwah, Canning and Toorbul described as Area ‘A’ as shown on plan FTY 996 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 180 hectares; and

(g) All that piece or part of State Forest 832, parishes of Bingera, Booyal, Electra, Eureka, Gregory and Stanton described as Areas ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’ and ‘D’ as shown on plan FTY 1008 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 286·8 hectares—

be carried out.

“(2) That Mr. Speaker convey a copy of this Resolution to the Minister for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council.”

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (12.26 p.m.): In speaking to this motion, I seek from the Minister some information concerning it. Some time ago I wrote to him asking for details of the notice of motion standing in his name.

The motion contains the description of a large area of land either owned or controlled by the Queensland Government. In reply to my letter, the Minister stated quite openly the details of the proposal. It is a proposal to swap some land with A.P.M. Forests Pty. Ltd., which intends to establish a pulp mill in the Caboolture area. It is seeking an appropriate site and has inspected several locations.

We know now that one of the proposals is to excise an area of 180 hectares from State Forest 611, parishes of Beerwah, Canning and Toorbul, and swap that for some land owned by A.P.M. Forests Pty. Ltd.

The land concerned carries stands of slash pine, which were planted by the Forestry Department in 1957, and the A.P.M. land

has some younger pine. The Minister suggested what he would do and set out the reasons why he supported the proposal.

I am concerned about this matter because of recent Press reports attributed to the Premier concerning the establishment of a pulp mill by a joint venture in which one of the parties will be a South Korean company, or maybe even the South Korean Government. I am not too sure which it is, but certainly it is partly a South Korean venture. The Premier said that this Korean/A.P.M. venture, worth \$300,000,000, would be in the Petrie area. He also said that the Australian market was too small for a large new wood-pulp industry but that Australia had the resources to develop the project for export. He added that exports would go to Korea and that they would comprise not pulp jelly but sheets of board and so on.

In the motion we find from inquiries outside this House that an area of land is to be allocated for the establishment of a pulp mill; we were not told about this pulp mill; we were simply provided with a notice of motion containing a number of paragraphs lettered (a) to (g). It was not until the Minister, outside the House, was asked for details of the proposal that we discovered the intention to establish a pulp mill. He has still not informed this Parliament.

On top of that, we find that the proposal embodies the possibility of exporting pulp or even woodchip overseas. I believe that we are heading for another Fraser Island situation. The Premier is rushing in to secure a major export industry. However, as we now know following the Fraser Island controversy, Federal Government approval is needed before a new export industry can come into operation. Furthermore, proper environmental studies must be carried out and the findings made public so that all Australians are aware of the pros and cons of the proposal.

The Minister, in notes that he supplied to me outside the Chamber says that he supports the company in its proposal and has entered into an agreement which, subject to the acceptance by Parliament of this excision proposal, will enable the project to proceed.

That means, in other words, that the Government of the State has entered into an agreement without telling the people what it is all about. It has made no public announcement of environmental impact studies. It has entered into a secret agreement concerning an industry that has caused grave public concern. As late as 9 January 1979, woodchipping and wood-pulping were referred to in "The Bulletin" on page 34 as "the pack rape of our forests".

Mr. Hansen: That is a very conservative paper.

Mr. BURNS: It is a very conservative publication. One of the points made very clearly in this article, and in a number of

other articles by our forestry service and other people, is that wood chips are just shredded trees. They are described as small fragments of timber; an early stage in the conversion of wood to pulp for the manufacture of paper and paperboard. We are aware of those facts. The wood chip industry is part of the pulp-wood industry.

The Senate inquiry into the woodchip industry looked into the whole question of woodchip and wood-pulp and said that there was nothing wrong with a continuation of the domestic pulp industry; if it was only for domestic purposes it could see no reason for concern. But this is not for domestic purposes. This is an export proposal. The Premier was reported as saying that in "The Courier-Mail", and in the "Telegraph" of Saturday, 24 February 1979. On 23 February, the day before, the headline "Joh optimistic for Wood Pulp" appeared. Many statements were made by the Premier when referring to the Koreans and the export of wood-pulp. That is not in accordance with what the Senate committee of inquiry found when it said that we should go ahead with the domestic wood-pulp industry. We are talking about an export wood-pulp industry. In recent years, headline after headline has referred to the problems created by clear felling of large areas.

I am told that clear felling is necessary to provide sufficient woodchip for pulp material for a mill to be economic. A plant with large capacity is necessary if it is to be competitive with overseas producers. A 1974 report indicated a minimum annual capacity of 300 000 tonnes of pulp. In January 1978, Ian Ferguson of the Department of Forestry at the A.N.U., Canberra, said that 300 000 tonnes would seem low by current overseas standards, even as a minimum figure.

Warren and Lambert Hyne—Maryborough boys born and bred—of Hyne's sawmills and timber yards are entwined in Maryborough's history, just as an original Hyne in 1889, as the member for the Maryborough district, wrote his name into our State's Forestry Department's history with one of the first motions for the creation of a Department of Forestry. Hyne & Sons is a well-respected, long-established sawmilling organisation. It was a party to a proposed woodchip export project based on hardwood sawmill residue. This company and Wilson Hart, another long-respected Maryborough sawmilling firm, engaged consultants to look into the possibility of establishing an export chip plant at Port Alma or Gladstone in Central Queensland to chip the waste resources of all the sawmills from Maryborough to Rockhampton and out to Theodore. After they had spent about \$40,000—I do not know the exact figure—it was found not to be a viable proposition. They could only expect 70 000 tonnes per year and they needed at least 100 000 tonnes. They looked into woodchipping old trees to make up the residue, but that was not feasible.

I am talking about hardwood. About 45 per cent of a hardwood log should become saleable timber. In other words, 55 per cent is wasted. I do not know the outcome of the C.S.I.R.O. tests of a couple of years ago to determine whether it was feasible to make charcoal from sawdust and other waste by reducing it to powder and using it as an extender to furnace oil, but in the light of the energy crisis and the virtual daily escalation in petrol and oil prices, this could be a boon to the sawmilling industry. It would involve hardwood. The saving of money by this means, if it worked, would amount to many millions of dollars in overseas funds. Whilst we use only about 45 per cent of hardwood logs, we can use up to 100 per cent of the woody fibre in pine logs.

My eyes were opened when I looked at this article in "The Bulletin", which reads, in part—

"It is not widely realised, for example, that woodchips are not produced by simply chewing up odds and ends of wood, like a mixed salad. Woodchips are not made, and in fact cannot be made, from forest leftovers—tree crowns cut from timber logs, side branches, bark, or stumps.

"The requirements of the Japanese mills (one of the biggest importers) are quite specific and very strict. They will not accept burned or charred wood, because the carbon discolours the paper. They will not accept any bark with the chips, because this cannot be satisfactorily pulped. They want only a few preferred species of hardwoods that have the right length of wood fibre, and not too high a content of kino (gum)."

We have looked at the hardwoods, and now we should consider the softwoods. I have been trying to get figures in relation to them but, unfortunately, I was unsuccessful. We have an agreement with New Zealand relating to softwoods. New Zealand has initiated an ambitious programme of massive plantings, and stresses that it can produce softwood more cheaply and rapidly than is possible in Australia.

In 1977 there were reports that a pulp operation of some sort would commence in the early 1980s in the area we are talking about, where the Government is now undertaking negotiations with the Koreans. I am told that Woodland Limited had the right to large volumes of pulpwood coming forward and a commitment to complete a feasibility study by a certain date. I want to know if it has been completed and what it showed. The "Australian Forest Industry Journal" of October 1977 referred to the Queensland pine resources and said—

"Tuan-Toolara: The Department of Forestry, Queensland has granted Woodland Limited first call on approximately 300,000 cubic metres of pulpwood for a pulp mill to be set up in the Gympie area in 1985."

Remarkably enough, that is the date when this proposal is to start.

"Two particleboard mills are now operating, one in Brisbane and the other in Gympie. In the agreement with Woodland provision has been made for integrated utilisation of pulpwood, sawlogs, and round timbers for poles, etc.

"Beerburum: These plantations continue to supply mill logs to a number of small sawmills but a recent development has been the start-up of a large new sawmill at Caboolture by Wilkinson Pine Pty. Ltd. There is also a relatively small commitment of pulpwood to A.P.M. Ltd's pulpmill at Petrie and expansion can be anticipated in this direction in the future."

It there mentions a number of small sawmills and the new large sawmill of Wilkinson Pine. In Tasmania, because of the operation of woodchip, which as I say is part of the wood-pulp industry, some sawmills are closing down as they can no longer get timber in competition with the chip mills.

I suppose the argument will be put to us that this is going to create employment; so let us have a look at what employment will be created. First, I wonder how long we will continue sending pulp to Korea if we have to employ at our rates 1,100 people that the Premier says will be employed. I asked for a comparison of rates, which I have converted to U.S. dollars for convenience, between Australia and Korea. In the printing and publishing industry—an industry that is associated with paper products—an Australian gets \$232.56 a week and a Korean gets \$33.94. That is about seven to one. In the food industry it is \$218.87 for an Australian and \$25.43 for a Korean. I cannot believe that the Koreans will continue to employ Australians at seven times their wage rate to pulp the product here. After a while they will suggest that we send woodchip to Korea, where they have cheaper wages, and their pulpwood plants over there will process it. That is business. That is not an argument of ecology or environment. That is a straight business argument. It will be seven times cheaper to do it that way.

Mr. Yewdale: The Japanese did it with shipbuilding.

Mr. BURNS: Indeed they did.

On the one hand, the Premier is reported in the newspaper to have said that under this proposal we will have jobs for 1,100 people. The chip mill at Eden has a licence to export up to 750 000 tonnes of woodchip a year. We were told before that it was not feasible for a mill to operate with an output of about 300 000 tonnes. The mill at Eden employs 130 people, with another 270 in the logging and haulage operation. That brings the total for that mill, which has an export quota of 750 000 tonnes a year, to 400. Last year, when the Japanese importers asked for a scaling down of exports because of an over-supply in their own country, the logging and

haulage contractors, totalling two-thirds of the work-force, found themselves facing bankruptcy. They had hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of equipment on lease or under hire-purchase lying idle. This placed them in an untenable position. They have little security of employment.

What I am suggesting is that today, through an item innocently appearing on our Business Paper, we could be accepting a proposal for a wood-pulp and woodchip industry at Beerburum or Caboolture on the near North Coast. I do not believe that is the way it should be introduced into this Parliament. I do not believe that the Parliament of Queensland should be making a decision, on the Minister's say-so, on a proposal he admits he has accepted and endorsed. These are his words—

“As the establishment of a viable pulp-mill on this locality will be of benefit to the Department and the State I have supported the Company in their proposal and have entered into an agreement which, subject to this excision proposal being accepted by Parliament, will enable this proposal to proceed.”

So he has entered into an agreement, and the only notification we have is this list of six or seven items on the first page of the Business Paper today. Nowhere is it said that by agreeing to the excision proposal this Parliament will agree to the establishment of a pulp or chip mill in that area. All it suggests is that we are excising 180 ha of land from one section of a State forest.

At this stage, the information supplied by the Minister refers only to land changing hands, with each party managing its own plantation till 1985. Forestry experts advise that the period from the decision to invest to the commencement of production is at least three years, probably more, and markets can fluctuate markedly over such a period. Yet we are told in 1979 of plans for a mill in 1985; or is that only a blind? Will it end up, I wonder, as a woodchip proposal? Capital costs are high, and in the 1975-1980 period, as reported by forestry journals, overseas investment will total \$50,000 million, and that will be spent on new pulp capacity overseas. Japan has said it will not need additional supplies of pulpwood or woodchip until 1980, and that time could be extended to 1985. Recent developments have led to reductions in the levels of future consumption forecasts for wood products, especially for paper products. Clearly the period of rapid expansion of the Japanese and European markets is over.

I draw the attention of members to an article in “The Australian Financial Review” of July last year which was headed, “Where timber exports can't see the wood for the trees”. The first paragraph reads—

“Export prospects for Australia's timber, pulp and paper industries appeared gloomy, a member of the forestry department of the Australian National University, Dr. I. S. Ferguson, said on Tuesday.”

The article further stated—

“Prospects for developing export markets for paper products by Australia, New Zealand and developing countries of the Asia-Far East region were still remote.”

Now, here is New Zealand, which states it can produce more softwood and do it cheaper than we can, lumped together with Australia, six months ago in an article stating that the prospects for exports are remote. Yet here we have sneaked—I have to use that word; there is no other—into this House and placed on the Business Paper in this form a notice concerning the establishment of a pulpwood factory here. As I said, we will end up just as we did with Fraser Island. I wonder if the Government has asked the Federal Government whether it would agree to the issue of export licences for this proposed factory. Have the proper environmental studies been carried out? Have members noticed advertisements calling for public comment or input to an environmental study in the area? I wonder if the people there want it?

Mr. Frawley: Of course they do. They all want it up there.

Mr. BURNS: All right. Of course we want work for the mills, but let us make sure that in the final result we do not end up with an area clear felled, as has happened at Eden. If we do, we will face the problems of soil erosion and leaching that destroyed large areas of New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia. Many of those in the forestry industry—the small sawmillers, loggers and others—and the farmers who live in areas where woodchipping has been carried out are today its most vocal and outspoken critics.

So what we want to know, before we get the jobs for those fellows, is that it is not going to destroy some of those beautiful areas on the near North Coast that the honourable member for Caboolture and others represent. Will it provide security of employment? We should be given this information before a proposal of this sort is brought into the Parliament in the way in which this one has been introduced. If that is a satisfactory way of carrying out the business of Government and of making a decision on the development of a new pulp industry in this State, then I am concerned at the standards that are being laid down. There are a couple of questions that I would like to have answered by the Minister.

Mr. Ahern: Are you aware of the difference between pulp and chips?

Mr. BURNS: Yes, I am. I tried to explain that before to the honourable member. He is chairman of the Select Committee on Education but, unfortunately, he has not been very well educated.

Mr. Ahern: I will give you a bit later.

Mr. BURNS: The honourable member can give me a bit later; that will be O.K. I searched through all the dictionaries, and over the week-end I had many contacts with people in the woodchipping and wood-pulping industries and they told me that in this process the trees are chipped and pulp is eventually made from the chips.

I made the point before that Korean wages are one-seventh of Australian wages. If only 400 people are employed in a 750 000 tonne per year woodchip mill in Eden and we say that we will employ 1,100 people—700 more—at a smaller mill in Caboolture, I believe the Koreans will be saying to us within a very short period, “We can employ those 700 people in Korea for one-seventh of your costs, so all we want you to supply in future is chip and we will pulp over here.” It is no good Government members arguing that they will put something into the agreement, because we would not even have known about the agreement if we had not asked the Minister for an explanation of this excision proposal. He would not even have told this Parliament that it was going to happen.

I have some questions to ask the Minister. Will planted exotic pine plantations on the Sunshine Coast be fed into woodchips, followed by native hardwood forests from Mapleton, the Conondale Ranges and the Woodford State Forests? If the company has to undertake clear felling, will it be able to do so? Did the Forestry Department make a survey of potential woodchip material in the native forests of Mapleton, the Conondale Ranges and the Woodford State Forests, employing men from the survey section of the Forestry Department at Beerburrum? What provision will be made to control pollution, erosion and over-use of existing transport facilities? Will the field and factory operations of a woodchip (export) industry affect environmental assets vital to the Sunshine Coast tourist industry? Why is it now possible to export forests in the form of woodchips when Australians have been told for decades that our softwood resources are inadequate, and softwood forests were planted to meet our own requirements?

On that point, the Forestry Department, even in its last report, made the point that the Federal Liberal and National Party colleagues of members opposite have reduced the amount of money available for softwood plantings. In the future they will make money available for maintenance only—and we are told we are short of softwoods. No-one is arguing that we do not import a tremendous amount of timber from overseas.

Mr. Ahern: We are not short of softwoods.

Mr. BURNS: Well, have a look at the list of imports. If I had enough time, I would find it for the honourable member. The pulpwood removals in this State last year totalled 105 963 cubic metres gross. If this pulp mill is going to be of export standard

and to be economic by world standards, it will need to have an output of more than three or four times that amount. If that is all we took out last year, we will have to take more than three or four times that amount out of the area up there. It will not come out of sawmill waste, as someone tried to tell me, because that would be impossible. It will come out of the clear felling of large areas of land. As soon as that is done, there will be the erosion problems and the environmental problems mentioned in the report of the Senate standing committee.

I think I have said enough. Some members opposite are now going to speak on this matter. The Minister did not give one word of explanation today. All he did was stand up and say, “I move notice of motion No. 5”. That is the whole explanation that this Government believes the people of Queensland deserve or are entitled to on a proposal of this magnitude. To me that smells.

Mr. FRAWLEY (Caboolture) (12.47 p.m.): I did not really intend to speak today, but seeing that this proposal affects my area I will say a few words about it. The honourable member for Lytton wants to create more unemployment in the Caboolture, Landsborough and Beerburrum areas by preventing the establishment of this industry. He is doing exactly what was done regarding Fraser Island, but we are not going to allow any mob of ratbag conservationists to stop this industry from being established in this area.

The Landsborough Shire Council wrote to me and asked me to make representations to the Minister to ensure that this industry was established in the area. I am familiar with this area of State forests north of Elimbah. This is the most suitable place to establish this mill. It has adequate water and power, it is near the Bruce Highway and there are many pine trees in the area. I can see nothing wrong with the proposal.

