

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 17 APRIL 1979

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 17 APRIL 1979

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. E. H. Houghton, Redcliffe) read prayers and took the chair at 2.15 p.m.

PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table—
Orders in Council under the Queensland
Film Industry Development Act 1977.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

REPUDIATION OF CHARGES BY LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION CONCERNING TRANSPORT HOUSE

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (2.17 p.m.): I make this ministerial statement to repudiate the malicious remarks of the Leader of the Opposition under the question of privilege.

It is apparent that the honourable member is basing his attack on my credibility on a false document which he claims to be a true copy of a page from a Works Department report. I appreciate this opportunity to assure the House that the Leader of the Opposition is once again making false and malicious accusations.

I state emphatically that the answer which I gave to the relevant section of the question was correct. My department did not find that the Transport House building was as described in the question.

I have in my hand the Confidential Report on Project Management submitted by the Director of Works on 15 August 1977 to the then Auditor-General (Sir Allan Sewell). This establishes beyond all doubt that the report submitted by my department did not even include a "General Remarks" column, as referred to by the honourable member. Furthermore, the alleged relevant page from the report as tabled by the honourable member differs from the genuine report in two other respects. On the tabled page, projects are indicated by Roman numerals whereas on the genuine page they are indicated by letters. Also, the tabled page shows the reference to Transport House as the second project on that page, whereas the genuine one shows it as the first project on the page.

I table for the information of the House, a certified true photostat copy of the relevant page of the Project Management Report.

Furthermore, a search of my department's Transport House file has failed to reveal any report which discloses that this building was in the condition described by the honourable member or which states that any major improvement was necessary. This building has been occupied since 1974 and only minimal maintenance has been necessary.

This latest attack by the Opposition is in keeping with its continued use of unfounded accusations and false documents in an endeavour to try to discredit the Government. If the honourable member is prepared to take such drastic action and table a document containing false information, I submit to the House that he is the person who should be subject to investigation by the Privileges Committee.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the photostat copy referred to.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (2.20 p.m.): I move—

"That the report which the Minister indicated to the House in his hand be tabled."

It is a document to which he referred in the House and, in accordance with Standing Orders, I am quite entitled—

Mr. Moore: What Standing Order?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: 123A.

Mr. SPEAKER Order! It will be 4, 5, 6 for some members. The Minister has made a statement and he has tabled the necessary document. There will be no debate on questions. I have previously discussed that with the Leader of the Opposition. There will be no discussion on questions.

Mr. CASEY: I rise to a point of order. This is not question-time. It was a ministerial statement. During the course of it, the Minister referred to a report from his department. He held up a brown-cover report and indicated that the relevant document, which he has now tabled, is a photocopy of a page from that. In accordance with normal procedure and Standing Orders in this Parliament when a member refers in the House to a document that he is handling and quotes from the document and refers it to the House, it is competent for a member to move that the document that he is referring to be tabled.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has said that he has tabled a certified document.

Mr. Casey: No. He has tabled a photocopy.

Mr. Burns: You have proved your point. Claudie won't table it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! He has tabled it. There is another point. As I have said repeatedly in this House, if a document tabled by the Leader of the Opposition, a Minister or any honourable member, whether or not it is a statutory declaration, is not going to be accepted by Parliament, it is about time Parliament packed up and gave the game away. The Minister has tabled the document that he spoke about.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT; CRITICISM BY
MR. STURGESS

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (2.22 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, as you and other members of this Parliament would be totally aware, the recent legislation involving amendments to the Justices Act and other Acts has been the subject of widespread public debate. A number of eminent legal personalities in the Queensland community have seen fit to enter the debate, for reasons based on their own professional judgment.

One member of the legal fraternity, Mr. D. Sturgess of the private bar, has been most vocal in his criticism and, indeed, condemnation of the measures and also of my decisions concerning those measures. In one article in the Brisbane "Telegraph" of Saturday, 7 April, Mr. Sturgess is reported to have stated in personal criticism of me—

"He plainly has no understanding of basic matters of the law affecting this matter.

"The public might do well to reflect upon what management of things may be expected from him regarding the intricate fundamental processes of the law.

"I believe the whole handling of this matter now requires the resignation of Mr. Lickiss."

Then, in "The Sunday Mail" of 8 April Mr. Sturgess is reported to have said that I had shown plainly that I had no understanding of the provisions of the law affecting this matter. In the "Sunday Sun" of 8 April, Mr. Sturgess also called for my resignation and is reported to have said it was time a lawyer was placed in charge of the administration of law in Queensland.

My comments, to which Mr. Sturgess took great exception, were directed towards cases of charges of assault occasioning bodily harm to be dealt with by magistrates in summary jurisdiction. Mr. Sturgess has said that I made a basic, elementary mistake in law in my published statement that, on the current state of the law, such charges would not require my approval. I presume Mr. Sturgess is aware of section 343A in Chapter 31 of the Criminal Code and of a recent decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasise to this House that any statements of a legal nature that I made in relation to the legislation under discussion were made with the benefit of advice which I obtained from most senior Crown Law officers. As you know, the Government of Queensland is served most ably by solicitors and barristers well versed in any aspects of criminal and civil law and, naturally, I accept their advice, as sought, with strong feelings of confidence.

In view of Mr. Sturgess's trenchant criticisms, therefore, I did, in fact, seek another opinion in this particular matter from a

most eminent Queen's Counsel, who is a member of the Queensland private bar. The opinion is a most extensive one and does involve considerable legal analysis. I do not propose to read the entire opinion to the House, but I will content myself with reading one paragraph of the summary appended to that opinion. That paragraph says:—

"The Attorney cannot be said to be in error on a basic question of law (if that means an elementary point) when he has expressed a view in conformity with a current decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal. Even if that decision is upset on appeal, the point cannot be said to be basic, in the sense of elementary, if it has caused such difficulty to the Court of Criminal Appeal."

It can be seen that, if there has been a basic elementary mistake in law, it has been made by three judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal, whose decision is binding in law until set aside.

Put another way, I am saying to Mr. Sturgess, on excellent advice, that my comments on legal issues in this matter, which I have conveyed to the Parliament and the public generally, have been perfectly sound and correct in law as it stands. I am also saying that, on the other side of the coin, Mr. Sturgess's interpretations were wrong or misleading, as the law currently stands. And it is noteworthy that no other barrister has come out in support of his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way placing myself beyond criticism. But in circumstances where my statement has been seen to be correct by one of Mr. Sturgess's more eminent colleagues, I do think that Mr. Sturgess, as a man of principle, should show the same enthusiasm he used in condemning me to publicly rectify an incorrect and damaging statement. Similarly, I consider the branches of the media that have reported Mr. Sturgess's comments in this area may also see fit to publish the true side of the situation. I am quite happy to make a copy of the opinion available to Mr. Sturgess.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as Attorney-General, I have always endeavoured to carry out the responsibilities which apply to that office in an impartial and objective manner. I will not abdicate from those responsibilities whatever pressure may be brought to bear from any quarter.

In any legal matter, as I indicated earlier, I have available to me the highest legal talent from within and outside the State Public Service. I make no apologies to this House, to Mr. Sturgess—or to anyone else for that matter—for the basic principle contained in the Act. Methodology or implementation of this principle is a matter now under consideration.

PETITION

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

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) presented a petition from 743 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.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. MT. GRAVATT HOSPITAL PROJECT

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

(1) In view of the deliberate disinclination of the Minister for Works and Housing and the Minister for Health to answer my questions in this House regarding the names of the subcontractors who have been successful in obtaining part of the work for the construction of the Mt. Gravatt Hospital, Stage 1, and, as he has the responsibility for his Government, what are the names of each of the 60 successful subcontractors on the Mt. Gravatt Hospital?

(2) What was the value of each contract, what was the type of each contract and what is the registered address of each successful person, firm or company?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The main contract for the Mt. Gravatt Hospital is with the Department of Health and the project manager is Civil & Civic. Whilst approval of the Department of Health is required before acceptance of any tender, the actual contract with any subcontractor is between the project manager and the successful tenderer. Therefore, it is not proposed to supply the details as required.

2. INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE, OPERATION OF NEW PORT OF BRISBANE

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

(1) With reference to the Cabinet decision recommending monopoly rights to Brisbane Wharves and Wool Dumping at the new Port of Brisbane, when was the proposal for an extra committee, now known to be headed by Sir Sidney Roberts, submitted to Cabinet and did he initiate this move as the responsible Minister, and, if not, who was the Minister who raised the proposal?

(2) When did Cabinet appoint this additional committee, now known to comprise Sir Sidney Roberts and Messrs. P. G. Addison and M. Adams, and did he, as the responsible Minister, submit the three names to Cabinet, and, if not, who was the Minister who did?

(3) What is the duration of appointment of the three members of the committee and what are the terms of reference of their inquiry?

(4) Are their investigations confined to the issue involving Associated Container Transportation (Australia) Ltd. and Brisbane Wharves and Wool Dumping or is the committee appointed on a wider basis to inquire into other aspects of the new port development?

(5) What background, experience and qualifications (academic, business, commercial and/or industrial) have Sir Sidney Roberts and Messrs. Addison and Adams in the maritime and stevedoring industries to qualify them for such an inquiry, particularly as their report has been used as the basis for Cabinet to overrule the port authority, the public accountants (Hungerford Spooner) and five of Queensland's most eminent public figures?

(6) As members of a Government committee appointed by Cabinet, what payments are to be made in terms of (a) salary, (b) allowances and (c) allowances and expenses to each of Sir Sidney and Messrs. Addison and Adams and what payments have been made in each of these respects to 12 April?

(7) In view of his statement to this House regarding the Government's support for free enterprise, on what date did the Roberts committee see representatives of Associated Container Transportation (Australia) Ltd., prior to completion of the report?

(8) On what date was the Roberts committee report submitted to Cabinet and was that report submitted by the committee to Cabinet through him as the responsible Minister, and, if not, which Minister submitted it?

(9) If another Minister submitted the report to Cabinet, did his department have a prior opportunity to study the report and present a summary of recommendations to accompany it to Cabinet, and on what date did Cabinet, after consideration of the report, decide in favour of Brisbane Wharves and Wool Dumping?

Answer:—

(1 to 9) In reply to a question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition on 3 April 1979, I indicated

that I did not propose to outline the steps taken by the Cabinet or members thereof to obtain advice which would assist them to make their policy decision concerning the choice of operator for the new container terminal.

I explained that Cabinet had received advice from several sources and that a decision had been taken, after weighing all of the information available, that Brisbane Wharves and Wool Dumping/Australian National Line were the most appropriate bodies to operate the terminal.

No payment of Government funds has been, or will be, made to Sir Sidney Roberts or others who joined with him in respect of their obtaining and presenting information concerning the choice of a terminal operator.