The member for Lytton tried to say that the Minister has attempted to pull the wool over the eyes of this Parliament. Nothing of that nature has happened. I have been fully acquainted with the proposal from the word go. The people in my electorate trust me because they know that I am not afraid to stand up and say what I mean, unlike some of the lily-livered, chicken-hearted politicians who appeared on the television programme “Nationwide” last night and sat on the fence, and who could have knocked back the amendment to the Justices Act. At least I have the guts to stand up and say what I think. I supported that amendment to the Justices Act, and I would do the same again. As far as I am concerned, A.P.M. Forests has done a lot of good in the electorate of Caboolture. By the way, it owns 11 per cent of the freehold land in the Caboolture Shire.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: They reckon you got a backhand for it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I have never had a backhander from A.P.M. I have never taken a backhander from anybody, but I have handed out many backhanders. As a matter of fact, I have been offered money by people on more than one occasion to do certain things.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the motion.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I just want to get the record straight.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Frawley, could I just ask you a question?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I told the honourable member the other day: tomtits keep out of it; just let the eagles get up. So he should keep a back seat.

A.P.M. Forests has been studying the feasibility of establishing this mill for a long time.

Mr. Burns: Tell the people of your electorate about it.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I have told the people in my electorate about it. I am prepared to stand up during the next State election campaign and make this part of my policy so that the people know where I stand.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: As an Independent?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I would win the seat as an Independent.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. FRAWLEY: If the honourable member would come up and stand against me, I would be pleased to resign now and contest the seat as an Independent.

As the Minister told the House, many areas have been investigated, but the most desirable site is at Beerburum, just north of Elimbah, in my electorate. In fact, most of the state forest in that area is in the Landsborough Shire.

I cannot see anything wrong with exchanging this 180 ha of land with A.P.M. There is nothing underhand about it. I knew about it; the Minister rose in this Chamber and spoke about it. The honourable member for Lytton is only trying to draw a red herring across the path, and "a red herring" is a very apt phrase, too. In the case of Fraser Island, what assistance did he give the people of Maryborough who were put out of work? Who is running the State of Queensland? The Federal Government, or the Government of this State? The Government of Queensland is running it, and it should stand up and tell the Federal Government to go and jump in the lake, that it is going to establish this industry in Beerburum and provide some employment for the people of the area.

The Caboolture Shire Council also encourages the establishment of industries of this type in my electorate, and I invite honourable members to consider those that have come there. It is now the fastest-growing shire in Queensland. I am open to correction on that statement; perhaps the Redland Shire is growing a little bit faster. Nevertheless, Caboolture is a fairly large shire and it needs more population. My electorate has a total area of 700 sq. miles; I have not bothered to convert that to square kilometres yet.

I support the Minister in every way on this proposal, and I have no hesitation in saying that it will be of great benefit to both the Caboolture Shire and the Landsborough Shire. It will provide a great deal of employment, and I think that A.P.M. is to be commended for going ahead and establishing the industry.

In conclusion, I say again that if anyone thinks the Government is going to let a mob of ratbag conservationists stop this, he has another think coming.

Mr. HANSEN (Maryborough) (12.52 p.m.): I support the proposals that the Minister has put forward, with the exception of the one mentioned by the honourable member for Lytton, who is the Opposition's spokesman on land matters. We are not being told enough about that proposal, and the happenings last week give a fair indication that members of Parliament should ask more questions about what is happening.

When the honourable member for Caboolture speaks about ratbag conservationists, does he include Malcolm Fraser? He was the man who made the decision on Fraser Island. I remind the House that it was the Liberal-National Party Federal Government that made that decision, and it, not the conservationists, will make any future decisions. If the Federal Government is of the same opinion as it was about Fraser Island, the Queensland Government will not have any say in the granting of export licences. These are the facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we, as members of Parliament, should face up to the facts.

The transfer of land is a simple matter; there is nothing to it. In this instance, 180 ha of land is involved, and arrangements about the value of timber on it are to be made in due course. However, I believe that we must look at the proposal a little more closely and try to find its real purpose.

I admit that my interest may be more parochial than that of the honourable member for Lytton, because I would not like to see the forest areas of Tuan, Toolara, Imbil and the Mary Valley denuded to feed a pulp mill at Caboolture. My understanding of pulp mills is that they need a tremendous volume of water, and I do not know whether sufficient water is available in that vicinity.

No-one knows anything about that. All we know now is that the land is going to be passed over.

Mr. Powell: They could use Pumicestone Passage.

Mr. HANSEN: If they use Pumicestone Passage, I am sure that many of the constituents of the honourable member for Landsborough will not vote for him if he supports such a proposal.

Although water is very necessary in the manufacture of pulp, the manufacture of woodchip is a completely different matter. The word "pulp" has been used, and the fact that last February the Premier made an announcement about the Koreans coming in on a \$300,000,000 pulp plant makes one wonder what is to happen. It ties in with the proposal that the forest land in question here is to be exchanged with A.P.M. as a site for a pulp mill. I question whether the establishment of a pulp mill there is what is going to happen. Will it be a chip mill? Not so much water is needed for a chip mill. The Parliament should be better informed about what is proposed.

Many people believe that greater use should be made of forest waste. In the woodchip industry the toppings, the crowns, the branches and the stumps are not used. That industry requires the long-fibre timber that is being used as mill timber. The annual report of the Department of Forestry indicates that over the last year there was an increase of about 4 per cent in the amount of mill timber used. As many small mills have closed down because of lack of viability, their allocations of forest timber have been transferred to the larger mills to keep them going.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Would you like to see a pulp mill established in Maryborough?

Mr. HANSEN: I would like to see one anywhere around there, but I would not like to see the forests denuded for an enterprise such as this. I think we are getting something loaded on to us, and I would need to have more details about the proposal before I agreed to the transfer of this land. We are entitled to that information. Anyone who does not think so has not been watching what has been happening about this place in the last week.

My interest is, to some extent, a local one. The Forestry Department report indicates that in the Brisbane forestry area there is about 16 340 ha of land; in the Gympie area there is 32 556 ha planted with pine forest; and in the Maryborough district there is 24 238 ha. More land will be planted with pine in the area of Isis, just north of Maryborough. So in the Gympie/Maryborough area the land under forestry is at least four times greater than that in the Brisbane area. The undertaking given by Woodlands was referred to by the honourable member for Lytton. My understanding of it is that at this stage that company is only looking at

the feasibility of establishing a pulp mill or a similar enterprise about 1985, which, incidentally, was the year mentioned for the Korea/A.P.M. project. I believe that we are entitled to more information than has been conveyed to us so far. It is not just a simple land transaction. A proposal has been put forward, and we will be asked, as many members were asked yesterday, "What did you do then? What did you know about the enterprise at that particular time?" We should be given further information about the project.

I am not knocking A.P.M. for what it is doing; I am not knocking the Koreans; but what about the wage structure at the primary stage of the manufacture of pulp, which will be what the Koreans are looking for? If the project is of a substantial nature, there will be exports of its products. The Premier has acknowledged that. In that event we are not dealing with conservationists but a hard-headed Federal Government that will be making a decision on the matter.

I would ask the Minister to inform the House what investigations have been carried out. What are the proposals? How much is this tied up with the project detailed by the Premier? How will it affect the Woodlands project? This is of vital importance to me and the jobs of the people in that area.

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

Mr. KRUGER (Murrumba) (2.15 p.m.): I have read with interest the very brief outline of the proposal as put forward by the Minister in the document that he gave us. As earlier Opposition speakers said, he has told us virtually nothing.

The area referred to in paragraph (d) of the motion is only very small. I am wondering whether the Forestry Department had considered the possibility of retaining that area and negotiating with the Main Roads Department for the establishment in it of a roadside park. Reference is made to the selling or other disposal of that land, and to negotiations. I am concerned at the possibility of its sale or lease to private enterprise. I hope that it can be put to better use for the benefit of those persons who visit the North Coast. As I say, the area is a small one, and it could be converted into an attractive little park. I should like the Minister to consider this point in his deliberations.

Mr. Frawley: It's only 1.25 ha.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order!

Mr. Frawley: I want some information.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KRUGER: That's all right, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I will not worry too much about the gentleman on the other side who calls himself a "ratbag conversationalist".

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: He used to shoot and skin koalas.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Murrumba is going to refer to another honourable member, he will do so in the proper manner.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Wolston said I used to shoot and skin koalas. I object to that comment and want it withdrawn.

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

Mr. KRUGER: I take your point, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

To get back to the motion—it is proposed to swap a block of land for one held by A.P.M. Forests Pty. Ltd. By 1985, the year in which the company would want to use the timber on the land for its pulp mill, it will be available for sawlog production. If the Government does not retain control of the land, it should ensure that any deal entered into does not result in the people of Queensland losing out. Perhaps a satisfactory deal could be arrived at. However, we do not know too much about it from the information provided by the Minister.

As the Opposition spokesman pointed out earlier, it is possible that instead of a pulp mill the company will establish a chip mill and export its product overseas, where wages are much lower than they are in Queensland. Matters of that type should be made public. As in the case of Bills presented recently, the Opposition is not quite sure about the ramifications of this proposal. It is up to us to find out as much as we can, so I hope that the Minister will come clean.

Reference has been made to the equity of valuation of plantations. I stress that here, too, the people of Queensland should be fully covered. It is up to the Government to ensure that the people derive full benefit from forests that were planted some years ago, in 1957.

In the notes handed to the honourable member for Lytton by the Minister mention is made of the fact that the company did not wish in the early stage of the pulp mill project to incur the financial outlay that would be required, and so on, and that A.P.M. Forests Pty. Ltd. particularly wanted land. I sometimes wonder why the Queensland Government jumps to attention as soon as a company indicates that it wants something. It seems to me that big companies in Queensland and the coalition Government are part and parcel of the one operation. If a company is not as big as A.P.M., it does not get the same consideration.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: It is a company Government.

Mr. KRUGER: It is. I believe that A.P.M. and similar big companies get a fair and reasonable go.

I am interested in whether the production from this proposed mill is to be sold in Australia or whether it is to be exported. Statements made this morning indicate that it is quite possible the material will be exported by A.P.M. to overseas countries. If A.P.M. gets the go ahead from the Federal Government to export, I hope that will not mean that the people, and this country, do not get a fair and reasonable share of the income derived from the export operations.

Mr. Frawley: What about the employment created for people in Caboolture?

Mr. KRUGER: I will be talking about that later.

It seems to me that the major consideration will be benefits for A.P.M. In the present economic climate, very few companies in Australia are concerned about doing something for the good of the country. In this instance, the company is concerned about benefiting A.P.M. While it may be said that it will be great for the people of Queensland and the rest of Australia if the chip mill goes ahead, when it is all boiled down, it will be found that it is pretty good for A.P.M.

Mr. Austin: Why shouldn't it be?

Mr. KRUGER: That is a typical comment from a Liberal member of Parliament.

I do not begrudge any organisation a fair and reasonable return. But I do object to companies ripping off the people of Queensland, as has happened with so many companies in this fine State of ours.

I trust that the State Government has ensured that this mill is to be established in the right place, and has given major consideration to the employment that will be created. I do not believe that A.P.M. has given any consideration to whether or not it will be providing jobs for Queenslanders. By going there, A.P.M. will create some jobs, but it will be looking for profits from the efforts of the workers. It will not be concerned about how many people get jobs. Years ago, when A.P.M. started at Petrie, about half the working population of Kallangur, Petrie and Lawnton were employed at the mill. After buying up all the land available around Petrie, and the hills of Dayboro, company operations became more automated through the introduction of machinery that reduced the number of workers necessary. I understand that that massive mill now operates with a staff of about 24. The number of workers at the Petrie mill would be about a quarter of the number employed when it opened about 26 years ago. Likewise, with the chip mill, a certain number of people could be employed, then automation could take over. In that event, the company would not do anything to ensure that the workers laid off were found employment.

The member for Caboolture spoke of the great job done by the company. In certain circumstances that is so. The company did a good job at Petrie when it started, but I point out that it owned quite a lot of land in the Pine Shire. The Valuer-General's valuation of that land seems to be set at a minimum. In one instance when the Pine Shire asked the Valuer-General if any objections were being made to valuations it was told, "No, you can go ahead and strike your rates." Some months later the shire was told that A.P.M.'s valuations had been reviewed and reduced substantially. Several thousand dollars were involved. That meant that the Pine Shire's budget was upset. The company had an inside run and had valuations reduced after the closing time for objections. It seems to me that something goes on between the Government and some of these major companies. If a company is able to do that sort of thing, the people of Queensland should not have to suffer in any way.

It is to be hoped that any excisions or transfers of land from our forests are of advantage to the people of Queensland. This should be foremost in our minds. If the Minister had made an introductory speech and had told us something about the circumstances, we would be in a position to make a judgement; but, with nothing put forward, I can only think that there will not be any advantage to the people of Queensland. There may be; I sincerely hope so. When we are dealing with such companies, we have to get the best out of the negotiations. We cannot let a company ride roughshod over us so that it gets the whole advantage of the deal.

The member for Caboolture said that A.P.M. holds 11 per cent of the land in the Caboolture area. If that is true, I wonder how the Caboolture Shire Council fares in matters such as rates and valuations. I wonder just how great an asset that company is. If the company is to operate in that area and it is to be of advantage to the community, employment should be considered. The Government should have checked to make sure that that is the best area for a mill to be situated. If studies had been made, it could quite easily have been found that the mill should have been established in Petrie, near the other mill, or at Dayboro or Elimbah. There are quite a few areas that I could name. We are dealing here with Elimbah, of course, but it need not necessarily have been on this block of land.

It seems to me that there has been no major study carried out by A.P.M., except looking around, possibly considering a water supply and proximity to a railway line, and then thinking, "That is the size block we need." We are talking about 180 ha, which is not a small area. It seems a very large piece of land for just a pulp mill.

Mr. Ahern: They are exchanging, of course, aren't they?

Mr. KRUGER: Yes, they are exchanging this block of land.

I believe that something more is needed than A.P.M.'s saying, "We want to exchange this piece of land of ours for your piece of land." I believe that the Government should look closely at the matter to see if in fact this is the right area. Other companies have to undertake impact studies to show how a proposal will affect other people. I have not heard of anything done by A.P.M. along those lines; nor have I heard anything at all about the Government's looking at whether this is the right area, whether this project will serve the State best and employ the most people, or whether it will be the best all-round operation.

Mr. Frawley: You had better hope that they start it before the next election. You will be able to get a job up there.

Mr. KRUGER: A possibility is that there will be a lot of other people looking for jobs up in that area at the same time. I could name a few around here, but I will not stoop so low as to do that.

What I can verify is that A.P.M. at Petrie created an obnoxious smell. I will not go into this deeply. I just point out what happened when factories started up, as they did in days gone by, with no laws to control their discharges. They contaminated the river, and that contamination is just being overcome now. A lot of work has been done recently. But why should the people of an area have to suffer 20 years of misery before we look at these things?

Mr. Hansen: They use a lot of sulphuric acid in their processes.

Mr. KRUGER: They do, yes. It is released regularly.

Mr. Frawley: The dogs would pollute the river more than A.P.M.

Mr. KRUGER: The member would not know too much about that. His main habit is kicking them to death.

The most important point here is employment. The Labor Party believes that we should be very worried about employment. I congratulate the member for Caboolture for his thoughts on employment. I just hope that it all works out. I hope that the transactions are for the good of the State, and that employment opportunities are created.

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (2.29 p.m.): The Opposition today has done a pretty good job in trying to misrepresent the facts on this pulp mill proposal. The misrepresentation, I suggest, has been on three counts. Opposition members have carefully tried to play to the conservation lobby in the community and to suggest that all the native trees north of Brisbane will suddenly be gobbled up into some huge chip mill enterprise and exported overseas. That is a total misrepresentation of the facts as I know them—and I have

been closely associated with this development which, until the last election, was in my electorate.

They have also tried today to orchestrate a line that the Premier has suddenly decided that there is to be a pulp mill in the district, and that he has not discussed the matter with anyone at all. Opposition members are suggesting that the Premier has said, "There will be a factory here and that is all there is to it." Nothing could be further from the truth. They have also, as they always do when the Government introduces a measure to do with private enterprise, cried that we are trying to sell out the State to private enterprise. That is not the truth, either.

Today I want to take the House back in history. I have here an article from "The Courier-Mail" of 1965 which is headed, "New major industry for S.E. Qld". The article states—

"The State Government envisages an important pine pulpwood industry for its State forests in South-East Queensland.

"The Conservation Minister (Mr. Richter) announced yesterday that tenders would be called for the purchase of pine pulpwood."

Yet the Opposition is saying that this is a new proposal, that there has been no planning associated with it, and that Joh has got something to do with it.

Mr. Burns: Did he say 180 ha of land would be swapped for it?

Mr. AHERN: I will take that interjection.

Mr. Burns: Did he say that in that 1965 statement?

Mr. AHERN: This is the 1965 statement, O.K.?

Mr. Burns: Did he say say in the 1965 statement?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order!

Mr. Burns: He would obviously know he didn't.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is answering his own question.

Mr. AHERN: I would like to reply to the honourable member's interjection by quoting another article from "The Sunday Mail" of 3 April 1966 headed, "Pulp-wood could be major industry. Move for ninefold increase in output". The article reads—

"Moves begun by the State Forestry Department yesterday are aimed at establishing pulp-wood processing as one of Queensland's major industries. The department is aiming at increasing the pulpwood processing done in Queensland ninefold from the present 5-million superficial feet a year to more than 44½-million feet.

"We have hopes of attracting a pretty big pulpwood industry to Queensland," the Deputy Conservator of Forests (Mr. L. J. Rogers) said yesterday.

"Tenders for seven lots ranging from 1½-million feet to 15,300,000 feet a year have been called."

If members of the Opposition want to study some of the history of this project they can, as I did in the brief time available in the luncheon recess, go back and read some of the statements that I and interested Ministers have made in this Parliament from time to time. A number of people have spoken about this very big long-term project which we have been planning since plantings were first begun by the Forestry Department in the Beerwah area. I was also able to find an article referring to a statement I made to the House in 1976 about a pulp mill in the south-east of Queensland. The article was published on 29 October 1976 and stated—

"A pulp mill in south-east Queensland was forecast in State Parliament yesterday by Mr. Ahern (N.P. Landsborough).