3. PARLIAMENTARY PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

(1) With reference to the doubts in relation to the Government's procedures in the letting of capital works contracts, the many points outlined by the former Auditor-General (Sir Allan Sewell) in his report dated 14 September 1977 and the evidence of contracts being awarded against the recommendations of his own departmental experts, and in view of Sir Allan's comments on the need for public accountability, will he, as a matter of urgency, recommend to Cabinet legislation for the appointment of a Joint Parliamentary Public Works Committee, as has existed at Federal level for over 20 years, to meet regularly in open session to examine all proposed State Government capital works projects above an estimated fixed minimum amount?

(2) In doing so, will he also, as a step towards open Government that Queenslanders can see to be clean, decent and free of a hint of corruption, undertake to refer the contract in relation to the Mt. Gravatt Hospital to this committee for study and report to this Parliament?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) This is an item of Government policy and I do not propose to disclose Government thinking on the matter to the honourable member.

However, I repeat the information previously conveyed to the honourable member that the present Government manages all contracts in a responsible manner, and at all times ensures that the cost to the State is the minimum level that can be attained for the standard of accommodation required.

4. WIDENING OF TAKALVAN STREET, BUNDABERG

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

(1) When will work commence on the four-lane project in Takalvan Street, Bundaberg?

(2) What is the timetable to have this road widened between the airport and Bourbong Street?

Answers:—

(1) An Order in Council was published on 31 March 1979 allocating \$36,000 to permit preliminary site works, relocation of services etc., to proceed immediately on the section from Bourbong Street to Walker Street. Design of the section is nearing completion, and it is expected that construction will be in progress before the end of this financial year.

(2) The section from Bourbong Street to Walker Street will be completed in the 1979-80 financial year. Although the level of Commonwealth funds which will be available beyond 1979-80 is not yet known, planning and design of the section from Walker Street to the airport will proceed on the assumption that funds will be available to commence this section in 1979-80, continuing through to 1980-81.

5. HOUSING COMMISSION APPLICATIONS, BUNDABERG AREA

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

(1) How many applications are held for Housing Commission houses in (a) Bundaberg, (b) Childers, (c) Howard/Torbanlea and (d) Hervey Bay?

(2) Into what category does each application fall?

(3) What steps are being taken by the Government to alleviate the hardship suffered by people in the above centres who are seeking housing?

Answers:—

(1 & 2) Bundaberg—8 with 40 points priority; 101 with nil priority. Childers—Nil. Howard/Torbanlea—Nil. Hervey Bay—1 with 40 points priority; 8 with nil priority.

(3) Because of his continuing representations and his close attention to what is happening in his area, the member will know that at Bundaberg six houses were completed in March 1979 and contracts for another two have recently been let. At Hervey Bay, two are under construction and tenders for another two closed recently. The situation will be further considered when framing 1979-80 programmes.

6. OFFICERS AND FACILITIES, FRASER
ISLAND NATIONAL PARKS

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

(1) How many national park officers are employed on Fraser Island?

(2) How many of those officers live permanently on Fraser Island?

(3) What arrangements are made for the officers who live elsewhere?

(4) What facilities are currently provided for visitors to the Fraser Island national parks?

Answers:—

(1) The Fraser Island National Park work-force numbers six.

(2) One.

(3) Officers work a 10-day on duty, 4-day off duty shift, by mutual agreement and with union sanction. Air transport from the island to Maryborough Airport and return is arranged on a fortnightly basis at service cost.

(4) A well-signposted ranger information station is located at the "A" road camp. Information and assistance is available to park visitors there. Although not completed as yet, a grassed camping area with water supply is available at the "A" road site.

7. ACCIDENTS INVOLVING ELECTRIC-POWER
POLES

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

(1) In the years 1976, 1977 and 1978, how many road accidents have occurred in each electricity region in this State where motorists or motor-cyclists have hit electric-power poles?

(2) In each year, how many fatalities and serious permanent disabilities have occurred from these types of accidents?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) As the honourable member would appreciate, in many cases the impact of a motor vehicle with an electric-power pole is only part of the sequence of events leading to an accident and it would be difficult to directly attribute fatalities and serious permanent disabilities to one aspect of these types of accidents. For example, excessive speed could be a major contributing factor. A similar situation exists with other roadside fixed objects such as trees, post-boxes, telephone booths, and so on. I am advised that considerable research would be necessary to establish whether or not an electric-power pole or any other form of roadside fixed object was involved in traffic incidents and this in

itself would not determine whether these objects were the prime cause of fatalities or serious injuries.

8. DISCUSSIONS ON TAKE-OVER OF T.A.A.
SERVICES BY BUSH PILOTS AIRWAYS

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

(1) Is he aware of decisions presently taking place between Trans-Australia Airlines and Bush Pilots Airways executives?

(2) Are these talks in any way designed towards providing a more suitable aircraft than the Metro prop-jet to be operated by Bush Pilots Airways, thus allowing Trans-Australia Airlines to withdraw services from the Townsville-Mt. Isa route and all stops between?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I am not aware of any negotiations going on at the present time between Trans-Australia Airlines and Bush Pilots Airways and consequently I am not in a position to indicate whether or not they are discussing aircraft which could be used for Western Queensland air routes. Perhaps the honourable member could clarify his question.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ABOLITION OF ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Mr. CASEY: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the sweetheart agreement between the Government and the truck operators and the subsequent loss of approximately \$5,500,000 a year to the State of Queensland as a result of the abolition of the road maintenance tax. As the Treasurer was absent overseas at the time this happened, accompanied, I understand, by the Under Secretary of the Treasury, I ask: Was he contacted overseas by the Premier or other members of Cabinet before the sudden Cabinet decision was taken? If not, is it not an unusual Government practice to determine a major policy change in relation to revenue collection without the advice of either the Treasurer or the Under Secretary of the Treasury? Now that the Treasurer has had time to settle back into Queensland, can he say how the Government plans to raise the \$5,500,000 a year that it will lose as a result of the removal of this tax?

Dr. EDWARDS: I would have thought that the honourable member would have been awake when the Premier announced to the House that during my absence he was the Treasurer of the State.

FENCING OF PRIVATE SWIMMING-POOLS

Mr. WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, I refer to the tragic drowning of yet another young child in a private swimming-pool at Grovely on 11 April this year, and the recently announced findings of the Brisbane study by a Queensland University Child Health Department team, which fully supported the concept of private swimming-pools being guarded by fences. I now ask: Considering the fact that the Queensland Government has had the Brisbane City Council's proposed ordinances before it since July 1977, when will the Government give approval to ordinances to enable the Brisbane City Council to apply controls in the interests of child safety?

Mr. HINZE: I appreciate the concern of the honourable member in relation to the Brisbane City Council's desires. The matter is before the Government, and, of course, after due consideration by a responsible Government, a decision will be made known.

HUMAN CONSUMPTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. FRAWLEY: In asking the Minister for Primary Industries a question without notice, I draw his attention to a statement in last Sunday's Press attributed to the honourable member for Peak Downs in which he urged people to eat margarine for the sake of their health. Could the Minister advise the House if it is correct that humans can eat as much butter and cheese as they like and drink as much milk as possible provided they take a reasonable amount of exercise? Is it not a proven fact that butter is superior to margarine for human consumption?

Mr. SULLIVAN: I thank the honourable member, not in this matter, but for the confidence he places in me.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I have nothing in my hand. This is not a Dorothy Dixier.

My memory serves me well. When I was a young boy, my old mother used to say that, as the fifth child in a family of six, I ate as much porridge as the other five put together and always had plenty of milk on it.

I eat butter and cheese. My Cabinet colleagues will verify that at lunch-time today I had my fair share of the cheese. In spite of what appears in the Press sometimes about my health and my age, my health is so good that I could walk around the block a few of the fellows who write those articles. My view is that dairy products such as butter, cheese and milk are good for both the body and the soul.

LAND VALUATION OBJECTION BY LIBERAL MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. ROW: I ask the Minister for Survey and Valuation: Has he read an article which appeared in "The Sunday Mail" on 15 April alleging that a Liberal member of Parliament was allowed to lodge an objection to his valuation even though it was outside the statutory 60-day period? Is this a correct statement of the facts?

Mr. GREENWOOD: I have read the article; it is not correct. "The Sunday Mail" was apparently fed an Opposition story and put it on the front page without bothering to check with me or the Valuer-General. The facts are that in July 1975 a Liberal member of Parliament did object to his valuation. The objection was ruled out of time and invalid, and the member was advised accordingly. As a result, he lost the rights that objectors have under the Act.

The member then asked for an investigation under section 13 (2) (g) or 13 (2) (h). The department does this very frequently; in fact, it must do it well over 100 times every year. The procedure is open to everyone. Last week I mentioned two occasions on which it was used for the benefit of constituents of the honourable member for Rockhampton. Other A.L.P. members whose constituents have, I can recall, received the benefit of these sections in recent times are the honourable members for Bulimba and Lytton. That is the first point. The Liberal member used well-known procedures open to everyone, and used by many people many times a year. In this case, the report by the valuer showed plainly that he had made a mistake. He admitted he had made a mistake and recommended that it be rectified by reducing the valuation from \$6,650 to \$4,550. This was checked by senior officers, the Senior Valuer (Residential) for Brisbane and the Officer in Charge Valuations (Towns) for Queensland. These senior men both came to the same conclusion and recommended a reduction to \$4,550. Those are the circumstances in which this valuation was reduced.

I should mention that the same section, section 13 (2) (h), was used six months ago for the benefit of a different Liberal member of this House. His land had been valued at \$23,700. In the course of a subsequent investigation, the department came to the conclusion that a mistake had been made. His valuation was increased by about one-third—from \$23,700 to \$30,600.

So what I would emphasise is that there is no favouritism, no special treatment. If a mistake is found, it is rectified. Members of Parliament are on the same footing as everyone else. In the two cases involving Liberal members of Parliament in recent years, one valuation was reduced and one was increased. The important thing is that both mistakes were discovered and were put right.

RESERVATION OF LAND FOR THE NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. ROW: I ask the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation: Will he arrange for regional officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to be instructed to confer with local government members and local members of State Parliament before recommending the reservation of land for the National Parks and Wildlife Service? I understand that these officers are presently restricted in this area.

Mr. NEWBERRY: I have already issued such instructions regarding councils. As the honourable member would know, before a decision is made I discuss the matter with the local member of Parliament.

OPENING OF HILDER ROAD STATE SCHOOL

Mr. POWELL: I ask the Minister for Education: Has any decision been made concerning the opening of the new Hilder Road State School?

Mr. BIRD: I did receive an invitation a short time ago from the parents and citizens' association of the Hilder Road State School, asking for an official opening of that school. As honourable members would all be aware, it is impossible for me to attend every official opening of every school or every school facility in the State. This morning I took to Cabinet a request that one of my colleagues officially open that school, and I am pleased to be able to say that my Cabinet colleague the Minister for Survey and Valuation (Hon. John Greenwood) has agreed to open the Hilder Road State School on 6 October. I am aware that a fete will be held at the school on that date.

I understand that students from the Hilder Road State School were in the gallery earlier this afternoon but, unfortunately, have now gone. I hope that their stay in the Chamber was pleasant, and I am sure that they will look forward to the official opening of their school on 6 October by the Honourable John Greenwood.

TAXATION POLICY OF A.L.P.

Mr. SCASSOLA: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the Labor Party's policy of imposing a resources tax, in addition to a capital gains tax, if it were elected to the Federal Government benches? Does that policy conflict with the professed encouragement by the Opposition in this place of the development of mineral resources? What effect will the imposition of a resources tax and a capital gains tax have on the development of mineral resources in this State?

Dr. EDWARDS: Again the Labor Party has indicated its lack of concern for the development of this nation.

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: It is interesting that the Opposition always squeals when these facts come out. It is known as the whingeing party of this State and of this nation.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Are you suffering from jet lag?

Dr. EDWARDS: At least I am awake. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition was not and did not know what was going on while I was away.

As to the capital gains tax and the resources tax to which the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt referred—it is very important that the people of Queensland note that that party, the Labor Party, is dedicated to the imposition of taxes that would be a disincentive to the development of this State and this nation. A resources tax and a capital gains tax are taxes that do nothing but destroy the incentive of mining companies, individuals and businesses, to make certain that this State and this nation, which are so capital-hungry and whose natural resources are so ripe for development, are left to the mercy of people such as honourable members opposite.

I say quite clearly that this Government opposes fully the concept of a resources tax and a capital gains tax. It believes that they are a disincentive to the development of this State. The Government wishes to place on record quite clearly that while it is in power it will continue to oppose the Labor Party and its policies, which are out to destroy the incentive that is so necessary if we wish to see our State and our nation develop.

Some reference was made to my visit overseas, when the Government was able to attract capital to this nation. When I was speaking to bankers and financial institutions, insurance brokers and insurance company representatives in New York, it was interesting to note that they were highly critical of the Labor Party and its policies. They were highly critical of the way in which the Labor Party, when it was in Government at a Federal level, gave a disincentive to the nation and to overseas investment to see this nation develop. I might also add that they were full of praise for the economic and fiscal policies of the Fraser Government.

I want to say quite clearly again that if the development of this State was not in the hands of the National-Liberal Government, the mining industry would be depressed and development would no longer occur. Our Government is totally opposed to a capital gains tax and to a resources tax and I believe that the people of Queensland, and indeed the people of Australia, would support our move to make certain that these taxes are never introduced and that it will be a long time before the Labor Government ever becomes the Government of this nation again.

ABOLITION OF ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Mr. MACKENROTH: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: (1) Does he agree with the decision in his absence by the Acting Treasurer in relation to the abolition of the road maintenance tax; and (2) As he will be, as Treasurer, responsible for finding the extra revenue to pay for the abolition of this tax, where does he propose to gain this extra revenue?

Dr. EDWARDS: It is incredible that the honourable member should ask such a question; in fact it is a question that was handed to him by the Leader of the Opposition. Of course, one knows what happens in that particular camp.

As a member of the Cabinet, I fully support any decision that is made by the Cabinet of Queensland. As far as I am personally concerned, I am always delighted to be associated with any move to reduce taxation on the people of Queensland. I remind the Opposition that four major taxes have been removed by this Government in the last three years. No other Government in Australia has removed one tax. We have been responsible for the removal of the gift duty tax, the estate duty tax, the road tax and now the road maintenance tax. This is indicative of the Government's attitude, and Opposition members should hang their heads in shame when they dare criticise the action of the Government in removing a tax upon the people of this State.

Regarding the way in which the Budget will be framed to overcome this loss of income, I might say that this Government has had a record over a long period of time of balancing its Budget. This particular road tax will not be removed until 30 June and will have no effect upon balancing this year's Budget, which will be presented in September this year.

I would also like to say that because of the tremendous growth and development in this State—often at the expense of other States, I might add—we can see that, in spite of some of the policies that have been implemented elsewhere, this Government's policies will mean that we will have no difficulty whatsoever in presenting a balanced Budget in late September and that it will be a Budget that will mean further development and progress for the State of Queensland.

INSTANT LOTTO

Mr. AUSTIN: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: With reference to a recent story in "Sunday Sun" on the introduction of Instant Lotto in Queensland, has the Government considered the introduction of Instant Lotto? If so, what was the outcome of its consideration? Did the story correctly reflect his attitude on this matter?

Dr. EDWARDS: It is true that Cabinet asked me, as Treasurer of the State of Queensland, to undertake an investigation into the various activities to which the honourable member referred, namely the instant lottery game, Tattsлото and other instant money programmes. Within the next two or three weeks a report will be made to Cabinet. I want to make it quite clear that I deplored quite adequately and fully the headlines that appeared in "Sunday Sun" on that occasion. On no occasion have I supported instant money. My personal view, as has been stressed quite clearly, is that I abhor the kind of gambling implemented through instant money programmes. I have been asked to prepare a report. I will prepare a report, as indicated; but I want to make it quite clear that I will be very surprised if the Government of Queensland adopts instant money.

EFFECT OF ABOLITION OF ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX ON RAILWAY DEPARTMENT REVENUE AND EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. KYBURZ: I ask the Minister for Transport: Can he estimate the amount of revenue that will be lost as a result of the abolition of road maintenance tax? Can he guarantee that few or, preferably, no jobs will be lost in the railways because of the abolition of road maintenance tax?

Mr. TOMKINS: The Railway Department is presently studying what loss will be caused to the department. We know that there will be some loss. That is just common sense. The loss of this tax will have an adverse effect on the department, and that is one reason why the department is not very keen on the proposal. I have heard a figure as high as \$10,000,000 quoted in relation to the loss, but I think it will be somewhat less than that. The Railway Department is very conscious nowadays of the need to look for business. It has very good coal and other contracts. I believe that after some time the loss will not be great at all. We have made very successful use of the contract system to encourage business to the railways. I believe that the action we have taken will lead, in due course, to the return of some business. In the initial stages, I know that there will be some loss, but I do not think it will be considerable.

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

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members, last week a matter of privilege arose affecting the honourable member for Salisbury. I have been given all the necessary documents on the matter. Having studied them, I believe that this is a matter entirely for the Committee of Privileges.

REFERRAL OF MATTER RAISED BY MEMBER FOR
SALISBURY

Mr. **AHERN** (Landsborough), by leave,
without notice: I move—

“That the matter referred to the House
by the honourable member for Salisbury
be referred to the Select Committee of
Privileges.”

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

DISALLOWANCE OF REGULATION

Mr. **WRIGHT** (Rockhampton) (3.31 p.m.):
I move—

“That Regulation 127D under the Public
Service Act 1922-1978, as made on January
25, 1979 and tabled in this House on March
13, 1979, be disallowed.”

I move this motion on behalf of the Opposi-
tion because we now have no alternative
to moving that the regulation covering
all the persons mentioned in it who have
had the right of appeal removed be dis-
allowed. It was our intention simply
to debate that aspect pertaining to Stip-
endiary Magistrate Division II and Stip-
endiary Magistrate Division III, which is
recorded on page 3 of the amendments
to the regulations to which I refer. How-
ever, as members will be aware, it is impos-
sible for any person in this House to simply
move the disallowance of part of a regula-
tion. One has to move the disallowance of
the total regulation.

At the very outset, I make it clear that
we are not opposed to the removal of the
right of appeal in respect of the other
positions in the Public Service; so it would
be wrong for any member to rise in the
debate later and say that we are trying to
challenge what is set out in respect of
appeals against promotion to all these other
positions. I reiterate that we are dealing
only with the positions of stipendiary
magistrates as listed on page 3, referred to
as Division II and Division III.

For another reason, I say that we have
no alternative other than to move in this
way. That is because every effort has been
made by the Opposition to convince the
Minister for Justice and the Government
that that right of appeal should not be
removed; yet the Government has refused
to review its decision. It is a very unfor-
tunate decision, but we have no alternative
to opposing the regulation in this manner.

I suggest from the very outset that this
decision seems to indicate that the Govern-
ment is intent on fostering the idea of jobs
for the boys in the Queensland magistracy.
The whole issue has been going on for
some six months and has been one of an
attempted cover-up, again by the Minister
for Justice. There have been misleading
statements in this Assembly and in the media

generally over the intention that this Govern-
ment and the Public Service Board had to
clerks of the court. It seems to me that
typical bureaucratic tactics are being used
here. Whilst these regulations were recom-
mended back in August last year and were
actually changed officially in October last
year, they were not tabled until this session.
There has been a six-month period—a six-
month delay—during which these regulations
have been applicable. However, we in this
Assembly—and we in the Opposition, in
particular—could do nothing about them.

I first raised the issue by way of a question
on 10 October 1978. Based on information
given to me, I claimed that the right of
appeal against appointments of stipendiary
magistrates Division II and III was being
removed. I suggested that it opened the way
to advancement and appointment for a wide
range of Crown employees. I suggested also
that the scheme being proposed by the
Government and specifically by the Public
Service Board was detrimental to the clerks
of the court. Honourable members will recall
that at that time the Minister for Justice
tried to dodge the issue. He said that—

Dr. **EDWARDS**: I rise to a point of
order. I draw your attention, Mr. Deputy
Speaker, to the motion moved by the hon-
ourable member for Rockhampton. It
reads—

“That Regulation 127D under the Public
Service Act 1922-1978, as made on Jan-
uary 25, 1979 and tabled in this House
on March 13, 1979, be disallowed.”

According to our information, this particular
regulation applies purely to the Executive
Director of the Stock Routes and Rural
Lands Protection Board and has nothing to
do with stipendiary magistrates.

Mr. **WRIGHT**: If that is so, there has
been a typographical error on behalf of
this Parliament. Before it was moved it
was checked with the Clerk of the Parlia-
ment and it was checked with his assistant
in this Parliament and, if it is different
on the Business Paper from what I originally
moved, it certainly is not an error on the
part of the Opposition.

Dr. **EDWARDS**: I rise to a point of
order. I ask for a ruling, Mr. Deputy
Speaker. It is important, if this regulation
is to be debated, that we in fact know which
regulation the Opposition is debating.
According to the motion that the honourable
member has moved, the regulation to which
he is referring is not the regulation that he
is debating.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D.
Hewitt): I ask the honourable member for
Rockhampton to remain relevant to the
regulation.