"He said Australian Paper Mills had acquired 5,000 hectares north of Brisbane and the company had a pulp mill on its planning board."

Mr. Hodges: It is part of a Cabinet decision already.

Mr. AHERN: As the Minister says, it has been under discussion. We have been trying to bring it to fruition for many years. Contracts have been entered into between Australian Paper Manufacturers and the Queensland Government to take a certain amount of the pine thinnings from the forests in that area. The details of those contracts have been announced to the Parliament and are a matter of record in "Hansard". There is no doubt that the Government has been trying to do this for a number of years. I think it is a worthy type of project to promote in the interests of our State's economy, and I hope the Government will see it through to fruition.

When my electorate included a lot of these Australian Paper Manufacturers plantings and a large area of State forest, I took the trouble to visit the A.P.M. factory on two occasions. On the occasion of my last visit, I invited a number of my colleagues who represent that area to talk with officials of the organisation and look through the plant. I suggested that they talk to those officials about their plans for the future. I suggest to the honourable member for Murrumbidgee that he go out there and see what they are doing, talk to the employees and the employers, and find out what are their plans for the future. He ought to do it soon, as obviously he has not done it so far. What he said here today about the association of this company with the district was just so much tommy rot.

The Opposition has also tried to confuse the public by suggesting that this pulp mill will be a chip mill. The situation is that

a group of Korean investors who were in Australia recently decided to have a look at this area as a possible site for a chip mill. There was some Press speculation about it, and suddenly the Opposition is saying to us that today in this Parliament we are agreeing to the establishment of a chip mill.

Mr. Bishop: They would not know the difference, anyway.

Mr. AHERN: There is a very important difference in the trees that are used.

Mr. Burns: The Premier said that the Koreans and A.P.M. were going to put in a chip mill.

Mr. AHERN: The Press statement was that there were people out here looking at a number of propositions. That is it, as far as I know. Frankly, I do not think that a chip mill in the area, based on native hardwood harvestings, would have a ghost of a chance. There is a very real possibility of a pulp mill being established in the area, based on pine plantings. That has been planned for decades now, and I think that it ought to eventuate. I think that this is what it is all about. In fact, I know that it is what it is all about. I want it to happen, and I think that the community in this area want it to happen. What we are concerned about is whether it will happen.

Frankly, this industry suffers enormously because one cannot make short-term decisions about it. Plants take a generation to grow. They take an enormous time to come into production. One has to look in the long term when one is planning the future of an industry such as this. One has to try to predict international and national trends of consumption in the long term, and that is extremely difficult to do.

I have visited this company on two occasions. Its management people have told me about the sort of planning exercises that they are doing. They told me that, taking transport costs into account, the factory had to be sited on a lease-cost basis. Transporting the log material to the mill site is a highly significant production cost. The siting of the factory depends very much upon a lease-cost model associated with the siting of the plantings. So they have settled on this 180 ha site just south of Beerburum, and this will not cost the people of Queensland anything at this stage. All that the company is doing is swapping a piece of planted land for a piece of land that A.P.M. has planted, and there will be a valuation at the appropriate time to ensure that the interests of the people of Queensland are preserved. That is all we are doing, yet it has brought a cry from the Opposition. This usually happens when we are trying to do something to create employment through private enterprise.

An Opposition Member: Come on!

Mr. AHERN: That is quite true. Water studies have been going on for a long period, and, of course, they are extremely difficult. With the new technologies that are associated with paper pulp manufacture today, the industry does not require the amount of water that was required in the past. It does not require oceans and oceans of water. It is totally ridiculous to suggest that water from the Pumicestone Passage might be used. That is just simply not on. Before this industry is established, appropriate water studies will have to be made.

We do not have before the House today studies on all aspects of the proposal. All we are doing today is enabling the company to proceed further with its detailed planning, and I hope that it will do that. Water studies will have to be carried out in consultation with the Minister's department, and particularly with the Water Resources Commission. Studies have been going on. There has been consultation. There will have to be studies of the environment. The technologies in this area today are infinitely better than they were in the past. The fear tactics of honourable members opposite and their talk of dreadful damage to the environment will not be successful in relation to this project.

The Opposition is always trying to bash companies. Whenever the Government brings before Parliament proposals relating to coal companies, A.P.M. or other companies, the Opposition is worried about what profit is going to accrue from them. I hope that the company will get going—and that is not inevitable, because of high production costs and all sorts of associated problems—and that it will make a profit. If it makes a profit, half of that money goes back to the Australian taxpayer and half of the new jobs that are created in Australia are financed out of profits.

The honourable member for Murrumba made the scurrilous suggestion that A.P.M. had received some special consideration from the Government under the Valuation of Land Act. That is completely out of line with what really happened. The land of Australian Paper Manufacturers was valued by the Valuer-General in the same way as the land of every other citizen of this State is valued. The company exercised its right of appeal to the Land Court and then to the Land Appeal Court. To suggest that the Government runs the Land Appeal Court in Queensland is scurrilous.

Mr. Burns. You lay down the rules.

Mr. AHERN: Are you suggesting that the Government runs the Land Appeal Court in this State?

Mr. Burns: You appoint the members and you lay down the rules. If you don't, I don't know what you call that.

Mr. AHERN: That is a very interesting imputation by the honourable member for Lytton. To suggest that the Government

has afforded some assistance to Australian Paper Manufacturers by way of the Land Appeal Court is arrant nonsense. It is ridiculous; it is simply not on.

Mr. Burns: Why didn't this proposal appear in last year's report of the Forestry Department if it has been planned since 1966?

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member knows it has been planned since 1966. I have been talking about it, as have Ministers of the Crown. In looking through "Hansard" today, I noted that Mr. Sullivan answered questions in the House on it when he was in charge of the Forestry Department. Does not the honourable member listen to what happens in this place?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Lytton has already had an answer to his question.

Mr. AHERN: The proposal has not reached the stage at which it could be offered to the Parliament as a reasonable proposition. The company is not yet ready to place a firm proposal before the Government of Queensland. The Government has simply tried, by calling tenders, to create a situation in which the industry can be supported in Queensland. It has done that with a view to providing employment and revenue for the people of Queensland, and that is what the Government must do if it is to overcome the present difficulties in the field of employment. I hope that the proposal gets off the ground.

The honourable member for Lytton showed his ignorance about the softwood agreement when he talked about Australia's long-term needs for softwoods. If he had bothered to study the statistics, he would know that the softwoods agreement has only recently been renegotiated and that the Federal Government has decided to decrease Federal involvement by way of funding. It has done that on advice that initial projections of Australian consumption have been overestimated, and the industry as a whole has accepted the view that Australian softwood plantings should be based on Australian consumption alone.

In view of the inflated projections that were made previously, it was decided to aim future projections at a more realistic level. That is why there have been some cutbacks. Therefore, A.P.M. and whatever partners it may attract will have to finance the project and pitch it not only to the Australian market but also to the overseas market, which is extraordinarily difficult to do. They require Government assistance and co-operation, and that is what they are getting from this Government. That is what private enterprise has always had from the Government, and that is why the majority of employees of institutions of this type often vote for Government members.

Mr. Davis: Come off the grass.

Mr. AHERN: Why is it then that the honourable member for Peak Downs is returned to this Parliament from all of those coal-mining areas in his electorate? It would be interesting, too, to poll A.P.M. employees out there to see which way they are voting. A great number of them realise where their bread and butter is coming from.

A pulp mill in this area is not inevitable; I do not think a chip mill is a possibility at all really; so it is all so much emotive nonsense.

Mr. Hodges interjected.

Mr. AHERN: We have a pulp mill and a small chip mill dealing with pine thinnings.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. AHERN: I say quite clearly now that if there are any more proposals to clear fell land in the Conondale Range area, I will oppose them. I do not think that steep areas should be cleared of native forests and planted to pine trees. I do not think that is essential. It ought not to happen, and I will oppose it.

The Opposition has deliberately tried to misconstrue the proposal. The people in the Landsborough Shire certainly want to see that industry established in their area. They want to offer it complete support, and I know that support will be forthcoming.

Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT (Auburn—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources) (2.47 p.m.), in reply: Most probably the honourable member for Landsborough made more pertinent points than any previous speaker in the debate. He did tie in the things that I feel are really necessary to the development of Queensland. Naturally I am duty bound to reply to the various speakers. The first Opposition speaker was the honourable member for Lytton. The present proposal has been developed quite independently of any export considerations. A.P.M. has had an agreement with the Forestry Department for many years for use of pulpwood from the department's softwood plantations at Beerburum, and from its own plantations nearby. This present land exchange proposal was put forward to allow the development of the additional processing plant necessary to handle this pulpwood, and was in hand long before there was any suggestion of any possible export venture.

At this stage no detailed proposal has been put forward for an export venture, but naturally any company must explore all available market possibilities in planning its future. However, quite independent of what happens in that regard, the company still needs to expand its processing facilities to meet its obligations under the agreement to use locally grown pulpwood, and will require the site for this expansion.

No natural forest areas are involved in either proposition being considered by the company, both of which are wholly related to plantation softwood material.

Some years ago the Forestry Department did carry out an assessment of the potential availability of pulpwood from native forests in South Queensland, including the Woodford and Conondale areas mentioned by the member for Lytton. This was done merely to provide information to people interested at that time in the possibility of chip exports to Japan, but it has never been envisaged that Queensland forests would be clear felled for this purpose, as the honourable member has suggested. This has been made quite clear on very many occasions. No proposals are under consideration at present for this type of woodchip operation in Queensland other than that based entirely on sawmill residues. This would have no effect on the forests themselves.

The honourable member queried the employment opportunities that this proposed A.P.M. venture would create. The company still has to carry out a lot of detailed planning, of course, but it is certainly the experience elsewhere that the establishment of a fully integrated pulpwood and sawmilling industry, as is planned here by the Forestry Department with its plantations, does employ a very large rural work force in addition to employees in the mills themselves. This proposal by A.P.M. is the first step in a long-awaited integrated development of this type in Queensland which would allow the most efficient management of the pine plantations. Far from having any adverse effect on the local timber industry, it would allow the pulping of the poorer quality material and enable the sawmills to secure much higher quality logs for their use. The sawmillers certainly have been pressing for this type of development. I think that effectively answers the honourable member for Lytton.

In reply to the comments made by the honourable member for Maryborough—in the notes supplied I pointed out that A.P.M., in investigating a site for the proposed plant, saw as the main requirements good access to transport, water and power. It would seem then that the company, which is, no doubt, well aware of the requirements of the law in regard to water pollution and of the need, if required, to conduct environmental studies, etc., would have ensured that the requirements in regard to water could be met prior to deciding on this site.

The member also made the point that there were greater Crown plantation areas in both Maryborough and Gympie than in the Beerburum area. He said that Woodlands was still unsure of the feasibility of establishing a plant based on supplies from Gympie and Maryborough. He overlooked the significant fact that in the North Coast area there is a very substantial area of private plantation owned by A.P.M. When this is taken in total, the area under plantation in

the general Beerburum area would support quite a large independent pulpwood operation.

As to the query about any effect that the establishment of a pulp mill on the North Coast would have on the viability of the plant proposed by Woodlands—the supply of plantation timbers to the plant proposed by Woodlands is already committed. The supply to a plant established by A.P.M. at or near Elimbah would have no effect whatever on supply input to the Woodlands plant.

The member for Murrumba talked about a small residual area at Beerwah and suggested that it could become available for use as a roadside park. If it is suitable for this purpose, the Land Administration Commission will have a good look at it. If that is the best use to which the land can be put, that will happen to it.

The A.P.M. company has an agreement to use Queensland material. How the company markets its products is its own business. The softwood resource has been developed essentially to meet local Australian needs.

The member may be assured that my department and the Government are fully aware of the need to ensure that the State obtains an equitable share of any profits from its softwood industry.

All matters that have been raised will be considered. As I pointed out earlier, the vital aspect is employment, especially at a time such as the present.

Mr. Burns: It's 1985. They won't start employing people till then.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: The member for Lytton is interjecting. I cannot quite gather what he is saying. Earlier he spoke about Korea. All I can say is that the Koreans have come here; however, no definite undertaking has been given. The member can rest assured that the Government will carry out a full investigation before it gives its blessing to any project.

Motion (Mr. Hewitt) agreed to.

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Row, Hinchinbrook, in the chair)

Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT (Auburn—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources) (2.55 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Forestry Act 1959–1976 in certain particulars.”

The main purpose of this Bill is to change certain provisions relating to the composition and operation of the Timber Research and Development Advisory Councils. The Bill also amends the section of the Act which deals with the placing of demands for the recovery of stumpage, damage to the forest and investigation costs in cases where forest products or quarry material have been interfered with on Crown areas without authority.

The Timber Research and Development Advisory Council of South and Central Queensland and the Timber Research and Development Advisory Council of North Queensland were established as statutory bodies under the Forestry Act by amending legislation assented to on 2 May 1974. The functions of these councils as defined in the Act are to advise the Minister and with his consent undertake operations or do such acts or things as are necessary or desirable with respect to:—

- (i) The promotion, merchandising and market development of sawn timber and timber products and the conduct of research into those aspects of the timber industry;
- (ii) The education, training, safety and working conditions of employees, and the control of the quality of timber in the timber manufacturing industry;
- (iii) The conduct of research and other investigations into product development and manufacturing costs.

In these respects the functions of the councils are complementary to the powers of the Conservator of Forests under the Forestry Act.

As the legislation now stands there is provision amongst other things for:—

- (i) The Minister to appoint a chairman to the South and Central Queensland Council who is then automatically appointed as chairman of the council of North Queensland;
- (ii) The term of appointment of the chairman and other members of a council to be at the Minister's pleasure;
- (iii) The Conservator of Forests with the approval of the Minister to fix the amount, additional to stumpage, to be paid by purchasers of Crown timber to provide funds for the councils.

Following advice from the present chairman of both councils that he intends to resign as from 30 June 1979, suggestions for changes in certain aspects of the operation of the councils were put forward by the timber industry associations representing the respective council areas.

At this stage I pay tribute to Alan Trist, who has been chairman of the South, Central and North Queensland Councils for some years, for the wonderful work that he has done to help the forestry industry in the State, firstly as Conservator and secondly as chairman of T.R.A.D.A.C.

The several matters raised by the timber industry associations, and now included in the Bill, provide for—

- (i) The chairman of each council to be appointed independently but without precluding the possibility that the same person may at any time be the chairman of both councils;
- (ii) The chairman of each council to be appointed by the Minister, in his absolute discretion, by notice published in

the Gazette, but with provision that timber industry associations, as specified from time to time, in each council area, may furnish to the Minister a panel of at least two names of persons considered by them to be suitable for appointment;

- (iii) The chairman and all members of each council to be appointed for a maximum term of two years with provision, unless the Minister determines otherwise, for reappointment. Appropriate action will be taken in regard to these appointments to ensure that retiring dates of members, other than the chairman, are staggered to give some continuity to the councils.

Also, to ensure full membership of councils at all times, provision is made for appointment of a retiring member to remain effective pending his duly appointed successor's taking up office.

- (iv) The timber industry in each council area, through those of its trade associations as nominated from time to time, to have the right to recommend to the Conservator of Forests the amount, additional to stumpage, to be paid by purchasers of Crown timber to provide funds for the councils. The conservator, after consultation with these bodies, will then make his recommendation to the Minister.

Some minor machinery amendments are also included to enable these new concepts in regard to the councils to sit coherently in the Act.

As I mentioned earlier, the Bill also provides for the amendment of section 91 of the Forestry Act, which deals with the question of recovery by demand of the value of stumpage, damage to the forest and investigation costs in cases where forest products or quarry material have been interfered with on Crown areas without proper authority. Such interference constitutes a breach of the Forestry Act 1959–1976. However, it is not always practicable or desirable to institute prosecution action where there is a lack of satisfactory evidence or if no deliberate attempt has been made to defraud the Crown. In these cases a demand is made under the provisions of section 91 of the Act.

This provision, however, has a serious weakness in that a demand can be made only on the person who actually carries out the interference. Investigations often disclose that this person acts under instructions or with the consent or connivance of another person who stands to gain from the unauthorised action. Under the amendment now proposed it will be possible in future cases to place a demand for payment on either the person who in fact does the interfering or, if appropriate, upon the person who is responsible for the interference.

I commend the Bill for favourable consideration.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (2.59 p.m.): The Opposition will have to look closely at the rather machinery provisions of the Bill outlined by the Minister in his rapid fire introductory remarks.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: Fancy you talking about rapid fire!

Mr. BURNS: The Minister gave us a little more information than he did on the last occasion. I thought his comment "I move motion No. 5" was a rather remarkable indication of the extent of the Minister's capabilities in the handling of his portfolio.

I am concerned about the cut-back in Forestry Department services as a result of the department's funds having been reduced by the Liberal and National Parties in the Commonwealth Parliament. I have been looking at reports in the couple of months that I have been shadow Minister in this portfolio and I am concerned in many ways about the future of a very efficient industry. There is no doubt that it is efficient. The I.A.C. report on the timber industry found that the industry was not only competent but also generally efficient at low cost by national standards. The I.A.C. suggested that it should continue to be assisted. However, the Liberal and National Party people in Canberra have decided not to provide that type of assistance.

I might refer to what the Conservator of Forests (Mr. Bryan) said in the Forestry Department annual report 1977-78. Let me digress to say that I am not sure what happened to the cover photo. Borumba Dam is quoted as being the cover photo, but it does not appear. That might have been one of the first cut-backs—no photo on the front of the report. Mr. Bryan said that the department was beset with problems in the last 12 months. He said—

"The total volume of Crown log timber and pulpwood which was harvested was a record, although difficult trading conditions continued in the timber industry."

He made the point that the level of Federal Government financial assistance had been reduced substantially; that the levels of stumpage payments received from the Crown for its timber were well down; that 1977 was the worst fire season for nine years; and that the major drought brought the lowest rainfall for 20 years at most plantations. We then were told that a new system of budgeting was being introduced.

First, let us have a look at some of the stories we read now in the newspapers associated with the timber industry. In "Timberman" of 30 March 1979 we see the heading "Muddle over Crown log pricing". I would like an explanation of just exactly how much money the State Government spends in the timber industry and what returns it gets. I would like

an explanation of why we have to send out an 18-page detailed explanation of the apparent anomalies that occurred in the recent adjustment to the Crown log timber royalty calculations. I understand that there were serious disruptions to pricing methods following January's adjustments to hardwood buyers by the Department of Forestry. As a result of that, the department had to send out an 18-page booklet to explain what it was up to.

In addition to that, I am concerned that the I.A.C. report says on page 64, when it talks about levels of employment and activity in the sawmilling segment of the industry—

"... there are no practical means of assistance which would ensure that previous or current levels of employment and activity in this segment of the industry can be maintained. This segment is undergoing long-term change because of the changing nature of its resource space."

Last week-end my wife wanted me to build a fernery. I think of the old ferneries we used to have on the farm, which were made of off-cuts of local timber. If one looks at the material at the local hardware shop today, one realises how the sawn-timber industry is being affected by modern mechanisation and interstate competition. I cannot see the maintenance of employment in this area, which used to give major employment in the days of the depression. With the pace of mechanisation and the handling of logs and timber being undertaken more and more by machines, there are fewer and fewer opportunities for labouring type employment.

I cannot understand how a Minister could say that, because of unemployment today, he would like to create jobs with a factory that is going to start in 1985. I cannot understand why he has not been making ministerial statements in this Parliament attacking his Federal colleagues (as used to be done when Whitlam was in power) over the reduction in Federal spending on forestry today. We have seen a reduction already in the work-force in the Forestry Department. I think this year the rank-and-file workers are down by 85 and the salaried staff are down by three. In the annual report by the Conservator of Forests we see this statement—

"There has also been a significant reduction in the level of financial assistance for reforestation provided by the Commonwealth Government. Not only has support for new plantings been withdrawn but funds for maintenance of plantations established under the previous Softwood Agreements will no longer have a ten year interest free period.

"As part of a continuing effort to get maximum value for money expended a new system of financial budgeting on a Department wide basis has been introduced."

With the cut-back in money available from the Federal Government, I worry about the possibility that in some of these departments we will end up with too many Chiefs and not enough Indians. It has happened before. When there is a cut-back, the sackings start at the bottom but nothing ever seems to be done about adjusting the jobs at the top. As my interest in this industry continues, I will be looking to see what sort of restructuring is done to ensure that the people sacked as a result of the Liberal-National Party cut-backs in finance to the industry are not all people at the bottom of the department's structure.

At this stage I say no more than that the Labor Party will look very closely at the Bill to see that it benefits the timber industry overall, the workers in the industry and those people in areas throughout the State who are dependent on it. If not, we will have more to say during the second reading.

Mr. HANSEN (Maryborough) (3.6 p.m.): I join with the honourable member for Lytton in welcoming any moves that will restrict damage to our forests. I believe that over the years Forestry Department officers have shown themselves to be very responsible people, even at some cost to themselves. As a young boy I can remember visiting Fraser Island when Elly Bennett's father was a contractor using oxen to haul timber on the island. I can remember seeing beautiful logs left at the dump near the creek because they had not been stamped by the forest ranger as being approved for removal. In those days the people there were very hungry and in order to get money quickly they started cutting down trees illegally, but they were never paid for the trees because the mills would not accept them. The people who had cut down these trees in their haste to earn extra money found that all their efforts had been in vain. In addition, this country lost a lot of valuable timber, although we did waste timber in those days just before the war.

I believe that the Forestry Department has been very responsible in allowing logging on Fraser Island for over 100 years under its direct supervision. I pay tribute to the management role played by the department. There are some people who look only at what they can achieve in the short term, but I believe that in the management of our forestry resources we have to look to the long term and the needs of future generations. If there is to be an increase in penalties, the Labor Party will support the Minister all the way.

In his introductory remarks, the Minister paid tribute to the officers of the Forestry Department, particularly the Conservator of Forests, for what they have done for Queensland. The Minister also referred to alterations in charges. I recently spoke to a man who had been involved in the timber industry for some years and he told me about an occasion when he felled a tree that had been marked for felling but then found that

it was not millable. He queried whether he could be recompensed for the cost of felling the tree. I know that the felling rates are fixed, depending on the quality of the timber that is available, the distance between the trees and their availability within a certain distance of a road.

I join with the honourable member for Lytton in his criticism of the Federal Government for its cut-back of the funds available under the Commonwealth-State Softwoods Agreement. This agreement was initiated by Mr. Fairbairn, the then Minister for National Development, because it was shown that Australia had a shortage of softwoods. That occurred some 12 years ago, and I do not believe that the position has changed. Maybe we are not selling as much timber today as we used to sell.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. HANSEN: There has been an increase in the softwood plantings, but our native softwoods take a long time to mature, and because of this the Commonwealth made money available. I know that there are softwood plantations, and I know that there are people who advance arguments about them. But that Commonwealth money was used to build up a national asset and to create a long-term investment.

There are people who will acknowledge in private today that there is money to be made from investment in forestry. I have received letters—and I do not doubt that other honourable members have received similar letters—from people in Western Australia asking me to take shares in companies that are planting forests in Western Australia. I can recall working with a man who told me that many years ago people were going around Australia hawking shares in New Zealand forests, and he wondered about how many of the shares had been lost. All of a sudden, the shares were worth a lot of money on the market. So forestry is a long-term investment. I commend the Forestry Department and the Government for what they have done in that direction, but the funds available to them have been severely curtailed.

The Conservator of Forests, in his annual report, mentioned that there has been a significant reduction in the level of financial assistance provided by the Commonwealth for reforestation. He said that not only has support for new plantings been withdrawn, but also funds for the maintenance of plantations established under the previous softwoods agreement will no longer have a 10-year interest-free period. When we are looking at a long-term investment, an interest-free period is very significant. The Conservator of Forests also pointed out that no funds were made available in the past year, yet in 1976-77 over \$1,500,000 was received in advances.

There have been many cut-backs in the management of the Forestry Department. There must have been a considerable amount

of pruning. The member for Lytton referred to Chiefs and Indians, and we often have to ask questions about such developments. I know that the Forestry Department has been an employer of casual labour, particularly in the planting season, and sometimes these casual jobs are extended. One man said on his retirement from the Forestry Department the other day that he never expected to last 30 years in a casual job. Nevertheless, these people become interested in what they are doing and they become skilled in their work. If there are cut-backs in these areas, the services of these people, who have a fair amount of experience and who have given a lot of time to their work, are lost to the industry. These problems face the Forestry Department. When the Bill is presented, we will certainly look at this matter.

The Minister indicated that the main points in the Bill concern the Timber Advisory Council and the steps being taken to prevent the removal of forest products without authority. I was pleased to note recently that in the Kilcoy area people were prosecuted for removing staghorns, elkhorns and the like from forests. One often hears of cases of people doing this.

Mr. Burns: New South Wales has a system of putting a stamp on top of the log or attaching a tag to the fern so that a person knows that it has been approved to be taken out.

Mr. HANSEN: It is very difficult to cover this matter.

Queensland millers have always argued that timber coming into Queensland from New South Wales offers severe competition, particularly in the Brisbane metropolitan area, where there is a great demand for timber. The Queensland millers have always put to me the argument that the New South Wales Government is more lenient than is the Queensland Government towards people in this industry. Thus, they are allowed to compete more readily and on more favourable terms than are the Queensland millers who have to comply with Forestry Department directions. If the Minister has any thoughts on that matter, I should be pleased to hear them.

Mr. SIMPSON (Cooroora) (3.15 p.m.): Forestry is a major industry in this State and provides one of its major resources. Therefore, the Government must show a responsible attitude towards it in the public interest and for the well-being of the State.

Over the years honourable members have seen the value of forest products. In more recent times, interested people have put forward the view that some forestry areas should be given a more passive use as national parks. In my opinion, some sort of sensible balance must be achieved. Forestry areas that have been productive over a number of years can continue to be productive while also being used for the benefit of those who enjoy the beauty of forests.

Areas such as Conondale National Park and Cooloola can be protected by reasonable logging being allowed without clearing being permitted for the planting of exotic timbers in adjacent areas. Parks can be protected and people can be allowed to enjoy them without loss to the State of the benefit of their productivity.

When new areas are being sought for timber production that will make a mill viable, the Government ought to be looking at private land that is adjacent to, or within economic transport distance of, a mill. Such land could be purchased and planted, and encouragement should also be given to private individuals to set up forestry areas on their own land in country that is unsuitable either for mechanised agriculture or for grazing. People could complement the production from their property in a way that would benefit the local timber industry.

In some shires—the Widgee Shire, for example—40 per cent of the area is unproductive and councils face a very difficult task in obtaining funds to provide the necessary main roads and local government facilities. This is particularly so in shires in which there are large forestry areas or national park areas. It is true, of course, that a large number of people are employed directly in the forestry industry or in the forests, and assistance has been received from the Commonwealth Government by way of grants for the planting of certain species of timber. However, those species have been considered very carefully recently and a review of priorities has led to a reduction in funds coming from the Commonwealth.

In my opinion, there are other ways in which employment of forestry workers can be maintained. I have in mind particularly increasing the public interest in using forestry areas for recreational purposes, and so on. As a service is being provided, some charge could be made. In that way more people could be employed, the industry could be made viable, and small milling towns would not die.

I will give an example of the many advantages of this type of new approach to the multiple use of forestry areas. I refer to the promotion of an off-road four-wheel-drive area in a forest at Gherulla, near Kenilworth. Prior to that, bush-walkers and bird-watchers were finding that the forestry areas they were moving into were being spoilt for their enjoyment by motor cyclists and off-road vehicle users who were tearing up and down the forestry tracks enjoying their sport and the beauty of the forest at the same time.

I brought two of these groups together for talks, in the hope that they could each play in their own particular area and thereby each enjoy their pursuits without spoiling those of the other group. That proved very effective. We now have an area where the four-wheel-drive enthusiasts can race around to their heart's content without hurting the

forest. Indeed, they are doing some experimental work on the erosion that could occur as a result of rainfall on motor tracks, and that type of thing. The use of sawdust in the tracks has proved worth while. What has been done has proved that those people can stick to that area and enjoy themselves, thus allowing the bush-walkers and bird-watchers to enjoy the quieter parts of the forest. They are coming in in increasing numbers to enjoy the beautiful scenery around Christmas Creek, the Conondale Range, Imbil and Kenilworth.

We need to keep the numbers up in these small forestry towns. I believe that it would be prudent to look at the possibility of imposing some charge for the services and facilities that are provided for visitors, so that they are just not another charge on the local rate or taxpayers.

One aspect of forestry work in new plantation areas, in order to gain their proper productivity, is grazing. Areas are let out under special grazing permit leases, and the holders of these leased areas have a very responsible part to play in their production. We are finding it increasingly difficult to get persons of good calibre as permit-holders. They are being charged the rate they set when they tender, and they are also being charged rates by the local shire council, even though they get little or no service from it. This is a matter that needs to be looked at when we are considering the future productivity and proper management of forestry areas. Of course, this comes under another Act. I am sure that the Minister has in mind many ways of increasing the productivity of forestry areas in timber and also in other ways, including the enjoyment of the public as a whole. I commend him in his pursuit of those objectives.

Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT (Auburn—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources) (3.25 p.m.), in reply: As I pointed out at the introductory stage, there are really only two points to the Bill. One deals with the appointment of a chairman, who can now be chairman of both the South and Central Queensland Council and the Council of North Queensland at the one time, whereas in the past the chairman could be chairman of only the South and Central Queensland Council and was automatically appointed as chairman of the Council of North Queensland.

The Bill also deals with penalties in relation to the taking of quarry material or forest products from a forest area.

The three members who have spoken raised various other aspects that do not directly relate to the Bill. However, I will have a look at them and, if they are worthy of action, I will see what can be done.

Like everyone else, we are worried about finance as a result of the Commonwealth cut-back. We will continue to put pressure on the Commonwealth for additional money for forestry purposes.

Motion (Mr. Hewitt) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION AND MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.28 p.m.): I move—

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

As I indicated at the introductory stage, while the changes to be made by these amendments are not extensive, they are of vital importance to marketing boards. This is particularly so in regard to the changes to boards' powers in relation to the drawing and accepting of bills of exchange.

As was indicated by the honourable members for Warwick and Cunningham, board financing is an important aspect of any board's operations. The introduction of this additional bill-drawing power will facilitate a board's ability to borrow. The finance provided to boards wishing to borrow under a Government guarantee system has, over the years, provided boards with money for capital projects. In many cases the money would not have been available without the guarantee.

This present amendment could lessen a board's dependence on this particular type of guarantee finance and allow it to operate more freely in the commercial world. It will in no way alter the present Government-guarantee situation but could offer boards alternative means of finance should they so require. The proposed change in the limit of the deduction that a board may make from a grower's return is also directed to this improvement of financial management.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure the honourable member for Cunningham that I am aware of the problems to which he refers. To this end, my department is working in conjunction with boards in a major review of the problems of all marketing boards, aimed at improving their general effectiveness.

I agree completely with the honourable member for Fassifern when he says that working capital is essential and a deduction of between two and 5 per cent is not unreasonable.

The ability that boards will acquire under this Bill to both hold shares in, and guarantee, co-operatives answers the points made by the honourable member for Murrumba.

In reply to the question asked by the honourable member for South Brisbane, I would reply that the ability of boards to purchase shares in co-operatives is not limited in the way suggested. However, we will find that boards will only be interested in investing in those co-operatives with which they have close association. This, of course, will also be the case with guarantees.

I have already informed honourable members regarding the report of the McKinnon Committee of Inquiry into the sugar industry. These matters are, of course, not directly related to the purposes of this Bill.

I might add that it was announced this morning that the Premier has requested the Prime Minister, and I have requested the Minister for Primary Industry (who will be the Minister making the recommendation to the Federal Government), that the recommendations of the McKinnon report be implemented in so far as the home-consumption price of sugar is concerned. I hope that there will be no hesitation on the part of the Federal Government in this matter, because it is 15 months since I put to Cabinet—and Cabinet agreed to put to the Federal Government—the proposition that an \$80 a tonne increase in the home-consumption price be implemented in two stages. It was to be a \$40 a tonne increase in the initial stage and a further increase of \$40 a tonne six months later.

That was not agreed to by the Commonwealth Government; it agreed to an increase of \$30 a tonne. It insisted on an inquiry, to be known as the McKinnon inquiry. With some reluctance, the Government and the industry agreed. The chairman of the Sugar Board, Mr. Lloyd Harris, was one of those who conducted the inquiry. Its terms of reference have been made known to this Parliament. It was a long, drawn-out, very exacting and precise inquiry, and certain recommendations flowed from it. The paramount recommendation was that an immediate increase of \$80 a tonne be made in the home-consumption price of sugar. I hope that the recommendation will be acceptable to the Commonwealth Government and that it will be agreed upon almost immediately.

In relation to the McKinnon report, I have already intimated that the recommendations are not related directly to the purposes of this Bill.

With regard to the changes to section 30 of the Act, that is, the changes to the Queensland Cane Growers' Council, I would again say that I believe the changes reflect the wishes of the majority of cane growers.

The honourable member for Mackay still wants to give support to what can only be a cumbersome 30-man council. The honourable member is not here.

Mr. Davis: Naturally. The Premier is not here, either.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Maybe the honourable member has something else to do.

This is despite the fact that a conference of cane growers last month, at which there were representatives of all sugar-mill areas throughout Queensland, rejected the idea of a 30-man Queensland Cane Growers' Council and passed a resolution supporting the plan submitted to me by the council itself. The details of this submission are embodied in the clause amending section 30 of the Act. As I said the other night, the Leader of the Opposition when he was opposition spokesman for primary industries—

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: He had your measure.

Mr. SULLIVAN: He never worried me one little bit.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: You used to cringe.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Wolston is interjecting from other than his usual seat.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The one field of agriculture in which it could be expected that the Leader of the Opposition would be informed is the sugar industry, since he represents Mackay, which is in the heart of the sugar industry. Regrettably, over the years that he has been the Opposition spokesman for Primary Industries he has been an embarrassment to the sugar industry.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: This is what people in the sugar industry have told me. Particularly at the time of negotiations on the problems with the long-term sugar contract with Japan, utterances by the Leader of the Opposition were embarrassing to the sugar industry. He was advised by ill-informed people of his own political persuasion—and strangely enough there are some of them in the sugar industry. Nobody will argue that there are any organisations better equipped to represent the industry than the Cane Growers' Council and the other organisations within the sugar industry; yet Casey has always been out of step with them.

Mr. Davis: The honourable member for Mackay.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The honourable member for Mackay has always been out of step with them. He tells this Parliament that what I am doing in this amending legislation is allowing for a Cane Growers' Council of 15 members. He is still advocating a 30-man council. Can you believe it, Mr. Speaker? The one-time Opposition spokesman for Primary Industries, now Leader of the Opposition, in the one agricultural industry in which he should be informed—the sugar industry—is so far out of step with the people who represent the industry that it is incredible.

An Honourable Member: He's stepping off on the wrong foot.