Mr. **WRIGHT**: That I moved, Mr. Deputy
Speaker?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion referred to on the Business Paper.

Mr. WRIGHT: This matter was raised previously when notice was given. It was checked by the Clerk of the Parliament. If, through some typographical error, today we have a different motion, I do not believe the Opposition should be held to blame in any way at all. It was clearly stated—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am similarly at a disadvantage and I want to be helpful to the whole of the House. I assume that the Deputy Premier is advising me that there are certain operative words. And those operative words on his understanding are?

Dr. EDWARDS: The regulation that is referred to as being made on 25 January and tabled in this House on 13 March 1979 refers exclusively to the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board and the right of appeal. It has no reference whatsoever to the matter of stipendiary magistrates and their right of appeal which, I believe, was approved by Executive Council late last year and not this year.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is a difficult question on which I am trying to adjudicate fairly and I am not being helped at all by members who indulge in frivolity.

The acting leader of the Government has advised me on the terms of the motion. I accept his advice and I therefore ask the honourable member for Rockhampton to relate his observations to those words that the Deputy Premier has outlined.

Mr. WRIGHT: The intention of the Opposition was to debate the removal of the right of appeal against appointments of stipendiary magistrates. I ask honourable members to note that the Queensland Government Gazette of 1 January 1979 clearly shows that regulation 127D refers to officers classified I-23 or higher and for particular officers of all departments. It goes right through. At the very bottom of page 3 it refers to Stipendiary Magistrates Divisions II and III. If there has been some type of typographical error as to the tabling of these matters—

Dr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. Could I suggest through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the honourable member in future check his facts more carefully. On this occasion, as he is debating the wrong regulation. I suggest that he no longer continue with the debate and that he move another motion at some appropriate time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is the honourable gentleman's decision.

73180—134

Mr. WRIGHT: One is unable to debate something about stock routes. That was not the intention. I am prepared to let this debate lapse at this point and I shall go back and thoroughly check the position. But I will expect an apology from someone if there has been a typographical error and the debate has been ruined in this way. I would even wonder if it has been done purposely by the Government, because it has been a very important issue and one that has been raised constantly by the Opposition. It is one that we intend to pursue regardless of the tactics that Government members are using here.

Dr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the honourable member withdraw his remarks in which he indicated that the Government had in fact made this error. It is the honourable member's mistake, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise to the House.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not intend to apologise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! If I instruct the honourable member to apologise, he certainly will do so; but, as it happens, I do not intend to sustain the point of order and he is not called upon to apologise. But I would not like him to think that he is not called upon because of his own belligerence.

Mr. WRIGHT: I seek leave of the House, then, to withdraw this motion of disallowance. I have no alternative.

(Leave granted).

MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (3.43 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Mines Regulation Act 1964-1978 in certain particulars.”

In introducing this Bill, I make the comment that the proposed amendments are a result of research which is being carried out continuously in my department to ensure that relevant legislation is adequate to cope with the expanding requirements of the mining industry. The Bill is a short one but the amendments proposed are important.

At the present there is no specified period of time after the occurrence of a fatal or serious accident in or about a mine in which the manager is required to give notice of such accident to the inspector or warden and district workers' representative. The amendments provide that such notice shall be given immediately after the occurrence. The Act

presently provides that the manager of a mine is required to report to the inspector or to the warden a number of specified occurrences which have the potential to result in fatal or serious accidents. The amendments add additional types of hazardous occurrences to those already specified. These include accidents to mobile equipment, the capsize or sinking of a floating dredge or concentrating plant and the breach or slumping of a wall of a dredge pond. It is now provided that such occurrences be reported immediately rather than within 24 hours as previously provided. The reporting of such occurrences immediately gives the inspector the opportunity to take action to prevent or lessen the accident potential in such situations.

The present Act contains no provision for the supply of information in the possession of the department to representatives of accident victims or other interested parties. A proposed new section makes provision for the Minister to authorise a scheme to facilitate the supply of factual information relating to a mining accident to persons having a bona fide interest therein.

The regulations under the Act have been completely re-drafted taking into account changes in technology and practices, the varying needs of large and small-scale operations, the various types of mining operations and the need to provide clear guide-lines for the safe operation of the industry. This has resulted in regulations becoming more specific and, in order to avoid a situation where a regulation is unnecessarily restrictive in its application to a particular mine, it is desirable that provision be made for the variation of such a regulation by the inspector upon the application of the manager of the mine concerned. It is proposed to add to the section giving power to make regulations a provision for the Governor in Council to make a regulation which may be varied. Following such provision, a new section is introduced permitting the inspector to vary a regulation in the circumstances I have described and where there is provision in such regulation for variation.

Finally, it is proposed to introduce a new section permitting the adoption by the regulations of standard rules, codes or specifications of such bodies as the Standards Association of Australia, the British Standards Institution and the like, or a code of practice given effect under any Commonwealth or State law.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (3.46 p.m.): I have listened to the Minister's introductory remarks about this Bill, and I will analyse its contents after it is presented.

However, I should like to make a few remarks about the Mines Regulation Act provisions. The Committee would be aware that these provisions relate to safety and health in metalliferous mines, quarries and

sewers. I am pleased to see the introduction of amendments which will improve safety and the facilities afforded to people who are covered by the provisions of this Act. I am aware, though, that, from my point of view and from the point of view of the Opposition, there are certain deficiencies in these provisions. We believe that considerable attention should be given to those that relate to safety in the mining industry.

When I became aware that this Bill was to be introduced, I checked the annual reports of the Mines Department for the last four years to ascertain the figures relating to safety in the metalliferous mining industry and the industry covering quarries and sewer construction. I looked, first, at the number of people employed in the metalliferous mining industry. There were 10,187 people so employed in 1977. I hark back to the remarks of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer regarding the growth and development of the mining industry in this State. I think it is worth noting that since 1974 the number of people employed in the metalliferous mining industry in this State has fallen from 11,408 to 10,187. Yet we see that in 1974 there were 737 reported accidents to people employed in the metalliferous mining industry, and in 1977 there were 756 reported accidents. There were two fatalities in 1974, and three in 1977.

In looking at the report of the Mines Department for 1977 and tracing the history of the metalliferous industry back to 1974, one sees the number of inquiries that were conducted as a result of accidents in the industry. I and the Opposition are concerned that, notwithstanding the fact that the number of people employed in the industry has fallen and that the incidence of lost time accidents has increased, the number of inquiries that have been conducted under the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act has in fact decreased over the period from 1974 to 1977. In 1974, three inquiries were conducted as a result of accidents in the metalliferous mining industry. In 1977, notwithstanding the fact that there were three fatalities and 756 accidents, no inquiries were conducted.

Another aspect which concerns the Opposition relates to the number of notifications of incidents under section 39 (5) of the Act. These are incidents relating to winding, falls of ground, etc. We find that in 1974 32 incidents were reported. There were 62 in 1975, 67 in 1976, and 43 in 1977. However, in those four years there was only one prosecution in the whole industry. There were no prosecutions in 1974, none in 1975, one in 1976, and none in 1977. It seems passing strange to the Opposition that, notwithstanding the fact that the number of persons employed in the metalliferous mining industry has decreased over the last four years—1974 to 1977—the number of accidents in the industry has increased, the number of notifications of serious accidents has increased from 32 in 1974 to 43 in 1977, yet

in only one instance has a prosecution been conducted under the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act.

In looking at the 1977 annual report of the Mines Department and tracing the position back, one sees each year, with monotonous regularity, in the section covering accidents and safety a statement that, as far as the Mines Regulation Act is concerned—

“Compliance with the Act and regulations thereunder generally was satisfactory. Some alleged breaches of the regulations were reported and investigated.”

In spite of the fact that there were 43 notifications of serious incidents, 756 lost-time accidents and three fatalities in 1977, there were no prosecutions. As I said, the Opposition believes it is strange that, although 10,187 people were employed in the industry and that number of accidents occurred, there were no prosecutions. One must ask: why is this so?

In regard to the provisions relating to health, on tracing back through the annual reports one again sees each year, with the same monotonous regularity, a similar statement—

“Within the limits of the available staff, surveys and investigations into dust, ventilation and noise in mines and quarries were continued. Conditions generally have been found to be satisfactory.”

Yet the reports indicate that in 1974 two employees of Mount Isa Mines were found to have lead poisoning, and that in 1975 four employees were found to have the same complaint. In the 1974 report, we see that the two persons who were found to have lead poisoning were exposed for a period of 47 weeks, but not one prosecution was launched in 1974 or 1975 under the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act. Surely something is wrong here.

I took the opportunity to check the number of inspectors. In my opinion, there is not sufficient policing of the provisions of the Act. According to the information that I have received, for the whole State there are six mines inspectors, two electrical inspectors and two mechanical inspectors. If there are insufficient officers to police the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act, something should be done about that.

I believe that a serious situation exists when over 10,000 people are employed in an industry and 756 accidents resulting in lost time occur in one year, yet no prosecutions are launched for breaches of the Mines Regulation Act. I cannot accept that in the metalliferous mining industry—I am including quarries and also sewer construction—not one situation arose in which a prosecution of an employer for a breach of the Act could have been sustained.

Mr. Frawley: Why do you want to prosecute the employer?

Mr. VAUGHAN: I say to the honourable member, with all due respect, that when 756 serious accidents occur in one year in an industry with 10,187 employees and there are three fatalities, and the number of accidents in quarries increases from 26 in 1974 to 68 in 1977, including two fatalities, something is wrong. In spite of that, we are led to believe that nobody covered by the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act is breaching those provisions. I reiterate that something is wrong.

I am aware that the employment of contractors is increasing in the metalliferous mining industry. Instead of work being performed by regular employees, contractors are now being brought in to do it. I recall a situation that occurred at the Mt. Isa mine a few years ago when contractors were engaged on underground installation work in the electrical field. When a check was made of the contractors' employees it was found that a considerable number of them were not in possession of the appropriate Electrical Workers' Board certificate. If that is happening, there should be a tightening up of the regulations and the provisions should be policed more effectively. When this sort of work is being carried out, particularly in underground mines, where there is always a potentially serious situation, every effort should be made to ensure that the necessary safety provisions are complied with.

I have also been advised of a situation in the sand-mining industry that relates to the number of inspectors employed under the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act. It arose on Stradbroke Islands a few years ago, and I venture to say that the same sort of situation would still apply if sand-mining were still being carried out to the extent that it then was. There had been sand drifts and sand had built up around the power poles to such an extent that the high tension wires were covered by sand. Of course, the power hunted an earth, and the heat was so intense that the silica in the sand was turned into glass. Had the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act been complied with, that situation would not have occurred. No prosecutions were considered necessary under the provisions of the Act.

Certainly I go along with what I understand the Minister has said about the provisions of the Bill, but I will reserve any further comments until I see it. As far as the Opposition is concerned, when we look at the figures I have quoted something seems to us to be wrong. I believe that there should be an overhaul of the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act. When we see the number of lost-time accidents that are occurring in the industry, I do not accept year after year the standard statement that compliance with the Act and regulations was generally satisfactory and there was no need for any prosecutions.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (3.58 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for

his contribution and I can assure him that the Mines Department inspectors in Queensland do a very good job in policing safety measures. It must be remembered that the qualifications of these men are so high that they are very difficult to replace. Quite recently we advertised for two mines inspectors and we received one application from South Africa and one from New South Wales. Neither of those applicants took up the vacant position. Mines inspectors must possess a degree in some field of mining, engineering or geology, and they also must possess a first-class mine managers' certificate. They are very highly qualified men.

The purpose of this Bill is to make it easier for mines inspectors to detect the potential of any situation to develop into one where loss of life can occur. I have stated that in the Bill. The Bill will also require a mine manager to make a report immediately. Previously he had a period of time during which he could consider his report. Now he must report immediately any accident.

Reference was made to punishment of accident victims. We do not go around punishing the victims of accidents. They might have caused the accidents themselves, but why should we prosecute them? However, where there is evidence of negligence in an accident, especially a fatal accident, which generally results in an inquiry, we do impose penalties if we can prove that there has been negligence on the part of anyone. The fact that there has been an accident and no-one has been prosecuted does not mean that the mines inspectors have not carried out their job.

I think that is the only point on which the honourable member elaborated and I, too, will leave comment on it to the second-reading stage. We can then go into the Bill in much more detail, and the honourable member will have had time to study its provisions.

Motion (Mr. Camm) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

QUEENSLAND TOURIST AND TRAVEL CORPORATION BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

Hon. A. M. HODGES (Gympie—Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism) (4.2 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced 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."

This is not a complex piece of legislation. It is designed to upgrade and streamline the Government's interest in tourism and to competitively promote Queensland throughout Australia and overseas. In line with the Government's promise, it represents tangible recognition for an industry that has the potential to become the greatest employer and income-earner in the State.

Under the proposal, the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau and the Department of Tourism, in their present form, will cease to exist and be replaced by a statutory authority known as the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. The corporation, responsible to the Minister and to the Parliament, will be run by a part-time board of directors, drawn largely from private enterprise, to set guide-lines and bench-marks for a full-time executive staff—now with the bureau—to translate into achievement.

The reasons that necessitate this measure are known to anyone with a knowledge of the present Queensland tourism scene. Tourism is one of the fastest-growing, most labour-intensive, and certainly one of the richest industries in the world today. Competition for the tourist dollar is growing daily more fierce. The global prospects are excellent, given that there are moves for cheaper, faster international travel, more leisure time for an increasing number, and, generally speaking, higher wage levels coupled with earlier retirement.

This situation within the industry leads inevitably to the conclusion that governmental activity in tourism can more appropriately be handled by an organisation which has greater flexibility and capacity to change with the developing needs of the industry than is possible within the framework of a Government department. Indeed, it is an entrepreneurial field, fiercely competitive, fast-moving and ever-changing. Our overseas and Australian competitors have been quick to recognise this, and have modernised their approach accordingly. Queensland needs to do likewise if it is to retain and develop its tourist industry in the face of competing attractions being promoted elsewhere. In short, we need to keep up with the times. If we do not move, our structure could be left as a 7-mile-an-hour organisation in a 70-mile-an-hour world.

The Queensland Government Tourist Bureau will, if it continues to be subject to the restrictions which necessarily apply to a Government department, be unable to compete on anything like equal terms for the tourist dollar despite the expertise which exists within the ranks of its existing employees.

To secure a fairer share of the lucrative world tourism market, we need a selling force with an intimate knowledge and experience of international financial practices, modern

marketing techniques, sophisticated sales and promotional processes—a selling force with the ability and authority to make quick decisions where necessary, and to be able to argue forcefully, fluently and confidently on Queensland's behalf in the boardrooms and at conference tables around the world. The intent of this Bill, therefore, is to enlist a small group of men with such qualities to revitalise and rejuvenate the Government's tourism sector and to give the executive staff now with the bureau the tools to do the job expected of them.

Cheaper international air fares (designed, apparently, to attract tourists only to southern capitals), the continuing high domestic air fares and the forthcoming Commonwealth Games—a wonderful opportunity to “sell” Queensland—make it vital that Queensland adopt a new and fresh approach to the promotion and development of its tourist industry. This the Bill sets out to achieve.

I must stress here that the Government recognises and appreciates the wealth of experience and expertise now available within the ranks of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau, but is of the opinion that such talent is not being properly used to the State's best advantage given the limitations under which the bureau is presently forced to operate. By contrast, the proposed corporation will act more like a public company, with greater administrative freedom than the bureau enjoys, and more able, therefore, to cope with the problems now facing the industry. As well, the freer, more business-like structure of the corporation will enable present Queensland Government Tourist Bureau staff, especially those genuinely interested in a career in travel, to properly develop their special talents for Queensland's benefit.

It is recognised that some Queensland Government Tourist Bureau staff may consider that their future lies not in tourism and travel but in the Public Service. The Bill will afford such officers the opportunity to pursue a Public Service career. Those seeking a rewarding and satisfying future in tourism and travel, however, will find that the new, more aggressive and progressive corporation ideally suits their needs, and allows them a hitherto unknown freedom to develop their ideas and use their initiative in their chosen field of endeavour.

Honourable members can be assured that the rights and privileges of public servants will be handsomely protected under the provisions of the Bill. Public servants who are presently working within the Department of Tourism will be seconded to the corporation and will have two years in which to decide whether they wish to remain with the new corporation permanently, or whether the different working atmosphere offered by the corporation is not the right one for them.

I am confident that the vast majority of existing employees will find the new conditions and atmosphere to their liking and will stay with the corporation; but those who do not, and so elect within two years of the transfer of responsibilities to the corporation, will be transferred to other departments as soon as there is a suitable position for them, with the aim of having all such transfers effected within three years of the date of transfer of responsibilities to the corporation.

During the two-year period and any extension of their secondment while waiting to be transferred back to a Government department, all employees will be regarded as having maintained continuous service with the State Government and all rights in respect of leave associated with such service and the right of appeal in respect of appointment to other Public Service positions will be maintained. Again, those who decide to remain with the corporation after the two-year period will take with them previously accrued leave benefits, and will also be able to continue to participate in the State Service Superannuation Scheme. New employees taken on by the corporation will also become members of the State Service Superannuation Scheme, except where they are ineligible under the normal provisions or if the Governor in Council later decides that other arrangements should apply in respect of future employees.

The corporation will be expected to meet up to 10 per cent of operating costs from its earnings in respect of fees, retainers and commissions, which is the approximate percentage presently being met from this source. The actual amount is to be at the discretion of the Minister. The Minister will be guided in his decision by the amount likely to become available from Consolidated Revenue to meet the remainder of the corporation's operating costs. However—and this is an important provision—the corporation will retain the benefit of any increase in the level of its commissions beyond normal rates of inflation for the exclusive purpose of promoting tourism within the State of Queensland. This provision introduces an entirely new element into the Government tourist sector—incentive. The more Queensland holidays its staff sells, the greater the amount the corporation will have to plough back into the development and promotion of the home product.

The six members of the corporation will be appointed by the Governor in Council and the permanent head of the department administering the Act—in this instance the Department of Harbours and Marine—will automatically be the seventh member. The Governor in Council may also appoint the general manager of the corporation to the board if this is considered desirable as the work of the corporation progresses.

Some might say that the corporation will be competing with private enterprise and, in a sense, it will. The corporation will be competing with international cartels, southern-based agencies and foreign flag-carriers now heavily engaged in taking Queenslanders out of the country because of generally higher commissions on overseas packages.

On the other hand, by concentrating on the establishment of Queensland package holidays and by using all means to bring the splendid and varied attractions of Queensland to world attention, the corporation will stimulate further business for local, privately owned agencies and will certainly materially assist the many thousands of tourist-oriented enterprises, such as motels, hotels, restaurants, bus companies and caravan parks scattered throughout the State.

Whilst the corporation's main thrust will be the promotion and development of the Queensland holiday, it will, of course, as the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau has been doing for many years, handle overseas holidays also. If Queenslanders wish to holiday at an overseas destination and book through the corporation, the commission from such transactions will be used exclusively for the assistance of the Queensland industry.

In these days of natural public concern over the failure of some privately owned agencies, the corporation, backed by the Government, will set a standard that others could well emulate for the general good of the tourist industry and for the public image of the travel agency sector.

Honourable members will note with satisfaction that the corporation will differ from its predecessor in several important respects, not least of which will be its ability to materially assist the development of new tourist enterprises, especially those considered to be labour-intensive, and to similarly assist in the expansion of existing industries through the provision of loans or by way of guarantee.

Indeed, it is intended that the corporation devote much of its expertise towards the development of a tourist industry in Queensland that will be capable of absorbing an even greater number of persons, particularly young people, than it presently employs. So it will be clear that the new corporation will not become just another competitor in the travel field.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, with wider powers, headed by some of the best business brains in the State, and with a newly motivated executive staff, will have as its principal mandate the promotion and development of our State in the face of intense and highly professional competition.

Honourable members will be interested to know that the Queensland tourist industry is presently the fourth biggest in the State. It employs an estimated 10 per cent of the total State work-force and earns, conservatively, \$200,000,000 per year.

Given the proper encouragement, given the material and moral support and given, too, that the natural attractions we know it has to offer will be marketed in such a way that at the very least they will be seen to be the equal of anything that our competitors have to offer, it is the Government's confident belief that the tourist industry of Queensland will be able to earn more and employ more. This measure will go a long way towards bringing the undoubted potential of Queensland's tourist industry to fruition.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. JONES (Cairns) (4.15 p.m.): At the outset of his speech the Minister said that this is not a complex piece of legislation. It might not appear to be a complex piece of legislation, but it is of some magnitude in that it provides for the conversion of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau into the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, which is to be a statutory authority. I have seen Press statements indicating that some people see this corporation as being the panacea or the cure-all for all the problems of the tourist industry. Others see it as a threat to the stature and make-up of the State Public Service. Thus I believe that the first requirement in the establishment of this corporation is that assurances be immediately given to the employees of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau that the implementation of the provisions of this Bill will not interfere with their rights, award conditions and privileges, that their entitlements will not be less and that their financial remuneration will not be reduced.

Mr. Hodges: I have given you that assurance already.