Mr. SULLIVAN: He has two left feet. He has been doing that since I first knew him. I hope that cane growers get behind their organisation and work together to overcome some of the real problems of the industry. I believe that an efficient growers' organisation such as the Cane Growers' Council with all its separate components must ensure that its elected representatives are well informed on the problems of growers. I say this with all the sincerity at my command.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That's not much.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I misjudged the honourable member. I am not going to do my block over his remark. He does not upset me one little bit.

Those of us who represent a sector of rural industry, whether it is sugar, grain, beef or dairying, have a responsibility to see that we are informed by the people in that industry so that we can argue their case when legislation is presented in this Chamber. Regrettably, the honourable member for Mackay, in his former role as Opposition spokesman on primary industry matters and now in a more responsible position as Leader of the Opposition, has never chosen so to do. It is regrettable, but he will pay the political price for that.

At the same time, the organisation must ensure that all growers are kept fully informed of developments in the industry. All members have indicated that they approve of the principles of the Bill. Whilst the measures contained in it are important to the various industries, I believe that they are simple and clear-cut, and there should be no real argument. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. FOURAS (South Brisbane) (3.40 p.m.): Firstly, the amendment to section 13, under which a board is deemed to have always had the general power with regard to the drawing and acceptance of bills of exchange, is supported by the Opposition. We agree that commercial lenders require that the boards they finance have the power to accept financial accommodation bills. I note that in his speech the Minister stated that this amendment could lessen a board's dependence on this type of guaranteed finance and allow it to operate more freely in the commercial world. I think the operative word is "could". I do not believe that this will be so in practice because I believe that lending institutions would much prefer to have guarantees. However, this amendment will definitely facilitate a board's ability to borrow.

I am sure that the amendment to section 18, under which the maximum deduction that a board can make on account of its working reserve fund is increased from 2 per cent to 5 per cent, will be used to benefit the functioning of marketing boards. This will give them more flexible management of their financial affairs, which will

allow the building up of reserves in poor seasons, and, consequently, provide better facilities for handling commodities and servicing growers' needs. We agree with that, but I also think that the fact that the Director of Marketing will be represented on each board ensures that the Minister will be well informed and can consequently approve or disapprove of the rate of deduction set by the board.

In the introductory debate I asked the Minister whether the ability of the boards to purchase shares in co-operatives would be limited to those co-operatives that the board used as an agent to handle its produce. The Minister said that this ability is not limited, but I feel that it ought to be. I feel that in many ways a lot of co-operatives in this State have a fairly poor track record, basically because they do not have the one power that is included in the Act, that is, the power to direct that a grower must market his commodity through a certain board and must follow the guide-lines of orderly marketing.

I say this because many growers are fair-weather sailors; that is, they supply a co-operative when there is a glut situation and thus receive the best price, but when the market improves and they can obtain a little more on the open market, they avoid the co-operative and take the best price they can get on the open market. In a private-enterprise society I suppose that is fair enough. But it galls me that these people who like to practise sectional socialism want the best of both worlds. That is one reason why, on the record they have shown, I would be very wary about allowing them to purchase shares in some co-operatives.

Let us now have a look at the reduction from 17 to 15 in the membership of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council. In the introductory debate the Leader of the Opposition and I expressed reservations about this change. The Minister said that it would streamline representation on the council. How would it do this? I believe that some district executives will now not be represented and that this will lead to factionalism in the sugar industry. We in the Opposition believe that, although a majority of council members supported this change at their recent conference, they may well regret their decision.

The Minister spoke at some length—in fact, he ad libbed—about the problems of the sugar industry and the McKinnon report. It is unfortunate that there has been such a delay in giving to our cane growers a fair domestic price for their sugar. It is good to see that the McKinnon report has finally been made public, although a lot of industry members have had it for some time. We now at last have an opportunity to peruse what is in it. The end-all of that is that if it is accepted there will be an increase in the price of sugar of 10c a kilogram.

A problem arises when there are long delays in the granting of a price increase. There are very serious effects when the price of a commodity is not increased gradually. An increase in the price of sugar will affect soft drinks, cordials, and foodstuffs such as breakfast cereals. The other day the honourable member for Salisbury said that some breakfast cereals contain at least 50 per cent sugar. I realise that she was talking about the dietary effect that this sort of muck has on our children and on the adults who might eat it.

We see the effect that an increase in the price of sugar will have on the C.P.I. Anybody who has read of the price increases recently will know that in the past two months the price of manufactured goods has increased by 3.5 per cent. As manufactured goods make up some 50 per cent of the C.P.I., it appears now that the increase in the C.P.I. could approach 10 per cent and not the 5 to 6 per cent predicted in the last Federal Budget. I think it is most unfortunate that there has been a long delay in looking at the domestic price of sugar. We are looking at an increase in the price of sugar at a time when both politically and economically it is not propitious. Again I think that the sugar growers of this State should be looking with disdain at their Federal National Party representatives in Canberra. They should be questioning their State representatives also. They should be asking the question, "Why have you allowed this situation to arise?" I again say that both economically and politically, this is a very poor time to give justice regarding the price of domestic sugar.

We on this side of the House have been urging that action be taken on the price of domestic sugar, because we know the straits in which sugar growers now find themselves. We are concerned not only about sugar growers but also about the whole sugar industry in the towns up and down the coast of Queensland. This includes the employment opportunities in the manufacturing industry that is connected with the sugar industry. We on this side of the House rightly express our alarm and disgust on behalf of sugar growers, other than those who speak to the Minister for Primary Industries and who tell him that they do not like what the Leader of the Opposition says. The Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bundaberg, and I speak on behalf of sugar growers. Unfortunately, the member for Bundaberg cannot be here today for this debate. I can assure members opposite that many sugar growers are listening with delight to what we are saying. They are pleased with the actions of our spokesman on primary industries, the member for Bundaberg, and support fully the statements and credibility of the Leader of the Opposition when he acts on their behalf.

As I said at the introductory stage, we support the principles of the Bill and we will not be opposing it. Again I say that we feel

that the National Party, at both Federal and State levels, has sold the sugar industry down the drain.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.48 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for South Brisbane for indicating on behalf of the Opposition that he accepts the proposals in the Bill and that he will not be opposing them. He was fairly gracious until he mentioned the McKinnon report, when he proceeded to have a couple of bob each way. Nothing in this Bill is related remotely to the McKinnon report.

The honourable member indicated his concern about the delay in the granting of an increased price for domestic sugar, and then for some reason or other he became political. He seemed to have a great fear of the National Party.

Mr. Fouras: This is a political forum. You go for your life.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I listened very intently to the honourable member. I did not interrupt him. He seemed to have a great fear and a horror of the National Party. I suppose he should, because before the emergence of the National Party in 1957, the Labor Party represented a lot of sugar areas and a lot of rural areas. We have stripped the A.L.P. of that representation.

Mr. Fouras: We will have it again.

Mr. SULLIVAN: It will never happen again in the honourable member's lifetime or in my lifetime. The A.L.P. is on the run, and the Government will keep it on the run—not for its own sake politically, but for the sake of the people in the sugar industry, the wheat industry, or any other industry.

The honourable member for South Brisbane expressed his concern—and this is where I say that he was having 20c each way—that the growers had been deprived of an increase in the home consumption price of sugar in the last 15 months and then expressed his concern about the effect that the recommendations of the McKinnon report will have on the consumer price index and the cost of living if they are implemented. The Government does a bit of homework on matters such as that, and I point out to the honourable member that an increase of \$80 a tonne in the home consumption price of sugar will have an effect of .1 of 1 per cent—one-tenth—on the C.P.I. Is that something about which the honourable member can be concerned from the consumers' point of view at the expense of the producers? I do not ask him to answer; I think the answer is simple. I simply say again that he is having 20c each way.

In spite of that, I think the honourable member for South Brisbane for his ready acceptance of what is contained in the Bill. As there has been no other argument against

it, I think that my officers and I have, as usual, come up to expectations in updating the provisions of the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act.

Motion (Mr. Sullivan) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Row, Hinchinbrook, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 11, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

COAL MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (3.54 p.m.): I move—

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

Although the Bill amends only one section of the Act, it is, nevertheless, an important one as it updates the particular section dealing with the establishment and operation of rescue brigades, previously termed rescue stations.

Before examining in detail the points of the Bill, I would like to put the honourable member for Nudgee's mind at rest in relation to comments he made during the introductory debate. Rescue brigades are composed of a management committee and a panel of men from the industry who most unselfishly volunteer to become members of the brigade in order to carry out assistance in the event of an emergency in a mine. They spend many hours in intense training so that they may be properly fitted for their duties when an emergency occurs. Their primary function is, of course, the saving of lives and the rendering of first-aid to the injured. It may well be that the fighting of a fire and the clearing of dangerous gases from a mine is necessary to save lives, and it is in these aspects that brigade members are intensively trained. To this end the amendment states that the function of a rescue brigade shall be to afford assistance in the case of an emergency in any coal-mine, and I reiterate that the saving of lives is the first duty in any such emergency.

Regarding the recommendations of the Box Flat and Kiangra inquiries, I assure the honourable member that much work has been carried out in relation to the recommendations of those inquiries, and this work is continuing.

In the field of research, a chief research engineer has been appointed, and a committee called the Queensland Coal Mines Safety Research Advisory Committee comprising representatives of the Government,

the Queensland University and the industry has been established. Three mining engineers employed by the department are also working on research. Investigations into spontaneous combustion and ventilation in relation to pillar extraction are being carried out, and to date my department has contributed a substantial sum of money towards these investigations.

Studies are continuing into other aspects of safety, such as the monitoring and suppression of coal dust, underground mining methods and particularly large-scale operations, prediction and drainage of gas, as well as the prediction of outbursts, which is a world-wide problem. It is proposed that one of my department's senior coal-mining engineers should proceed overseas in the immediate future to acquire the latest information available from expert research bodies in other countries.

In the matter of education, my department in conjunction with coal-mine owners and the mining unions has published booklets for the education of all persons employed in underground coal-mining. Two booklets have been published—one for mine management and one for mine employees. Following publication of this material, discussions were held at all coal-mining centres in Queensland, and as a result of this programme of education a number of heatings arising from spontaneous combustion have been successfully contained. Rescue brigade superintendents were involved in this programme of education, and they are available for consultation with mine management in the matter of dealing with mine fires.

Standardisation with New South Wales coal-mine legislation has been, and is being, effected wherever practicable. However, this aim has not been allowed to delay the implementation of urgent legislation, and the Queensland Coal Mining Act has been amended to provide for stone dust or water barriers and for barographs as recommended.

Monitoring of carbon monoxide is now being carried out at all mines where pillars are being extracted in seams liable to spontaneous combustion. CO/O₂ deficiency ratios are determined for each underground district where pillar extraction is being carried out. Preparatory seals are mandatory and must be installed before pillar extraction is commenced in any underground coal-mine, and the Coal Mining Act has been amended to provide for persons with technical authority superior to a mine manager. Such persons must now possess a coal-mine managers' certificate of competency under the Coal Mining Act. I trust that I have covered the points raised by the honourable member, and I now turn to the Bill.

As I mentioned earlier, to keep pace with modern terminology the term “rescue station” has been changed to “rescue brigade”, and the powers of the Minister to establish localities in which a rescue

brigade may be formed have been extended to permit the formation of more than one brigade in any one locality. At present there is no provision for a rescue brigade to operate outside the locality in which it was formed, although in cases of necessity this has been done. In order to give this very desirable situation legal standing, the amendment provides that a brigade may afford assistance in any other locality or place whether within or outside the State in the case of an emergency.

It is provided also that the committee of management of a rescue brigade shall consist of such number of persons as the Minister may determine in a particular case, and of those persons appointed not more than two shall represent each of the authorities or bodies of persons listed in the Bill as expresses a desire to be represented.

Each of the authorities or bodies may nominate to the Minister one or two persons, as the Minister may determine to be necessary, for appointment to the committee, and they shall be entitled to be represented on the committee. Filling of vacancies is provided for in a similar manner.

It is to be noted that the Bill provides for the committee to ensure that there is at all times available through the brigade a sufficient number of suitably qualified and trained persons suitably equipped to allow the brigade to properly discharge its function.

The authorities and bodies of persons eligible for appointment to the committee are the same as those listed in the current legislation, with the exception of the Workers' Compensation Board of Queensland, which has replaced the State Government Insurance Office.

The remainder of the clause merely details more fully the method of funding of rescue brigades, the legal standing of the committee and meeting procedures.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (4.1 p.m.): I thank the Minister for his reply to my introductory comments. I have noted his comments in relation to the proposed function of the brigades and the information that he has given the House concerning the implementation of the findings of the Kianga and Box Flat inquiries. I hope that too much time does not elapse before we see the implementation of the recommendations set out in the findings. I, with all other honourable members, would hate to see the occurrence of a similar disaster.

As to the Bill—the section that has been amended has been altered considerably. As I said at the introductory stage, the amendment is worth while. The first portion of the clause elaborates on the establishment of a locality or a number of localities. The position has been clarified and much greater emphasis has been placed on the establishment of localities. In the Act the reference to localities was rather vague.

The other portions of the clause are reasonably straightforward. As I said in my introductory speech, the change in the name of the rescue bodies is an appropriate one.

As to the composition of the committees, I note that the clause allows the Minister to decide the numbers. I suppose that in certain circumstances it could be difficult for the committees to comprise the numbers as outlined in the Act. However, as the numbers are to be determined by the Minister, I wonder whether the Minister might decide that a particular body in a certain locality may not need to be represented. I should like some clarification on that point.

As I said at the introductory stage, I am pleased to note that the Bill allows for various bodies to nominate representatives. The Act was lacking in this regard, but now the position has been clarified by this worthwhile amendment.

Dealing with the function of the rescue brigades—the Bill provides that their function shall be to afford assistance in the event of an emergency. In my introductory speech I commented on the present section, which provides that rescue stations, as they were previously called, were for the purpose of affording first aid in the event of accident. I went on to mention the circumstances under which rescue teams had been used, and I referred particularly to the Box Flat and Kianga disasters. I said that I was under the impression that the prime function of rescue station personnel was the rescue of mines rather than the rescue of personnel. The Minister referred to that point in his second-reading speech. However, I still feel that the wording of the clause is not really appropriate to the functions of the rescue brigades. Their function is outlined in the words “shall be to afford assistance in the case of emergency”.

I believe we should spell out the reason for which the rescue brigades were really established. A fire was recently reported in the New Hope colliery on the Ipswich field. Because of the findings of the Kianga and Box Flat inquiries, most of which have been implemented, the situation that could have developed in the New Hope colliery was overcome without the necessity for a rescue team to go into the mine to fight the fire. That is how it should be.

The reference in the Bill to “emergency” is a little broad. It leaves the situation almost as bad as it was previously. The assistance rendered by the rescue brigade should be spelt out as assistance involving the use of specially trained, competent miners, using such special equipment as may be necessary. The vague reference to “afford assistance in the case of emergency” is very broad. It could still be argued that the prime aim of a rescue brigade is to rescue a mine. We know that these people are specially trained. If a fire breaks out

in a mine and people are trapped, the rescue squad is required to enter the mine and effect a rescue.

Reverting to the Box Flat and Kianga disasters, as I understand it no personnel were trapped, but the rescue teams went in to the rescue of the mines. Rather than leave it as "assistance in the case of emergency", we should define rescue work as work undertaken to effect the rescue of persons who may be trapped or injured in a mine as the result of an explosion, a fall, a fire or flooding.

I appreciate what the Minister said when he pointed out that a rescue brigade is restricted by the provisions of the Act to its own locality. The amendment will allow rescue brigades to be drawn from various areas throughout the State in times of major disaster.

In future, if all the findings of the Box Flat and Kianga inquiries are implemented there should be no need for men to risk their lives to rescue a mine. The findings of the inquiries are very comprehensive. The committees did a very good job and their recommendations should be implemented to the full. That would certainly be advantageous so far as the operations of the rescue brigades are concerned.

My next comment relates to a particular point made by the Kianga committee of inquiry. At all times the prime consideration of rescue brigades in the control of any heating or fire must be the safety of the personnel present. I should hate to see men sent down a mine to fight a fire in order to rescue a mine. My belief is fortified by my realisation of the situation in which men were placed in both the Box Flat and Kianga mine disasters.

If there is any suggestion that heating in a mine could be out of control and could lead to the development of a serious fire, there should be easy methods of sealing the mine without having to adopt what I believe is the somewhat antiquated method of building stoppings. Temporary stoppings, as they are called, are erected in a mine to cut off the supply of oxygen. In this day and age, we should have the expertise to implement mechanical means of installing seals or doors to cut off oxygen to a fire very quickly without having to send people underground to spend considerable time there, at their peril, erecting barricades. Surely we have advanced far enough with technology to be able to install such underground mining aids.

The Opposition concurs with the proposals contained in the Bill. We think that they will improve the lot of rescue brigades.

Mr. LESTER (Peak Downs) (4.11 p.m.): I commend the Minister and, indeed, all of the Parliament for taking the time to consider ways and means of making easier and more professional the job of mines rescue brigades. I have been to a great number

of demonstrations by the brigades. The last was at Blackwater last Saturday, where there was a very comprehensive mines rescue demonstration, including safety aspects. It is very relevant in that town, because it was not so long ago that two young people in the prime of life were lost at the Leichhardt Colliery.

I commend the provision of a research engineer. We are constantly being challenged to do a more professional job, firstly to avoid problems and, secondly, to make sure that we have sufficient expertise to deal with problems that do arise.

Nor must we forget the aspect of open-cut rescue, which is being treated quite seriously since open-cut mining has become more widespread in Queensland. Unfortunately, a number of serious accidents have occurred in open-cut mines. They range from traffic accidents through engineering accidents to accidents involving jamming by bulldozer blades. Mines rescue does have to extend to open-cut activities, even though the traditional mines rescue is underground. I ask the Minister and the Parliament not to forget open-cut mines. Accidents in them are probably as frequent as in underground mines, but it is probably fair to say that most of them occur through some degree of carelessness. When we become familiar with something, we tend to take things for granted.