Mr. JONES: The Minister mentioned certain aspects, particularly superannuation, but I do not think he actually spelt out that salary levels would be maintained or that certain entitlements on which I shall elaborate later will be protected under this legislation. Not having the Bill in our hands, we can only surmise as to its contents. One aspect that has not been elaborated on is continuity of employment and promotional opportunities for employees of the Tourist Bureau. I have gained the impression from talking to employees of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau and to the State Service Union that these matters will be paramount in their minds. The two-year period of secondment could disrupt the employees of the bureau not only throughout this State but also in the bureau's offices throughout Australia. At present they are designated as public servants, but if they decide to remain with the corporation they

will be placed outside the Public Service and this will have wide ramifications for their future and that of their families, and they are being asked to make that decision now.

Mr. Hodges: A two-year secondment as public servants may assist the union to make up its mind.

Mr. JONES: I know that the Minister says that there will be a two-year secondment period and that it is hoped that all transfers will be completed within a three-year period, but I am quite sure that even that guarantee will not prevent the employees who are directly involved from feeling a great deal of concern. Most of them would probably make up their minds immediately, but in two years' time conditions may have changed radically. Their family circumstances may have changed or the workings of the new corporation might be such as to make them want to opt out of the new corporation. One could well ask how those who choose to opt out of the new corporation and transfer to other Government departments in two years' time will be slotted into the existing Public Service set-up.

Mr. White: If two years is not enough, how long would you give them?

Mr. JONES: I am looking at the set-up of the statutory body. I do not believe that these people should be outside the Public Service. I cannot see any reason why these employees should be set apart from the Public Service set-up. Consideration has to be given to their level of classification and to the town in which they may have chosen to work. They may have been working in their particular branch of the Public Service in a certain town for quite a period. I believe that the Government is going to give an undertaking that anybody who is not happy in the corporation within three years will be given another job at his present classification in his town of choice. Everything in the garden will be rosy! I think that the Government has looked at this matter through rose-coloured glasses.

In the setting up of this corporation, the Government will have a bit of a problem with staff management. It is not necessary to depart from the present practice in the Public Service. This matter has been seen by some people as a direct threat to the Public Service. That fear has been expressed in the Press. It is seen as a phasing out or a dismantling of the Public Service by design and by degree.

If one wants an analogy, one only has to look at the Workers' Compensation Board and the State Government Insurance Office. They are contained within the Public Service. This corporation also ought to be contained within the Public Service. I cannot see any purpose in setting up such a statutory body outside the Public Service. Perhaps it was necessary to revamp the Queensland

Government Tourist Bureau, but I cannot see the need to set up a statutory body to do that.

I reiterate that the employees are naturally concerned about this matter. They have been told that the staff details have not yet been determined, that the existing staff will be seconded to the corporation over a period of two years and that their options will remain open. The position regarding their rights and privileges, such as flexi-time, leave to attend C.M.F. camps and other entitlements that have been won over a long period by the unions covering employment in the Public Service, will have to be clarified, by the Minister here today, much better than it has been up to this point.

I believe that unqualified assurances must be given regarding the operations of this corporation. The Minister has not done that. At the outset, he told us that certain things will happen over a two-year period, but he has not said what will happen to the employees who remain with the corporation and whether all or only some of these rights and privileges will apply to them. At present, there is vagueness in that matter, and the Public Service axiom is that, when there is doubt or vagueness, the answer is no.

I revert to the question of salary ranges and ask whether the Public Service awards will apply to the employees of the corporation, or will this statutory authority be a new ball game? Will the salary ranges be fixed by the corporation by agreement, will they be negotiated, or will they be determined in some other way?

I accept the example that the Minister gave about those officers presently employed in the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau being able to transfer their superannuation entitlements, but the Minister, in his speech to the Committee today, did not explain the method of determination of the salary ranges. That must be of concern to all the employees who will be affected. In his introductory remarks, the Minister did not deal in any detail with promotion within the corporation. He told the Committee in an airy-fairy sort of way how good a job the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau was doing and what the corporation might be expected to do, but he did not outline the privileges that employees of the corporation might expect to receive.

Mr. Hodges: I would be here all night giving you all the minor details. You will get them at the second-reading and Committee stages.

Mr. JONES: I wish to express my concern, which I believe is being reiterated throughout the service. If the Minister can assure honourable members that the right of appeal will be preserved, that the rights and privileges of employees of the corporation will be similar to those within the Public Service,

that the right of redress will not be taken away from any employee who feels that he or she is aggrieved or has been passed over or victimised, he will go a long way towards establishing the acceptability of the transfer.

In the setting up of the corporation, emphasis appears to be given to its promotional role and the mobilising of finance. In his report to Parliament last year, the Director-General of the Department of Tourism outlined the difficulties that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau was encountering in financing its promotional activities and mentioned particularly the research that was necessary for the efficient functioning of the bureau. In spite of that, the only amount that has been nominated in statements heralding the establishment of the corporation is \$400,000 in commissions, and apparently that will be the only money available to it.

The Minister did say that additional commissions will be generated by the activities of the new corporation and that funds will build up, but I remind the Committee that adequate funds for advertising, promotion and research have always been a bugbear of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. Suddenly the six people mentioned, with perhaps a seventh from the Department of Harbours and Marine and later a general manager, with their expertise and their intimate knowledge—I think that was the expression used by the Minister—of what is going to happen in the boardrooms in other parts of the world, will bring about an upsurge in the commissions that will come in.

During the giving of notice of a question in the House this morning, it was indicated that only 4 per cent of the people coming to Australia from overseas come to Queensland and visit the Barrier Reef, and that 85 per cent of domestic tourists travel by car in Queensland. The workshop held in Mackay last week showed that Queensland ought to be looking to the domestic tourists, not to the overseas tourists who are being diverted into the Sydney/Melbourne/Canberra triangle.

Mr. Hodges: That is what this is all about.

Mr. JONES: I should like to be able to say that the high-falutin phrases used by the Minister today would cause me to share his enthusiasm, but he said, "... to the State's best advantage, given the limitations under which the bureau is presently forced to operate". Under what limitations has the bureau been forced to operate? I think that needs some elaboration. The Minister is over-emphasising the expertise that we are going to develop by bringing in outsiders.

Mr. Hodges: I said they were already there.

Mr. JONES: I realise that the Minister said that. However, what are the limitations? If the Minister says that the expertise is within the Queensland Government Tourist

Bureau, why haven't we gained the momentum over the last few years that he feels will come about by his now declaring a statutory authority?

Mr. Elliott: Because we will use high-class people at the top.

Mr. JONES: The honourable member says that he will use high-class people at the top. Is he going to get Mr. Keith Williams at \$25,000? Is he going to get Sir Bruce Small at \$100,000? Is this the situation? The Minister says that he set up an advisory committee consisting of experts in their own field. However, all he is doing is selecting operators and entrepreneurs who have a personal interest in the industry. However, if the Minister selected someone like Doug Nettleship from Markman International Pty. Ltd. with an organisation like the Dairy Promotion Council, in New South Wales, with its members being volunteers and doing the job in this behalf, I would say the Minister was going about the job in the right way. All he has set up is an advisory committee that is limited in its outlook because its members are all operators within the industry. It is also limited in its outlook because the members are drawn from the south of the State. There is no representation for Far North Queensland on this advisory committee.

Mr. McKechnie: How do you know?

Mr. JONES: There is not one on it. The honourable member would not be able to name those who are on the committee. Does the honourable member know who is on the advisory committee?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I know one, and he is Mr. Frank Moore, a prominent National Party member stooge in Longreach.

Mr. JONES: That is a fair indication. I feel that the Minister should be looking at this in a constructive manner. If it is intended to select members of this corporation who may be able to impress some people but not the major portion concerned with the tourist industry in Queensland, then I believe that he should be looking more broadly at the composition of the body. I might add that if it was the Minister who had the power to select, I would say "Yes", but I notice it is going to be the Governor in Council. Why shouldn't it comprise an employee member or a member from the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau? They are people who have been directly involved with this industry over a long period of time.

It was suggested at the workshop at Mackay the other day that there should be an election of at least some of the people who are going to be put on this authority or this corporation. And why not? It is not very hard to sort out in a union situation in a compulsory ballot the people

who ought to represent it. Wouldn't it be more democratic for those people who are involved in the industry, who put their life savings into the industry, to have a say in who should represent them and make decisions on their behalf. I cannot see any reason why this can't be done.

I want to know what is going to be so different with the advent of this new corporation. In my opening statement I said that the corporation is seen by some as the answer to all the industry problems. I am yet to be convinced about the employees situation, the degree of funding and the extent of the funds available to do all the things that have been promised by this corporation. I want to know who will make up this board and how they will be selected or elected and whether the Minister will have any say in who shall be on this infinite and unknown body that is going to do such great things for the tourist industry. Certainly what the Minister said in his opening address rings true.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BISHOP (Surfers Paradise) (4.35 p.m.): The Opposition spokesman on tourism has given us a classic indication of just how little Opposition members know and understand the tourist industry.

Just as Hawaii is the acknowledged leader in tourism among the 50 States of the United States of America, so, too, should Queensland return to the position of eminence it once held amongst the States of Australia. With the passage of this Bill providing for the establishment of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, I see Queensland becoming the acknowledged tourist leader in our Pacific region and, indeed, the whole South East Asian area.

The principle of a tourist corporation is not new. Western Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia have to some extent taken similar steps.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. BISHOP: In the light of his great knowledge of the world, the honourable member for Archerfield should know that Queensland has lagged somewhat behind the other States and that is perhaps one reason why, in recent years, we have slipped from the No. 1 spot in Australia to the No. 3 position.

I share the Opposition spokesman's concern on one matter, namely, the transfer to the corporation of the work-force presently employed in the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. However, I have satisfied myself that members of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau will be catered for adequately and given every opportunity to settle down in the new

organisation. I am sure that many, if not all, of them will benefit greatly by transferring to the new organisation.

The Bill reflects the growing pressure on Governments to wake up to the value and worth of the tourist industry in Queensland and throughout Australia. It is quite obvious that the creation of this corporation is a big step forward. From my point of view, it has taken the Government a long time to move. I recall speaking about such a move in the early 1960s to a former Minister in charge of tourism in Queensland, namely, Mr. Alex Dewar.

It has taken far too long for the Queensland and other Governments to realise the potential of tourism in Queensland. Tourism employs 5 per cent of the work-force in Australia and 10 per cent of the work-force in Queensland. The Australian Tourist Commission has forecast a growth rate of 10 per cent in tourism this year and a 15 per cent growth rate by 1981. Those are very significant figures. By 1983, 1,000,000 tourists will come to Australia annually. We have to ensure that they come to Queensland.