I point out that the committee has a real challenge ahead of it to make sure that it covers all aspects of mine safety and rescue. I commend to the Parliament the posting of a man overseas to look at the latest developments in controlling spontaneous combustion of coal dust. That is a good move and certainly in the interests of those Queenslanders who work in the coalfields and earn a lot of dollars for us. The booklets that are being produced by the department will be a big help and will not only influence miners but will enable all of us to have an appreciation of the problems that exist. I am sure that many of us do not quite realise the problems faced by miners every morning when they go to work. Unfortunately, every so often somebody goes down a pit never again to come out alive.

The standardisation with New South Wales, where possible, is a good move. However, if we have something better and the New South Wales Government cannot agree with us about it, we should continue doing our own thing.

I have one other point which I believe is very relevant. It has been pointed out that in an emergency situation other brigades may be brought in to help. It is obvious that one can draw virtually a straight line from South Blackwater through Peak Downs, Saraji and Norwich Park, right up to Goonyella. It will not be too long before German Creek, Oaky Creek and Gregory are in production. A road linking all these

places would facilitate the movement of people from one mine to another if a rescue operation had to be mounted. If there was a major catastrophe caused by an explosion or in some other way—I certainly hope one does not occur—all available rescue personnel would have to be concentrated at that point as quickly as possible. I also believe there is a need for an upgraded airport at Blackwater so that if necessary Army or other personnel could be flown in to help in an emergency.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. LESTER: I say, in reply to the honourable member for Archerfield, that I consider this to be a very serious debate. I have attended a large number of mine rescues and they are a serious business. The points I am trying to make are pertinent to the issue.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Didn't they have to get you out of Blackwater during the strike for your own safety?

Mr. LESTER: If the honourable member went to Blackwater, I would have to get him out for his own safety. I just hope that the attitude of the honourable member is not shared by his colleagues. I think they agree with the points I am making on this very serious issue. Because the honourable member lives in Brisbane, perhaps he does not understand the seriousness of the issue.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I am trying to learn from you. It is very difficult, I know.

Mr. LESTER: Perhaps the honourable member might meet me outside the Chamber after I have finished my speech and I will explain to him the ramifications of the Bill.

I fully support the Bill, bearing in mind that we have to be ever alert to improve the conditions under which our miners work and make it easier for those brave people who rescue miners when there is an emergency.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (4.18 p.m.), in reply: I wish to thank the two honourable members who spoke for their contributions to the debate. The honourable member for Nudgee reiterated most of what he said in the introductory debate. May I again remind him that it is from experience that it was decided that the Minister has discretion as to the size of these rescue brigades. The people who have the responsibility of nominating members to sit on these brigades are outlined clearly in the Bill. If they accept that responsibility, there will be no necessity for the Minister to use his discretion as to the size of these brigades.

The honourable member also mentioned the implementation of some of the recommendations made after the inquiry into the Box Flat disaster. During many sessions of Parliament since that disaster I have been introducing amendments to the Mining Regulations and the Mining Act incorporating many of the recommendations of that inquiry. This amendment is a further move towards implementation of those recommendations.

The honourable member spoke about the work of the rescue brigades being concerned with personnel rather than saving the mine. I think I outlined clearly in my second-reading speech that the prime purpose is the saving of lives and the treatment of the injured. It is quite wrong to talk about the mines rescue brigade at Kianga, because no mines rescue brigade was involved in the Kianga disaster. The miners themselves went down the mine and endeavoured to put out a suspected fire.

I wish to commend the member for Peak Downs for his contribution. I know that he is quite concerned about improving the conditions in the mining industry. Representing as he does a very large proportion of the coal-mining industry of Queensland, he is for ever reminding me of what we should do to make the lot of miners easier in not only working conditions but also living conditions. He works hard among all Ministers in an endeavour to make things easier for the people engaged in the mining industry.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. CAMM: When the member for Peak Downs rises to his feet to speak in this House, he shows that he is a very constructive thinker and a very constructive debater. I can assure the member for Archerfield that we take a lot more notice of the member for Peak Downs than we do of some of the mouthings that we hear from the other side of the House.

Mr. Davis: Aren't you a nice type!

Mr. CAMM: If the honourable member wants to play it that way, he will get the same as he metes out.

I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Motion (Mr. Camm) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Row, Hinchinbrook, in the chair)

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

MINERS' HOMESTEAD LEASES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (4.24 p.m.): I move—

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

When introducing the Bill, I commented that the amendments proposed were brief but important. They correct certain anomalies in the present Act and remove restrictions on the ownership of land in areas where mining has no further value or potential.

Throughout the State mining fields have been proclaimed over various mineralised areas and on such fields miners' homestead perpetual leases may be granted. Over the years, however, some of these mineralised areas may have been worked out and there may be no longer a necessity to retain the mining field in part or in full over particular localities. The removal of a mining field permits a greater freedom in dealing with land than when the field existed.

On most mining fields over a period of time many miners' homestead leases and miners' homestead perpetual leases have been granted. In the event of a mining field being abolished, no further leases can be granted. The amendments provide that leases already granted continue in force and that the rights and liabilities of the holders of such leases are preserved as if the field had remained in existence.

The present Act provides that a lessee who does not comply with the residence or improvement condition imposed on any miners' homestead lease or miners' homestead perpetual lease and who has not been granted exemption from the performance of such condition is deemed to have abandoned the land and shall cease to have an interest therein. The Bill deletes this provision, as it conflicts with other parts of the present Act that adequately cover this situation. Those parts provide that a lease may be forfeited for a breach of the conditions imposed after the lessee has been given an opportunity to present his case before the warden's court as to why the lease should not be forfeited. It is considered that these present provisions are a much fairer way of dealing with the cancellation of a title in that the lessee has an opportunity to state his case before the land is forfeited.

The final clause of the Bill covers the position where a lease could have been dealt with by way of transfer or other dealings and at that particular time a condition of the lease may have not been fulfilled. To safeguard any such transactions that were made in good faith at that time, the amendment prevents a lease from being deemed abandoned for a breach of the residence or

improvement condition that may have occurred prior to the commencement of this amending Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (4.26 p.m.): I appreciate that the Minister has indicated that the provisions of the Bill are virtually only machinery matters, but I have some comments to make that I should like placed on record.

As I see it, new clause 5A allows any miners' homestead lease or miners' homestead perpetual lease to continue in existence and to continue to be covered by the provisions of the Miners' Homestead Leases Act, including the rights and liabilities of the lessee, notwithstanding that the area in which the lease is located may have been excluded from a designated mining field by a variation of the boundaries of that mining field.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister said that over the years methods of mining have changed, certain mineralised areas have been worked out, and there could be a need for areas to be deleted from a mining field. I acknowledge that such a need could exist, and I would be interested in hearing the Minister elaborate on that point.

I think that for the record, and having regard to the provisions of the Bill whereby leases granted under the provisions of the Act are to continue in existence and still be subject to the conditions of the Act even though the area of such leases is no longer in a mining field, the Minister should outline, as he sees it, why there could be a need for areas to be deleted from a mining field. If the Minister knows of a specific area, I should like him to explain the situation there so that members of this Assembly are fully aware of what the Minister has in mind relative to the provisions of the Bill.

I can see that there could be grounds for persons who hold a lease in an area that may be deleted from a mining field to have their position protected. I understand that many leases would be located in areas where, if it were not for the conditions that apply under the Act, it would not be viable for the lessee to continue his particular activity. However, I do believe there are also many leases that are located in areas where this is not the case.

I must say I have some reservations about the provisions of the Bill in the latter case. I can foresee a situation where there could be two properties in an area. One property may be located in an area that has been deleted from a mining field and yet, in accordance with the provisions of this Bill, still be subject to the advantageous provisions of the Act, while the adjoining property would not. I believe such a situation could cause problems.

In this regard, the last part of the Bill intrigues me also. While another section of the Bill deletes from the Act the provision that automatically returns a lease to the Crown if a lessee fails to comply with the conditions of the lease, the last part of the Bill enables a lessee who may have forfeited his lease, because he had failed to comply with the conditions of the lease prior to this Bill, to be deemed not to have forfeited his lease. When referring to this section during his introductory speech, the Minister said that in the past there had been cases where a lease had been subject to transfer or some other dealing and that because the lessee had failed to comply with the conditions of his lease he had been deemed to have abandoned it.

The Minister said this amendment validated any such dealings which were made in good faith and safeguarded any lease from being deemed abandoned. I can appreciate that there could be many cases where, because of particular circumstances, a lessee was unable to comply with the conditions under which he was granted a lease. I can also appreciate that since section 21 (3) has been deleted from the Act, there is merit in giving retrospective effect to that deletion, which is what this section in effect does. However, in conjunction with the provisions of new clause 5A, this provision could be of considerable benefit to some lessees who otherwise would have had no entitlements. I make these points for no reason other than to record what I believe could, in some circumstances, be the situation as a result of this legislation.

I do note that the Minister prefaced his initial remarks at the introductory stage by saying that the Bill provided brief but nevertheless important amendments to the Act. Regarding the deletion of section 21 (3), I have noted the Minister's remarks that elsewhere in the Act the circumstances are adequately covered. From a perusal of the Act, as far as I can see, the situation is covered in sections 30 and 32. I might say that I believe the show cause provision is more desirable than the cold automatic forfeiture. They are all the comments I wish to make.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (4.32 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Nudgee for his contribution. As I indicated earlier, there could be districts in Queensland where mining activity has ceased, but where the main tenure for landholders is still a miners' homestead lease or a miners' homestead perpetual lease. Those titles carry with them certain privileges by way of their acquisition and the rent paid, particularly on a miners' homestead perpetual lease, where the value is determined by the mining warden. One district comes to my mind immediately. In the city of Gympie and the surrounding area all land at the present time is held under mining titles.

It is not considered that any mining activity will ever again take place in Gympie, but there are people in that area who desire to freehold their land. If we excise that area of land from the mining field, we declare that a certain area in the Gympie mining field is no longer in that field, thus enabling those people to freehold their land. At the same time, if they wish to retain their land under a mining title, they may do so.

A miners' homestead lease does not require the owner to pay any rent whatsoever. He has paid his rent for 30 years, and then he pays rent if it is demanded. In effect, it is as good as freehold title. No miners' homestead leases have been issued for many years. The Labor Government brought in miners' homestead perpetual leases, just as it brought in perpetual leases for residential areas throughout the State. It never allowed land to be freehold. It just doesn't believe in the freeholding of land, and that is a fact it must accept. This provision is made to enable those people who desire to stay under a mining title to do so, even though the land is not contained in a mining field.

As to the honourable member's other question—there could be occasions when, through some mistake just before the enactment of the Bill, it could be deemed that a person had forfeited his lease. The provision will take that into account, and that person will be able to retain the land as a miners' homestead perpetual lease. If by other provisions in the Act we can forfeit that lease, we will do so. There are some areas in other mining fields that have been abandoned. If we do excise those areas from a mining field, we want the Mines Department to have the right to take that land back. We do not want to be hard on people who may have a legitimate reason for not having been able to effect the residential conditions or improvement conditions on those miners' homestead perpetual leases. This will occur only in rather isolated instances. It is not intended that vast areas of Queensland will be released from a mining field. When mining activity of any consequence is taking place, the land will still remain a mining field as far as the Queensland Government is concerned, and the land tenures will still come under the control of the Mines Department.

Motion (Mr. Camm) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Row, Hinchinbrook, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

QUEENSLAND MARINE ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. A. M. HODGES (Gympie—Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism) (4.38 p.m.): I move—

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

At the introductory stage, I summarised the purposes of the amendments as—

(a) Extending the safety and prevention of accident provisions contained in Part VII of the Act beyond coasters and short-limit ships;

(b) Extending the regulation-making powers to include additional requirements for safety drills and life saving signals;

(c) Extending the regulation-making powers in relation to ships and shipping to the provision of treaties, conventions and agreements and providing that the making of such treaties, etc., is to be within the objects and purposes of the Act.

At the introductory stage I also expounded in some detail the provisions of the Bill giving effect to these principles, and honourable members will have now had the opportunity of examining the Bill in the light of the explanations then given. It is a straightforward measure and I would not envisage that there would have been any difficulty so far as its contents are concerned.

The honourable member for Cairns referred to certain aspects of the proposals and it would be appropriate for me to clarify these before any further issues are raised. Firstly, he made mention of the matter of costs which may fall upon owners and operators of small craft owing to the implementation of the provisions of the Bill. His concern in this respect is appreciated, but it is proposed to implement the new regulations under the amended provisions in such a way that there would be no immediate increase of costs to operators of smaller fishing vessels or pleasure vessels, or indeed to the operators of tourist vessels.

The new regulations will extend to new vessels coming into the survey requirements after June 1979 and where existing vessels are concerned will be applied where it is reasonable and practicable to do so when these particular vessels become due for survey.

Reference was also made regarding watertight subdivisions and it is agreed that this requirement could be a most expensive exercise if applied to the small pleasure vessel operators. However, it is considered that watertight subdivisions on passenger vessels are most important. A recent accident at Phillip Island in Victoria involving a ferry showed that, unless adequate subdivisions are made, safety of passengers is at risk.

Once again the new provisions relating to watertight subdivisions will be brought in gradually—firstly, appertaining to new vessels and, as surveys become due, certain additional requirements would be made to existing vessels depending upon their build and their age. However, I would point out that the requirement for watertight subdivisions is not a new concept. Such subdivisions have been a requirement for many years and the new regulations will merely improve the standards of construction relating to the separation of the different compartments.

It is the intention of my Department of Harbours and Marine to in no way hinder the operators in the operation of their vessels but to gradually bring vessels to a higher degree of safety. The honourable member made specific references to what he termed “yachtees”. Owners of private yachts are subject to the Equipment of Pleasure Yacht Regulations of 1971, which deal with the safety equipment that must be installed on private vessels. It is not intended that survey requirements for hull, machinery, or indeed for any part of these vessels, shall apply. They are private vessels used for pleasure and the extent of my department’s interest in them is to ensure that they are equipped with adequate life-saving equipment. The situation becomes more complex when such vessels become charter vessels plying for hire or reward on commercial operations. In the interests of persons who make use of these vessels, it is necessary that they be subject to survey requirements, but once again time will be allowed before any new requirements by our surveyors are brought into force.

Referring to the questions raised appertaining to the provision of gangway illumination, in vessels where the freeboard of the vessel and the wharf are identical, such as Brisbane cross-river ferries working to a pontoon, the method of boarding or disembarkation of passengers is both safe and easy. However, on tourist vessels working where the tidal range is large, it is necessary to provide adequate illumination on the vessel in the region of the gangway access. It would be expected that the wharf would also be provided with adequate illumination.

In all cases the provision of suitable deck lights on a pleasure or tourist vessel are looked at by the surveyors and this has always applied irrespective of the size of the vessel. It is not anticipated that there will be any change to this procedure. In clarification of a possible misinterpretation of what was said at the introductory stage, I would mention that illumination requirements are not variable according to the length and tonnage of the vessel.

The change from “50 register tons” to 35 metres in length applies specifically to the carrying of a pilot on small tourist vessels. A survey relative to this particular point has shown that the application of the 35 metres length will be far more compatible than “50 register tons”, and will obviate the present problems relating to the requirements for a

pilot whereby special exemptions have had to be issued to particular vessels exempting them from requirements which in their case were quite clearly unwarranted.

I have dealt with the major points raised by the honourable member for Cairns, and I will be interested to hear any other comments which honourable members may have on the Bill.

Mr. PREST (Port Curtis) (4.44 p.m.): The Opposition has no criticism to level at the amendments outlined in the Bill. At the introductory stage, our spokesman, the honourable member for Cairns, outlined our feelings. This afternoon I was very pleased to hear the Minister answer the queries raised by him. We agree with the amendments because they are in line with what is required in the maritime industry today. Safety is all-important. Because boats, both small and large, are becoming more popular, we must try to ensure that accidents at sea and in port do not occur. We must do our best to ensure that safety standards are maintained at a high level.

Because I did not take part in the introductory debate, I will take advantage of this opportunity to express my concern about a boating accident that occurred off the Central Queensland coast, either late in December last year or early in January this year. On this occasion a working trawler was rammed—in fact, I believe it was rammed twice—by another vessel, and sank. The vessel responsible for the ramming was found eventually in the Tin Can Bay area but, to the best of my knowledge, no charges were laid. An accident between motor vehicles on land is bad enough, but an accident at sea is far worse. Whoever is involved should not be allowed to escape, leaving the other vessel in distress or to sink. It is pointed out in the Act that all possible assistance must be given where necessary. This is one of the things that these amendments cover. Anyone who has any relationship with the sea must ensure that those provisions are rigidly applied.

The Opposition welcomes the amendments. Although there is only a small number of them, they are in keeping with today's needs. Therefore, we support the action taken by the Minister.

Mr. HANSEN (Maryborough) (4.46 p.m.): Like my colleague from Port Curtis, I support the measure. I had some reservations about the part of the Bill which deletes subsection 2 of section 239, relating to protection of officials. My concern about this relates to the definition of plaintiff and defendant. I have been assured by the Minister that "plaintiff" refers to a person who feels aggrieved and takes action against a public servant or some other person acting in authority. Under the present Act they are exempt from liability. I understand that this provision was dropped from similar Acts in the United Kingdom in the 1880s. However, it has continued to operate in our Act.

As this has been explained to me, I do not propose raising objection to the excision of that provision.

Generally, the other amendments bring provisions up to date. They relate to matters such as automatic pilots, which have become a feature not only in larger ships but also in smaller boats, yachts and the like. Regulations apply to other steering devices on vessels. Inspection of those is very necessary. There is also provision for general maintenance. There is justification for ensuring that maintenance is continued on gear such as that. Wind and salt set up a rapid corrosive action. For that reason, gear should be maintained in adequate condition.

It is for the benefit of passengers that regular boat drills are held. It is important to know that rescue gear is in good condition and that passengers are aware that life-jackets and rafts are readily available. The people who might be called upon to use them should be given the opportunity of doing so in practice, through boat drills, fire drills and so on.

Another provision introduced by the Minister makes a clear definition of what is a ship. It now covers vessels in enclosed waters.

Clause 8 amends section 174, which grants pilotage exemption. Whereas exemption was previously granted to a vessel under 50 registered tons, that has now been altered to a vessel "having a length of less than 35 metres measured from the fore part of the hull to the after part of the hull". I think this is a very clear definition. It is one of which builders of vessels and people having vessels built for a particular purpose will certainly take note. Previously, when tonnage was mentioned, definitions such as gross tonnage, net tonnage, tonnage displacement and cargo tonnage were used, but it is now quite clear that no vessel over 35 metres in length will be exempted from pilotage rates. Of course, the masters of some vessels have, because of their experience in various ports, been granted an exemption and as the Act now stands need not engage a pilot before entering a port.

These amendments are generally designed with the safety of vessels at sea in mind and I see no reason not to support them. I am particularly pleased that we have now cleared up the definition of who is a plaintiff and who is not. I understand that this measure was dropped from the United Kingdom legislation many years ago and I am pleased that it is now being dropped from the Queensland Act.

Hon. A. M. HODGES (Gympie—Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism) (4.52 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for the way in which they have accepted the Bill. As the honourable member for Port Curtis stated, the Bill relates to safety at sea. The honourable member for Maryborough referred to section 239 (2), and

that has been explained. Once again I thank honourable members for their acceptance of the Bill.

Motion (Mr. Hodges) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Row, Hinchinbrook, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 11, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Row, Hinchinbrook, in the chair)

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Welfare) for **Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Labour Relations) (4.55 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Workers' Compensation Act 1916–1978 in certain particulars.”

The purpose of this legislation is to rectify certain injustices which it is felt have affected widows following the death of a breadwinner and to bring back within the scope of the Act certain owner-drivers inadvertently excluded when the Act was amended in 1978.

With regard to a fatality claim lodged under the Act, hitherto the widow and/or dependants of a deceased worker have been entitled to a lump-sum payment from the Workers' Compensation Fund but have had to pay medical and funeral expenses. The proposal therefore is to amend section 14 (1) (A) of the Act to meet reasonable expenses for both, over and above other amounts payable under this section. The medical payments will continue from date of injury to death.

Compensation for death is now \$28,180. Each dependant child is allowed \$520 for each year between date of death and age 16 and between ages 16 and 21 if a student.

When the Act was last amended in 1978, it was not intended to exclude owner-drivers who worked under an award or a registered industrial agreement. Such workers, for example, could be owner-drivers employed by the Main Roads Department or local authorities. As the 1978 amendment excluded all owner-drivers, it is now necessary to amend section 3 in the definition of worker to reinclude owner-drivers employed under an award or a registered industrial agreement.

I am sure the Committee will welcome this measure. The Government is determined to rectify injustices whenever they occur and

to extend even further its leadership in worker compensation legislation all over other States.

I should like to touch on two aspects of this—rehabilitation and premiums. Honourable members will be aware that the Workers' Compensation Board has deposited an initial \$1,000,000 in a fund created to expand the State's rehabilitation services. The long-term aim is to provide a satisfactory and effective service for all injured workers needing rehabilitation treatment.

The State will seek to relieve the pressure on the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Centre at Taringa, Brisbane, by establishing assessment clinics and by training rehabilitation counsellors to undertake field work in homes and hospitals. The Queensland Government is fully appreciative of the co-operation of the Commonwealth in making available facilities for the training and treatment of State workers' compensation patients, but is determined to play a fuller part. To this end, advances in worker compensation administration and rehabilitation systems will be studied in Canada in May by the Under Secretary, Department of Labour Relations and Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board (Mr. J. E. McDonnell) and the Deputy General Manager (Mr. J. Campbell). I might add that the investigations by Mr. McDonnell and Mr. Campbell will complement those carried out in Canada in 1973 by the General Manager of the board (Mr. K. F. Doody).

Mr. Doody, who has given outstanding service, retired on 6 April, and I should like to place on record the Government's appreciation of his meritorious service.

The expansion programme could cover three stages—establishment of needs and administrative procedures; training rehabilitation counsellors; and establishing work assessment centres in Brisbane and selected country areas to work in conjunction with Commonwealth centres at Taringa and Townsville.

The Workers' Compensation Board of Queensland considers rehabilitation of seriously or permanently injured workers is one of the main functions of any workers' compensation authority. Loss of manpower to the work-force through serious injury is reaching alarming proportions. It is a prime responsibility to promote the rehabilitation of all seriously injured workers.

Queensland is in the unique position in Australia in that one organisation—the Workers' Compensation Board—administers the Workers' Compensation Act. We are in an ideal situation to establish and promote an effective and worthwhile rehabilitation system for injured workers as all injured workers' claims are processed by the board.

Queensland employers are at such advantage over industry in other States in terms of worker insurance costs that compensation insurance is now a prime incentive to capital investment and plant relocation. It may be

contradictory to state that a charge on industry can be deemed an incentive, but it is true, particularly when added to inducements such as freight concessions, preference in Government tendering, attractive leasing and freeholding conditions on Crown industrial estates, removal of death duties and regular lifting of the pay-roll tax base.

In other States, workers' compensation insurance is handled by several private insurers. Queensland's one-board system permits obvious economies of scale, the return to most insurers of a large percentage of surpluses through general and merit bonus schemes and periodic reductions in premiums.

Last September, the general bonus, which every employer gets, was increased by 10 per cent to 15 per cent and will yield in this financial year a rebate to insurers of \$12,500,000. The merit bonus, which is based on accident record, will absorb another \$26,500,000. In addition, compensation insurance premiums have been reduced by 10 per cent in each of the last two years.

These three continuing policy initiatives have led to Queensland's having premiums up to 40 per cent less than in other States, merit bonus rebates of up to 60 per cent of premiums for good claims records and, in addition to general bonus rebates of 15 per cent, an additional 5 per cent to those employers with approved on-site ambulance facilities. All this compares with premium charges in southern States soaring—in some instances 500 per cent in six years. It is little wonder that I see workers' compensation insurance in Queensland as an important part of the investment-incentive package as well as essential humanitarian action.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. YEWDAL (Rockhampton North) (5.1 p.m.): Having listened to the introductory speech of the Acting Minister, I, as spokesman for the Opposition, welcome the changes now proposed, particularly those that will apply to the recipients of workers' compensation. For example, a widow with a family will now receive consideration both in regard to her family and in regard to funeral expenses. The question of owner-drivers who, in certain circumstances, are covered by awards was raised when the present Workers' Compensation Board was established, and I am sure that persons in the community who are engaged as owner-drivers covered by awards will appreciate the improvements now being brought forward.

The final comment made by the Minister related to the rehabilitation and training of workers who sustain injuries in industry. In my opinion, that is very important, because I believe, as apparently the Government believes, that in the past not enough work has been done in the field of rehabilitation

and retraining of people who have sustained injuries that do not allow them to return to their original calling.

In talking about workers' compensation, one opens up a wide range of problems that confront people who receive workers' compensation. Members of this Assembly who are associated with the community at large, and in particular with people covered by workers' compensation, face many day-to-day problems that are brought to them by people dealing with the Workers' Compensation Board and its officers. I do not intend to lay the blame entirely on the officers of the board, but I think that valid criticisms can be made of the system or the *modus operandi* of the board, and I speak from my own knowledge of the experience of the people in my electorate of Rockhampton North.

I should like to raise the question of reopening of workers' compensation claims. Without going into great detail, I simply point out that a worker who has received treatment and been compensated for an injury might return to his workplace and later—it may be after only a short period or perhaps after a lengthy period—be forced to seek medical treatment for a recurrence of the injury. The system as I know it at present—and I am open to correction if I am wrong—is that after a specified period the files relating to that particular claim are forwarded to Brisbane. They are compiled in Rockhampton during the period in which the claim is current and then sent to Brisbane to be stored away. When a claim is reopened, the file is located and referred to and the necessary information has to be forwarded to the provincial office of the board. I should say that would be true of Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Cairns and any other major centre in which the board has an office.

In my opinion, that system should be improved. The contents of the files should be condensed by some of the methods that one now sees being used in many places. I could refer honourable members to the use of film in the Parliamentary Library, and I am sure that many other Government instrumentalities in the metropolitan area use a similar system. The point I am stressing is that, when a worker wishes to reopen a claim, his file should be readily available for consideration.

I know that the payment of workers' compensation has been streamlined and updated. Workers' compensation cheques are sent out under a mailing system. That system has eliminated the problem of people queueing up at counters on a set pay day. The mailing system has proved a success. It operates well while it works, but the moment it breaks down a serious problem arises for the individual worker who has not received his workers' compensation cheque. He may be paying rent on a home and supporting a wife and several children. He has to live from week to week on his

workers' compensation cheque. If it does not arrive on the Thursday or Friday, the normal week-end shopping cannot be done, and he cannot make his normal weekly outlays.

The department has always been co-operative in endeavouring to pay cheques over the counter in the event of an internal breakdown in the mailing of cheques. However, there is one point that I have stressed to the Minister on a previous occasion. These days it is very difficult to cash a cheque if a person cannot identify himself. Take the case of, say, an injured meatworker who is moving through the State. If he produces that cheque at a Commonwealth Bank, a hotel, a grocery shop or any other place of business, he is not identified merely by the production of the cheque. If he does not have a drivers' licence or any other definite means of identification, and is not known to someone in the district, he can find it very difficult to cash his cheque. I can cite a couple of cases.

One fellow had been living in a caravan park in Rockhampton for a couple of weeks. His cheque was not mailed at the usual time, so he could not cash it by paying his landlord in the caravan park. I did not know this person when he approached me for assistance. The matter was finally resolved with some hasty phone calls. He went back to the doctor's surgery, and the doctor verified that the person who had possession of the cheque was in fact the person he had treated for the injury that attracted compensation payments. I rang the bank manager and he was prepared to cash the cheque.

I have spoken to the Minister previously about this problem, and I asked a question about it in the House last year. There does not appear to be any provision for the identification of persons in receipt of workers' compensation cheques. I had in mind the idea that the Workers' Compensation Board could collaborate with the S.G.I.O. Building Society so that cheques could be deposited and money withdrawn. However, it was found that it was not possible to draw on the cheques immediately. A person had to wait 10 days for clearance of the cheque.

In another instance a local lad wanted to cash a workers' compensation cheque on a Friday. He could not identify himself by the presentation of a drivers' licence. The Commonwealth Bank in Rockhampton would cash his cheque only on the condition that the lad presented a personal letter from me. It was fortunate that I knew the lad and his family. I gave him a letter identifying him as the person to whom the cheque was made out. So there is a problem even in relation to the cashing of cheques for workers on compensation.

Another problem that often confronts us is the delay experienced in obtaining employers' and doctors' reports on injured

workers. I include reports tendered by public hospitals. The fact is that the Workers' Compensation Board will not finalise a compensation claim until its requirements are met.

Its requirements are that the injured worker fill out his claim form, obtain statement from witnesses, if any, and obtain his employer's report. After a claim is received from an injured worker, the board writes to his doctor or hospital for a report on him and on the treatment given to him. The problem is that if the doctor or the hospital does not submit the report within a relatively short period, the board has no set procedure to follow for obtaining the report.

I am sure that most honourable members have shared my experience of having to ring a doctor's surgery to ask the receptionist to send the report in to the board. Frequently I have had to ring the superintendent of the hospital or the manager of the Rockhampton Hospitals Board and ask that the report be expedited. Until the report is submitted to the Workers' Compensation Board, it will not finalise the claim. The late submission of reports causes undue delays.

Earlier I spoke of the reopening of claims. If in the course of a compensation claim a delay occurs for any reason, such as doubt as to the bona fides of the claim, the board does not give advice to the applicant for compensation to approach the Social Security Department and apply for the payment of sickness benefits pending the determination of the workers' compensation claim. Probably it is not the Workers' Compensation Board's function to give such advice. However, many workers are not aware of their rights in the event of injury. Because of delays, their claims for compensation may not be finalised for several weeks. During that period, they have to make do the best way they can. Eventually they become desperate and look around for assistance. They may approach the trade union movement or their member of Parliament. If they approach members, we immediately say to them, "You should have obtained a duplicate certificate from the Workers' Compensation Board and taken it to the Social Security Department to obtain sickness benefits."

I know of one fellow who was waiting six weeks for his compensation claim to be finalised and who ultimately obtained sickness benefits from the Social Security Department. Within a week or two his compensation claim was finalised and the normal compensation deductions were made. The board should advise people whose claims are delayed to approach the Social Security Department for sickness benefits. After all, quite often the board is responsible for such delays. It should say, "It looks as if your claim will be delayed for some weeks until we obtain some information, so you should apply for sickness benefits from the Social Security Department."

The Minister referred to rehabilitation and retraining and the possible establishment of provincial centres. I would put in a parochial plug here for Rockhampton, which is ideally located for the establishment of such a centre. The Central Queensland area contains a host of industries, including the mining industry, and a large number of injuries are sustained in those industries. Furthermore, development is occurring in Gladstone, which is only a drive of 1½ hours from Rockhampton. I believe that a centre should be established in Rockhampton.

Mr. Lester: What about making it more central and establishing it in Emerald?

Mr. YEWDALD: That is a parochial statement. If the honourable member wishes to push his barrow, he can do so. I do not think that his proposition is feasible. Emerald just has not the population or the feed-in which would come to Rockhampton. It caters for the whole Capricorn coast, right into the mining area, down to Gladstone and into the Dawson and Callide Valleys. Rockhampton is the logical place for such a centre.

An Honourable Member: What about Mt. Morgan?

Mr. YEWDALD: Mt. Morgan is another place that should be covered. Note should be taken of these matters for the Minister's consideration when he gets back into harness.

I digress for a moment to point out that Rockhampton is an ideal base for block-release training and the establishment of quarters for apprentices during block release.

Overall, rehabilitation and retraining leave a doubt in my mind. The Government has decided at this point in its history to rehabilitate and retrain people. It is essential that, in conjunction with its Federal counterpart, it determines policies relative to providing jobs, not only in the general sense but for rehabilitated and retrained people. The Government would find it difficult to approach employers and say, "We would like you to employ Joe Blow because he cannot return to his industry and because we have rehabilitated and retrained him." A proper approach to creating employment and providing incentive in the private sector would relieve the Government of much of the load to be borne in placing these people in employment. Without wishing to sound a sour note, I must say that it seems hopeless to rehabilitate and retrain people for other jobs if the jobs are not available for them. If the Government cannot find jobs for them and the private sector is not providing them, we will not get anywhere. Much could be achieved if the Government were to adopt a positive approach to developing jobs.

The Opposition welcomes the amendments outlined in the Bill. As I said earlier, when the Government moves to improve the lot of widows with children and helps them to meet funeral expenses, and allows people in the trucking industry to be covered by awards, we will endorse its actions.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (5.18 p.m.): I have had considerable experience with the S.G.I.O. and other insurance companies. I find that the S.G.I.O. is softening its attitude to the accident victim. I have considered the people handling workers' compensation to be rather tough. In many cases within my experience, they did not seem to realise that people do not purposely get injured at work. In some instances, they treated them as if they do.

I should like the Minister to consider one or two alterations to the Act. If a person who is injured is brought before a medical board, he has no right of appeal against the decision of that board. If I shoot someone and I am convicted in a court of law, I have a right of appeal. Why should an injured man not have a right of appeal? I have seen colossal financial and physical trauma completely overlooked in a board's decision.

Another matter that disturbs me greatly is the present fixation of compensation for death at \$28,000. That may seem to be a lot of money, but weekly payments are deducted from that sum. In many instances \$28,000 is not the amount paid by way of lump-sum compensation. At the moment I am treating a man who had his foot injured. I had to amputate half the foot. His disability prevents him from working in his old job. He has been notified that all he can get in compensation is \$2,800, and some of that money will be lost recouping weekly payments. That is a grave injustice.

Seeing that the S.G.I.O. is able to build multi-storey buildings in many places, surely to God it could devote some of its money to compensation for the loss of flesh and blood. Compensation premiums are reasonable, but the S.G.I.O. has a monopoly in the field. As it has a monopoly, it should be more generous than it has been.

I should like the Minister to consider the problem presented by there being no appeal against a decision of a medical board in order to see if he can bring these procedures into line with those of the ordinary courts in our country.

Mr. DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (5.20 p.m.): As the shadow Minister for Labour Relations said, the amendment relating to owner-drivers is very important, and it is one that I am particularly concerned with. When the amendment was made in 1978, a big outcry followed. Obviously the Workers' Compensation Department did not thoroughly investigate the matter. I do not think that this amendment goes far enough.

I do not wish to discuss the owner-drivers' dispute that is currently raging throughout Australia. In fact, about 2,000 owner-drivers in Brisbane are covered by various State awards or registered agreements, such as the Local Authority Award, the Main Roads Award and the Forestry Award. A number of drivers work either full-time or at casual rates with those departments or local authorities. Owner-drivers

who work for the Brisbane City Council, while they are allegedly self-employed, work for the main contractor, which presently is Thiess Brothers, and are paid under that local authority award.

Throughout Queensland a great number of owner-drivers work full-time for various companies such as T.N.T., Comet and IPEC. Whilst they are not covered by a registered award or agreement, they are covered by agreements between the union and the companies. I have said that they work full-time for those companies. They work exactly the same hours as any other employee. As a matter of fact, included in the agreement is a provision for painting of the vehicle and provision of uniforms by the company. While they are regarded as being self-employed, probably the only difference between them and other employees is that they own a vehicle. What concerns the unions is that some employers and owner-drivers use it as a way to get around award provisions.