The Minister said that tourism requires an intimate knowledge of, and experience with, international financial practices. He also said that it requires modern marketing techniques, sophisticated sales and promotional processes, the ability to make snap decisions of importance and the ability to argue strongly, fluently and confidently on Queensland's behalf. I point out to the honourable member for Cairns that that is the major reason behind the introduction of this Bill. It is designed to allow tourism in Queensland to do such things.

Qantas has said it is absolutely certain that in the first year of the general application of lower overseas air fares there will be a growth rate of 20 per cent in the number of incoming, non-business travellers. That would represent the greatest annual growth rate in tourism in this country in the past 10 years. The tourist industry in Australia has enormous potential, and Queensland has to make certain that it gets its share of it.

Mr. Jones: Tell us how many of those will go up to the Barrier Reef.

Mr. BISHOP: If the honourable member listens, he may learn something.

Whilst the new fare structure introduced by the Federal Government is complicated, it will undoubtedly help to get tourists into Queensland. From 27 May, the new super Apex fare will come into effect. That provides for a 40 per cent cut on normal economy return fares for 169 days of the year, provided a booking is made 45 days ahead, the absence is seven days or more and the departure and return are between 27 May and 3 August, 27 October and 30

November, and 28 January and 1 April. It really means that for more than half the year—196 days—and during the school holiday and Christmas periods, when most Australians are on holidays, super Apex fares are of no use to anybody. So there is still a considerable gap to be filled in the structure of air fares.

The existing Apex concession system has been extended to make available a 25 per cent discount from Queensland ports such as Coolangatta, Mackay, Proserpine, Rockhampton and Townsville. The concessions are available for 286 days a year, but seats will have to be booked 30 days ahead, again with a seven-day period of absence. However, the big lift is with international tourists. This is something for which we in the tourist industry have been pressing. A 30 per cent discount on all domestic fares is now available for flights longer than 1 000 km. That concession is to be made available to all international visitors and Australians going overseas, without advance booking conditions. This creates enormous opportunities for Queensland.

Mr. Davis: What about your dingy old Coolangatta airport?

Mr. BISHOP: To start with—and I hope the member for Brisbane Central is not one of these—50 per cent of Australians do not take holidays. Most of that market exists in the colder parts of Australia—in New South Wales and Victoria. Except for the 11 weeks of the year when half of those who do go on holidays try to take them, our accommodation is under-utilised.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. BISHOP: There is no doubt that the member for Brisbane Central is under-utilised. For 41 weeks of the year, our accommodation is operating at only 50 per cent capacity. In spite of the fact that only 50 per cent of our accommodation is being fully utilised for most of the year, we need accommodation of greater quality to cope with the growth of tourism. To maintain what we have at a proper standard and to provide quality—I am sure the member for Brisbane Central will recognise this—the Federal Government needs to provide for the accommodation industry a depreciation allowance for income-producing buildings. That was one of the major recommendations of the final report of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Tourism.

To underline this, the regional vice-president of Continental Airlines, which will commence flying into Sydney on 4 May, has said that Sydney's hotel facilities will be unable to cope with the 800 people a week whom Continental will initially be bringing into Australia. Continental's problem is not just getting people into Australia. As Vice-President Tobin pointed out, they will

have to rely heavily on the domestic airlines to carry them to other parts of Australia where accommodation can be found. All of this means that we will require greater utilisation of Australian aircraft. Can we any longer afford the luxury of airport curfews?

Mrs. Kyburz: Yes!

Mr. BISHOP: Can we retain a system that deprives travellers of the use of Brisbane Airport between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.? Millions of aircraft dollars are being wasted and employment to the community is being lost. Surely it must be evident even to the member for Salisbury that people no longer care about the time they arrive or depart. People who travel overseas from Australia do not give two hoots if they arrive at 2, 3, or 4 o'clock in the morning after a long flight. They get up and, in a couple of hour's time, are off again to their next port of call. It is a fact that all of our airports are equipped to serve the travelling public 24 hours a day, and they should be serving them 24 hours a day.

I shall now deal with more difficulties facing the tourist industry. Is it possible for T.A.A. and Ansett to delay any longer the introduction of wide-bodied aircraft? How much longer must we wait for this essential step to be taken? If we are to transport people around Australia, it will be impossible, even with the cheap air-fare system, to cater for them with the present airline system.

One suggestion that has some validity and should be considered is that T.A.A. and Ansett should hook up with Qantas and fly passengers on the empty across-Australia and round-Australia flights that are continually made by Qantas. In these days of competitive tourism and competitive flying, there is not much point in not fully utilising aircraft.

Mr. Davis: One of the main reasons why the introduction has been delayed is the A.S.L. crash, which cost Ansett \$24,000,000.

Mr. BISHOP: I am quite sure that the honourable member will be able to develop that remark and piece of logic in his speech. Any connection that it might have with the tourist industry completely escapes me.

Mr. Davis: It's high finance, that's why.

Mr. BISHOP: I am quite sure that, as he understands high finance, the honourable member for Brisbane Central will understand the complexities of the bulk-travel market. Again, one of the aspects that I believe will be—

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! There is far too much conversation in the Chamber.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I have warned all honourable members that there is far too much audible conversation and cross-firing in the Chamber. It will not be tolerated by the Chair.

Mr. BISHOP: One of the points I should like to make concerns the lack of understanding of the bulk-travel market that has been shown by the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. We have to market the tourist industry in the same way as we market our minerals, beef and sugar.

The new corporation should look at promoting Queensland jointly with New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. I cannot see why a joint sales team should not be made up from a cross-section of the various travel organisations, the airlines, the Government and private enterprise in order to promote and market overseas the eastern seaboard, particularly Queensland. The days when we could be parochial as a State, or as areas within the State, in my view have long since gone. We must look for the most likely markets and concentrate on them. The most likely markets for Queensland and the eastern seaboard are obviously New Zealand, the United States of America, Canada and Japan.

It is not perhaps realised that a tourist trade to Australia was beginning with the Japanese. But, as fares decreased and it became cheaper and cheaper for them to go to Honolulu and Europe, Australia lost out when Japanese tourists headed off in their thousands on wide-bodied aircraft to those particular countries. But I believe that with the introduction of cheaper air fares not only outside but also within Australia, and with the right type of vigorous promotional effort, the Japanese market could again open up to us.

The combined promotion team I have mentioned would need to talk to travel wholesalers in the countries I have mentioned. The travel wholesaler is the backbone of the package tourist industry. There is no reason why such a team could not set up workshops in the main cities of the countries I have mentioned. The wholesalers could be invited to meet all the team members and we could sell 14 to 21-day package tours to this country and take advantage of the cheap air fares. In my view, this is something that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau has never seriously undertaken.

I do agree that more money needs to be provided to the corporation. It will not be sufficient just to provide the amount presently being provided to promote Queensland, even though it is being done on an incentive basis. When one realises that a small tourist region such as Fiji is spending over \$US700,000 directly promoting its own tourist industry, one sees how insignificant is the amount we are spending. When one sees that travel from the United States of America to New

Zealand increased by 25 per cent in 1978 and is expected to increase by another 20 per cent in 1979, one realises the difficulties that we face. When one thinks that with a snap of the fingers this Government gave away \$5,000,000 through the abolition of road taxes a week or so ago, no matter how well justified that action was, whilst we are scratching to provide a few thousand dollars more to the tourist industry, one realises how difficult the situation is, even though it is well recognised that the return to the economy from increased expenditure in this area can be immense.

A moment or two ago I spoke about the parochialism that seems to be creeping back into any consideration of the tourist industry in this State. The honourable member for Cairns gave an indication of how parochial is his attitude. We must cease thinking this way. In any consideration of tourism, I believe it is essential to look at the State as a whole. Whether an extra 100,000 tourists a year go to the Gold Coast or to Cairns is irrelevant as long as we get them into Queensland—or, should I say, into Australia.

Our main problem is to induce the 50 per cent of Australians who do not travel to do so. I do not care whether they go to Mackay, Proserpine, Longreach, Brisbane, or wherever, as long as we get them to travel, because once they get the travel bug they will continue to travel. The fact of the matter is that as soon as a person can be persuaded to travel, he becomes a constant traveller. I suggest that the honourable member for Brisbane Central start travelling, because once he gets the bug we might be able to get him out of this place. He might decide to go to Perth and take up residence there.

Mr. PREST (Port Curtis) (4.55 p.m.): I join with the honourable member for Cairns in expressing concern about the introduction of this Bill. We have been waiting some time now for its introduction. We did not know whether it would be called a Tourist and Travel Corporation Bill or a Small/Williams Bill. We have seen Small and Williams pour \$125,000 into the National Party. As this corporation will have the set-up of a board, we are very interested to know the composition of the board.

I support what the member for Cairns said about our being concerned for the public servant who today works for the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. We sincerely hope that this new corporation will be not just a new name but a new organisation. I should like to know where it is going to be set up. Will it be Brisbane-based, or, as is the case now with the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau, will it have offices in Cairns, Townsville and Rockhampton?

An Honourable Member: Probably at Sea World.

Mr. PREST: We will get on to Sea World later.

We are talking about those men who have joined the Public Service, intending to make it their life's work. We are referring to those men who, as the honourable member for Cairns said, have worked in the Public Service for 20-odd years, or longer, and are today employed in the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. I would like to know whether those who find, at the end of two or three years, that they do not want to continue in the corporation, are going to be transferred back to the Public Service. I am concerned about their seniority and also about the promotion prospects that they may have lost through being part of this corporation for a period of two or three years. I should also like to know whether those public servants, before those two or three years have elapsed, can apply for a transfer back to the Public Service.

Mr. Elliott: They have two years in which to make up their minds.

Mr. PREST: That is right, two years, with a maximum of three years before they are found another job. But that could mean a lot to them in the matter of promotion. As I say, we are concerned about that matter.

I am also concerned about the funds that will be made available to this body that is to be set up. In the past, criticism has been levelled at the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau for what it has not achieved, but it is a fact that part of the problem, and a major part of the problem, has been the cut-back in the funds provided to the bureau to allow it to publicise Queensland, in the way that it would wish, not only in Australia but also throughout the world. I am quite certain that this should not be a reason today for our taking the bureau out of the Public Service and placing it under the control of some other authority. The bureau has done a very good job with the limited amount of funds provided to it.

I remember asking questions in this Chamber about making a film not only on the Central Queensland area but also on other areas, so that people would know the progress that has been made throughout Queensland. I was always told that it would cost \$20,000 or \$25,000 to make such a film and that funds were not available, but that it was hoped to make such a film in "two or three years' time". That is not good enough. As was pointed out by the member for Surfers Paradise, other countries—I think he mentioned Fiji—spend a lot more than Australia does in promoting tourism.