Another example is to be seen in ready-mixed concrete firms. They not only paint the vehicle but also supply the agitator that is attached to it. It could not possibly be said that they are not fully employed by the companies. The Minister did not mention whether those drivers would be covered by the amendment.

The interpretation of "worker" that was previously in the Act is the one that should be used. I would ask the Minister to comment on this in his reply. If owner-drivers covered by awards or registered industrial agreements are not included, then we will exclude from the coverage of this provision of the order of 1,500 to 2,000 owner-drivers. I am not referring to the owner-driver who works as a taxi-truck operator and will go from one carrier to another; nor am I speaking about the areas of my country and grazier friends on the other side where local carriers work for different graziers. I am talking about people who are more or less fully employed, either full-time or part-time, by one company. This is a very important question and I hope the Minister will consider it.

The Minister mentioned a problem that I suppose many members have raised with him. I refer to the case of a person who has been on compensation for a number of months, or even years, has not been before a board and has his compensation payments discontinued. Such a person will go to another specialist, who will certify that he should receive the sickness benefit. But there does not seem to be any recourse to an appeal board. On a number of occasions I have had to write to the Workers' Compensation Board about persons with this sort of problem, particularly those suffering from back injuries.

I hope that with this amendment of the Act the Minister does not fall into the same trap as the Minister for Labour Relations did previously, because he will have to include in the Act not only those owner-drivers who

are covered by awards and registered agreements but those who are still fully employed in the industry although they are not covered by an award.

Mr. PREST (Port Curtis) (5.26 p.m.): I rise to support the remarks of previous Opposition speakers on this amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act. I, too, am very pleased that these amendments will benefit workers and their dependants.

I wish to speak about the powers of the manager of a workers' compensation board or department. I refer to a case where a lady had been injured and still had a certificate from her doctor for a certain period. The manager took it upon himself to say that from a certain date he would disregard the doctor's opinion and he would discontinue this lady's payment. Although he is only a layman, he said that in his opinion she was not eligible for further payments. As I say, he has disregarded a professional person's opinion. If that lady had wished to disagree with the opinion of the manager, she could have said so in writing and taken her case to the Magistrates Court. But this would have cost her money because she would have had to be represented in court.

I believe this is only a mean way of denying a person compensation for the period remaining on the doctor's certificate. After all, if the certificate was only for another two weeks or so it would not be worth the time, cost and effort of engaging a solicitor and going to court to determine whether the compensation should be paid. I believe that if a manager has the power to disregard a medical opinion, at the very least another opinion should be sought from a Government medical officer. Unfortunately, this is not being done. As I said, the lady I mentioned pulled out because of the cost involved in engaging a solicitor and going before a magistrate to see if her claim should be allowed.

Over the week-end I had drawn to my attention the case of a number of unemployed workers in Gladstone and Rockhampton who obtained jobs on projects at Blackwater, Norwich Park and Dysart through the Commonwealth Employment Service. One hopes there will be many others employed soon at Oaky Creek and German Creek. These people have been employed on construction projects as riggers, crane drivers and so on. Each week-end they travel home to be with their families. Unfortunately, late last year one of these workers was involved in an accident. He is still under medical attention and is receiving workers' compensation. He was told this morning that his claim would be disallowed and that, because of the number of workers who are travelling to and from their places of employment on a week-end, the Workers' Compensation Board will use his case as a test case. That is very unfair.

At present these men are travelling from their homes in Gladstone or Rockhampton to their barracks at Norwich Park. I am led to believe that the Workers' Compensation Board is saying that they should travel from their homes to their places of work. That is virtually impossible because the distance between Gladstone and Norwich Park is at least 200 miles. It would be unfair to expect any person to leave Gladstone at midnight on Sunday night or 1 a.m. on Monday morning and start work at Norwich Park at 7 a.m.

These people are leaving for work in daylight to avoid the obstructions, such as cattle, that are on the road. They are travelling over very dusty dirt roads, and damage can be caused to their vehicles by not only cattle but also kangaroos. I believe that what they say is true. They work a restricted day on Fridays to allow them to get over the worst sections of the road before dark.

If this case is to be used as a test case, I ask the Minister to have these matters investigated. I believe that these men are fair dinkum and that they should not be denied workers' compensation just because of the unemployment situation in the coastal areas and the fact that the Commonwealth Employment Service sends them to the Central Highlands to get work. Any amendment that could be made to assist these people would be of great benefit.

When a person in these circumstances is unfortunate enough to have an accident and be placed on workers' compensation, he should receive his compensation without experiencing undue worry. These people are experiencing undue worry at the present time because the manager is ignoring the opinion of the medical practitioner and making his own decision.

It is entirely wrong that the Workers' Compensation Board should use as a test case the case that I have outlined.

The Opposition is only too pleased to support amendments that will assist the worker who has an unfortunate accident.

Mr. LESTER (Peak Downs) (5.34 p.m.): I should like to add my support for the Bill. The decision to pay to the wife of a man who is killed all medical and funeral benefits from the date of his death is a very welcome move. In many of these cases the wife, who has to become the bread-winner, is all too often forgotten.

It is a fact that at present a wife receives a lump-sum payment of \$28,180 and \$520 for each child for each year between the date of death of her husband and the child's reaching 16 years of age. That might seem to be a large amount of money but I do not believe that it is.

Let me take, for example, a woman living in a caravan on a construction site in the Central Highlands coalfields, to which the member for Port Curtis referred. Because

there is not sufficient housing, she has to leave there and return to Rockhampton, Mackay or Brisbane. She will not have a great deal of the \$28,000 left if she buys a house and equips it and tries to provide for the education of her children. Although \$28,000 will be of great assistance to her, it is by no means overgenerous.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! I remind honourable members, as I have before, that the sensitivity of the microphones in this Chamber is such that they pick up all conversations. I ask members to refrain from interfering with the speech of the member who is on his feet.

Mr. LESTER: Thank you, Mr. Row, for showing your concern about the case of a newly widowed person.

The comments of the honourable member for Rockhampton North are indeed commendable. I cannot see why files should have to be sent to Brisbane. If it is necessary to do that, why cannot records be kept on hand in provincial cities or wherever the board has an office? In these days of microfilms and computers, there is no reason why that cannot be done. When it is necessary to find a file to reopen a case, the present method seems to me to be very time-consuming. I support the comments of the honourable member for Rockhampton North, which I thought were sensible and sound.

The honourable member for Port Curtis mentioned workers proceeding from Central Queensland coalfields construction camps to their places of abode. What we have to realise is that in Central Queensland people are experiencing new conditions and a type of environment completely different from that prevailing in old-established towns. One could hardly expect someone to go out and live in a construction camp and not go home every week-end, or at least every second week-end, to see his loved ones. The Government must try to be a little bit humane in the legislation that it introduces and provide that people are completely covered when they are travelling home to see their families.

Of course, no provision should be made for people going to the races in Moranbah or somewhere else. I assure you, Mr. Row, that the Workers' Compensation Board will have a frightful fight with me on its hands if for any reason it decides not to pay compensation for accidents that befall people travelling from their family homes to their places of work.

I hope it is possible for us to ensure that all aspects of the problems of owner-drivers are covered. An owner-driver who falls ill still has repayments to make, so he must have some money coming in. That aspect must be fully covered.

Mr. Davis: You will find that it is not fully covered by what the Minister said.

Mr. LESTER: I should hope that we could ensure that these people are fully covered, because, unfortunately, many of them are being screwed by the big companies and are worse off than a number of fellows on wages.

I should like to make one point in relation to the \$1,000,000 to be spent on rehabilitation. It is pleasing that Mr. Campbell and Mr. McDonnell are going to Canada to ensure that Queensland keeps up with the latest overseas trends in this field, but I hope that they do not get too carried away when they are in Canada. I do not say that in any sense disrespectfully, because they are both excellent officers and have a great record. However, things are on a much bigger scale in Canada, and I hope that they do not forget the problems that exist in country areas in Queensland. When they return, I will invite them out to the Central Highlands so that they will get a balanced view. I am quite sure that they will accept that invitation.

The other point that it is necessary to make concerns rehabilitation counsellors going into country areas. The comment of the honourable member for Rockhampton North was fair enough. It did not allow me to make my point about the Central Highlands. I will deal more specifically with the Central Highlands in a moment. I thank the honourable member for at least accepting my interjection. It showed that he is interested in the welfare of injured people, and not just senseless political gain. I commend him for that.

The big problem in the Central Highlands is the lack of pay-out offices. This is where we can do something for people in Emerald, Blackwater and Moranbah. I am not for a moment trying to say that the offices in Mackay and Rockhampton—indeed, I commend Mr. Gilpatrick, the gentleman I seem to deal with in Rockhampton, who would have to be one of nature's finest gentlemen—

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. LESTER: I just heard he has gone to Cairns. Bad luck! Good luck to Cairns!

Because of distance all sorts of problems arise over the speedy payment of compensation claims. A person sends in a claim to Rockhampton or Mackay only to find that he has not submitted some certificate or declaration. A fellow sends in his claim and omits to send in this or that, a letter comes back, and on and on it goes. It is reasonable to assume that most people are not injured frequently. Therefore they are not used to filling in forms to claim workers' compensation. Some applicants have been held up for as long as six or seven weeks. One wonders whether the board could set up pay-out offices in the towns of Blackwater, Emerald and Moranbah so that claims from that area could be speedily processed. If a person did not submit a doctor's certificate or something else, the matter could be fixed up on the spot. Often a claim is sent to

an office in a provincial city and a long delay occurs. It might take a couple of days to get there; it might sit there for a week before it is processed; it might take another week before the claimant is informed by letter that he has not provided a certain document. Two or three weeks can be lost in this way. This is not good enough for a person who is living close to the breadline.

We do not expect the world but we do expect a little bit of a fair go in the Central Highlands area as a result of the very expansion that has taken place. Blackwater, Emerald and Moranbah, soon Oaky Creek and German Creek, Capella and Clermont make up a provincial area nearly as big as Rockhampton. However, the powers that be say that because we are decentralised, and as no one area is sufficiently large, we cannot have these offices. Somebody has to do a little bit of growing up and realise that a lot of taxes are being paid in that area. Our people work hard, even though they earn big money for which sometimes they are criticised, and they pay a lot of money in income tax. Usually the companies they are working for are making a lot of money. Indeed, one of the companies has made more money and paid more tax than any other Australian company. Income tax does not include the taxes those people pay on cigarettes, beer, motor cars, tyres and everything else. When I say that we should have workers' compensation pay-out offices in those centres, I do so for very sound, sensible and good reasons.

I should like to comment on the problem of persons who are incapacitated for lengthy periods. This is happening frequently in the coal-mines, where a number of employees suffer back injuries. After six months or so their payments either become lower or cease altogether.

I suppose it could be said that mine workers are earning good money and should put something away for a rainy day. Many of them, however, are paying off furniture and motor cars and are meeting education expenses for their children. At the same time they are trying to save money so that they can later buy a home in the city. If they are hit by an injury that has long-term effects, they can be in serious financial trouble. This problem must be looked at closely. I know that other members wish to speak, so I shall conclude my remarks. I hope that the points I have made will be taken.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (5.46 p.m.): Workers' compensation concerns a tremendously large number of employees who live in my electorate and are employed at the meatworks. Again I raise the hardy annual of brucellosis and the lack of concern shown by the Workers' Compensation Board or those who have drawn up the rules for workers who suffer from that complaint.

Over the years I have made a number of speeches on this matter, so it is not necessary for me now to make a lengthy contribution about brucellosis, brucella abortus, Q fever, leptospirosis and other diseases that afflict workers in the meat industry.

The Government talks about rehabilitation. The first thing it should do is change the rules that apply to persons who suffer from those diseases. Dozens and dozens of times I have found that meat inspectors employed by the Commonwealth Department of Health and working under the Commonwealth regulations are paid compensation while awaiting the results of blood tests or teeter readings, whereas their counterparts working under State awards and covered by the State Act are not paid it.

I congratulate the officers of the board on the way in which they always co-operate to the fullest extent with me or my secretary in demands that we make upon them on behalf of injured workers. I know a large number of men who have given their lives to the meat industry. Some of them suffered from what they thought were colds. They did not go to a doctor at first but, as they became listless and weak, they sought medical advice. Doctors who are aware of the diseases that afflict meatworkers send them off for teeter readings or blood tests. Doctors who are not aware of those diseases, however, just let them continue taking cough remedies. The disease is in their blood and system and, in some cases, eventually destroys them.

I am looking for rehabilitation for those who presently suffer from one of these diseases. However, before giving them assistance to get out of the industry and into other jobs, the Government should make decent compensation payments to those who suffer from brucellosis or Q fever.

I do not like the way in which the board treats workers who suffer from dermatitis and similar diseases. They are simply told to get out of the industry, and that's that. If they are knife-men who have been working in the boning room, and if that is the only skill they have, they are being told, in effect, "You have a disease, so you have lost your skill. You are lost to the trade, so you can go on the scrap-heap." They are entitled to retraining. They should also get a lump sum for loss of occupation. The Bill talks in some ways about rehabilitation. The people in my area who are in that plight are in need of retraining and rehabilitation.

I take up the point made by the previous speaker concerning speedy payments. I know that the board's staff does its level best to help claimants for workers' compensation. Unfortunately, a large number of employers do not do likewise. They fail to complete the forms straight away and send them to the board. Furthermore, in many instances a doctor or an employer makes a notation on the bottom of the form to the effect, "I think this may have happened on the football field." Such a comment constitutes an

invasion of privacy. If it is made for submission to the Workers' Compensation Board, it should be passed on to the injured worker concerned. If a man is prepared to try to deny compensation payments by saying, "I think he did it on a football field on Saturday," he should be prepared to back his statement up rather than make it in secret. I know of cases in which doctors and nurses have made complaints about workers without any reason, other than that they probably did not like the person concerned or were suspicious.

That brings me to the argument about compensation for people who are hurt on the way to work. It is about time that we looked closely at some of these matters. If we ever had a select committee of inquiry into this form of insurance, one of the matters I should like it to consider would be no-fault insurance. It seems that one of the slowest payments is that made to people who get hurt either going to work or coming home from work. Quite often there are no witnesses around, which is different from the circumstances of a man who cuts his hand on the job or falls off a machine in the presence of many other people. Compensation should be paid fairly quickly. If a person is getting ready for work, slips in the bath and breaks his neck, he gets no compensation, but if he walks outside his door on the way to work, slips in the gutter and breaks his neck, his wife gets a lump sum if he dies, or he is paid compensation and make-up pay for six months, with ordinary compensation after that.

It is time we looked at all of the ramifications of the insurance industry, and that is all that workers' compensation really is. We should try to see if there are ways to cover all workers so that we do not force some onto sick pay, some onto invalid pensions and others onto compensation.

It is also time we looked further at make-up pay. We now pay it for six months and the Workers' Compensation Board does not seem to be going broke. We give relief to the boss by way of discounts and reductions in premium, and it is time that we thought of increasing payments to the workers. When a person hurts himself badly and is entitled to compensation, we give him full wages by way of make-up pay. After six months, we cut him back to the compensation rate. Many workers find it very difficult to adjust. Figures should be prepared so that we can see how many people claim compensation for periods longer than six months. We want to know how much it would cost us if it was 12 months in the first instance, with an extension at a later date.

I take the point that was made by the honourable member for Townsville concerning appeals against medical board determinations. It is time that we looked into the right of appeal in this area. I do not know how many people have gone to one doctor who has said, "There's nothing wrong with you, mate," and then three months later

another doctor finds that they have had a disease or complaint for many years. If that can happen in ordinary life, it must happen in the compensation area. Medical boards make determinations that are not always correct.

Honourable members will no doubt recall that the other day, in Sydney, a man tried to hijack a plane. No doubt they will also remember Karl Kast who shot innocent people and tried to blow up some doctors on Wickham Terrace. Both those persons went off their head. They felt they had been injured on the job and had not received justice. Obviously there must be some people who do not receive justice. There must be something that we can say other than, "Look, mate, we are sorry, but under that section, when you get a letter like that there is no appeal. It does not matter if you cannot work or if you cannot do your job any longer. The doctors say that it did not happen as a result of your work. You are completely finished." So far as compensation is concerned it is important that we should start to define clearly in our minds exactly how we will allow a right of appeal to those people who feel genuinely aggrieved by the department.

I return to the question of brucellosis and make a plea that I have made on a number of occasions. I see no change in the department's attitude. Surveys have been conducted by officers of the Health Department at the meatworks in my area. I know that they show clearly that people are affected adversely if they work in certain sections as against others. My first point is that the figures clearly show that the disease is prevalent amongst workers in these areas. I can cite case after case of persons who have had brucellosis for a long time, as just about everybody in the industry will agree.

If they had worked under the Commonwealth Government awards, they would have been paid compensation, but under our system we do not give a doctor the right to say he believes that a man has had brucellosis and therefore should be paid compensation. We put him in the position that, if he does not get the right blood-test readings, he does not get compensation. That is cold and hard and too impersonal for me. I have a belief in workers' compensation, just as the Minister does. I am pleased to see him taking some sort of socialistic attitude to workers' compensation today. These are his words—

"In other States, workers' compensation insurance is handled by several private insurers. Queensland's one-board system permits obvious economies of scale, the return to most insurers of a large percentage of surpluses through general and merit bonus schemes and periodic reductions in premiums."

That is a good old socialist idea, introduced by the Labor Party in 1915. It has stood the test of time. If the Government hands

to the workers some of the money that is given back to the bosses in profits, it will be a better scheme altogether.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 5.57 p.m.