Questions were asked in the Chamber this morning about the workshop seminar that was held at Mackay last week. We found, Mr. Row—and I am not being in any way critical when I say this—that members of the Government were not present at that seminar; yet, with this very important Bill before the Committee, I am certain that a number of Government members will speak out on behalf of the tourist industry.

Mr. BISHOP: I rise to a point of order. To my knowledge, at least two members of the Government were there.

Mr. Yewdale: There is no point of order.

Mr. BISHOP: I know, but I am saying it anyway.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! I do not think there is any point of order.

Mr. PREST: If that is the case, the question will be answered tomorrow.

Mr. Innes: Members of the consultative committee, not the Government.

Mr. PREST: I am sorry. I am pleased to hear that Government members were there. The honourable member for Sherwood says that they were not on the investigating committee.

One of the questions raised at the seminar related to travel throughout Queensland, and there is no doubt that the roads over which tourists have to travel are a drawback to tourism in this State. Sections of the Bruce Highway, not only in my area but also further north, are very bad, and long delays and hold-ups occur, particularly during holiday periods. It is obvious that this Government and future Governments will have to spend a great deal of money on improving the road system throughout Queensland. That will be very costly, but until the work is carried out the number of people travelling by car in this State will not increase greatly. In the Central Highlands, which is a very good tourist area, in the Carnarvon out near Springsure and further west, the dirt roads make travelling even more hazardous, particularly for motorists wishing to pull a caravan. These are disabilities that the tourist industry has to overcome. As other honourable members have pointed out, it is more costly to travel by air in Queensland today than it is to travel overseas.

However, I am more interested in the purpose and the funding of the proposed corporation. People interested in tourism and the promotion of tourist attractions have difficulty in obtaining finance, and it is very obvious that the provision of finance will not be a function of the corporation.

Mr. Hodges: Yes. I announced that in my introductory speech.

Mr. PREST: I am very pleased to hear that the raising of finance will be part of the business of the corporation. Probably it will also make recommendations to other departments for assistance in this field.

Mr. Hodges: Yes.

Mr. PREST: That is very good. Festivals and shows are held over the length and breadth of the State, but they do not attract as many tourists as the well-established

attractions on the Gold Coast. A very successful festival, the Gladstone Harbour Festival, has just ended on the Central Queensland coast, but I regret to say that on this occasion, as in the past few years, the State Government did not make one dollar available to the Gladstone Harbour Festival committee towards its financing. Some years ago the Government made a major contribution of about \$150; even that has now been cut out. I would like this corporation to be able to make some recommendations to the Minister to promote festivals and agricultural shows. After all, shows of this sort bring tourists into an area and what the tourists see at these festivals and shows gives them the incentive to return. They will also tell their friends about what they saw.

It would not hurt to have someone from these festivals on this committee. We have someone from Festival Amusements who comes to our harbour festival each year. I refer to Noel MacGregor, who is widely known throughout Queensland. Because he visits shows and festivals throughout Queensland, he knows more about the promotion of tourism than a lot of others who might eventually find their way onto this corporation. These are some of the things that I would like to see included.

I believe that agricultural societies and show societies should not have to pay secretaries and others. Someone should be put into a centre such as Rockhampton, Gladstone or other places where he can become the secretary of the show society, secretary of the festival society or secretary of other bodies that are going to promote the area. This would mean that there would not be such a heavy drain on the finances of those societies or committees, because collectively they could make a contribution to his wages on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the Government. That is the sort of thing that I would like the Minister to consider. This is what we are interested in.

Mr. Hodges: Don't you think those who benefit from tourism should contribute more towards it?

Mr. PREST: I quite agree. After all, when we see the population of a town increase by almost 100 per cent, with all the hotels and motels filled up for eight to 10 days, someone must be making some money out of it. At the present time even our own tourist committee has a lot of problems in its operations.

Mr. Hodges: They get a bob from the toilet tax.

Mr. PREST: That is right. I believe that self-help is the best help. That is where it must start. If someone can show that he has the drive and initiative, he should be able to call on the Government or someone else to assist him.

I listened to what the honourable member for Surfers Paradise said about Mr. Williams and others on the Gold Coast. We know that the holiday period covers about 11 weeks of the year, and I believe that it is during those 11 weeks that people try to rip off tourists. The tourists should not be ripped off like that. After all, they are just ordinary people. In lots of instances they are only members of families who are trying to get away from it all, forget work and what have you, during the school holidays. However, they are hit pretty hard financially when they go to various places. I am not saying that Sea World and Bird Life are not very good tourist attractions, but the price of taking a family there for a day is out of this world. I believe that the price of admission for an adult is \$8 and that it is about \$4 for a child. That is \$20 for a man, his wife and one child.

Mr. Bishop: That's not true.

Mr. PREST: Then what is it?

Mr. Bishop: You are the expert, but those figures are not true. How would you like \$4 and \$2?

Mr. PREST: Very well, we will give Mr. Bishop his \$4 and \$2, but I still believe that the price is too high for a family to get in there. That only gets them through the gate.

Mr. Bishop: You were saying \$8 is too high; now you are saying \$4 is too high. If I were to say \$2, you would say that was too high. You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. PREST: It is easy to see who financed your campaign. Nevertheless, he is doing it for the National Party also, so you are not alone.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PREST: I will, Mr. Row. I believe that there are lots of places, and Sea World is one of them, where the price of entry is far too high. It is not what is spent to get through the gate; it is what is spent when a person gets in there. Prices of food and drinks in there would be 10c or 20c dearer than elsewhere.

Mr. White: Can we ascertain, Mr. Row, if the honourable member for Port Curtis is advocating some form of price regulation in the tourist industry?

Mr. PREST: We always hear that wages are killing the tourist industry. It is not a matter of wages; it is the cost of the article that is killing the tourist industry.

I have another story to tell about Mr. Williams, the big financier of the National Party or the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. When I was down there on a very busy day three years ago, it was almost impossible to

get a chair to sit on. People were there by the thousands, having paid the lower price that the honourable member for Surfers Paradise referred to. A girl who was working there came out of the building with a sandwich in one hand and a glass of orange drink in the other (which, of course, she had to pay for), and one of her friends asked her, "Where did you sit to have lunch?" She replied, "The only place I could find was the toilet." That is typical of this man who is willing to give \$25,000 to the National Party for the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. He cannot provide decent amenities for his staff.

Mr. Bishop: That is not true.

Mr. PREST: That is true.

I believe that we are looking for men of quality, men who are willing to do a job. People should not be allowed onto this board simply for their own benefit.

At the second-reading stage we will be very interested to hear about the composition of this board and how it will operate.

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (5.12 p.m.): I am happy to rise to support the Minister's introduction of this historic piece of legislation to constitute the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Only a very few political years ago people decided which candidate they would vote for on the basis of promises made—promises to spend millions of dollars. Electors voted mainly for candidates who promised to spend millions and millions of dollars in their electorates. But times change; today, people are very wary of politicians who promise to spend multimillions in their electorates and throughout the State. The electorate today is better educated. People have suffered some very hard knocks in recent times and they have had some bitter pills to swallow. As a whole, the electorate in Queensland is looking for quality in its politicians.

Over the Easter break I was talking to an old farmer in my electorate who spoke words of wisdom when he said, "If we are to overcome the employment and economy problems we have in Australia today, we must look for industries that pay tax rather than mop it up. We have to shoot some sacred cows and hobby-horses, and see that we do not conceive some others. We have to do those things that we do best. They will be hard to find, but they are there." He was indeed right.

We have to look for industries that will not add to the deficit problems we face as a State and nation, industries that will not require tremendous tariff assistance, because tariffs are equated to taxes borne by the people. We must look for industries that are labour-intensive and make all sorts of other contributions to our economy; industries that do not require tremendous support from someone else in the community.

The Federal Government does not have many options in this respect. In the light of its deficit problems, its opportunity to provide an immense bank of tax assistance to any industry, let alone the tourist industry, is very limited indeed. The Industries Assistance Commission has supported that view across the board. It has said that we should be looking for quality in industry. I support that contention.

Of the options that exist generally in the community today, the tourist industry is one of the best. It requires no tariff assistance, it requires little by way of tax support from other sections of the community and it provides immense employment in a very labour-intensive way. In a strange sort of way, it helps the nation's balance of payments. It is in a sense an export-earning industry.

What we need is a greater realisation by the community generally of the benefits of development of the tourist industry. In particular, we require it in those areas that are directly affected. There are some that are affected in very significant ways. My own electorate is one. The electoral roll compiled to 31 December showed a growth in a little over 12 months of 12.5 per cent. That means that in a little over five years there will be two electorates of Landsborough. That is caused by growth in the tourist industry.

However, there needs to be a greater realisation by people who live in the areas directly affected of the importance of the tourist industry to the State and to the nation—and I speak here with some feeling as a member who has represented the Landsborough area for a little over 11 years. One of the dilemmas confronting the representative of an area such as this is that on the one hand he has a group of developers and businessmen relentlessly pursuing development—creating a hothouse environment for development—and, on the other, a retired group of people, who are in the majority, fighting developments and causing any developments that do take place to meet all sorts of planning criteria, many of them unreasonable. This is a dilemma that those who represent such areas—and the local authorities, too—face. I say that there has to be a better realisation in these communities that the tourist industry represents one of the few options that this nation has to overcome the dual problems of the economy and unemployment.

Mr. Hodges: And to provide the amenities required for those areas.

Mr. AHERN: Truly, and I will come to one of those later.

It is one of the very few options, and it is an option that has to be exploited in the national interest. There must be very full development, with—might I say in qualification—reasonable planning checks imposed by the Government and by local authorities.

In the comments I am about to make I might differ from some of my colleagues in this place and throughout the nation. There is a realisation on our side of politics, I think, that the tourist industry represents an area of activity that the Government has to give some consideration to; that the Government has to look to as providing a solution to some of the economic problems of the future. However, I say quite conclusively and definitely that we should resist the temptation (under the guise of getting fair dinkum about the tourist industry) to provide a whole host of long-term taxpayer support to this industry. The taxpayer has a malaise at the moment. There is a realisation afoot that we have been led into our present difficulties through the feeling that taxpayers should be supporting all sorts of industries through general taxpayer support, ratepayer support and tariff support.

I hope that, as we promote the tourist industry—as we look to the future to see what can be done to have this industry help us out of our difficulties in a very important way—we will not succumb to the temptation to provide a massive amount of long-term taxpayer assistance. That is not to say that there should not be assistance, for there should be some short-term assistance to the industry through extra promotion. The sort of thing I have in mind—and I will be explicit here—is the type of development that might be assisted by the grant of Crown land. One is being made in my electorate at the moment. A group of developers are proceeding with the \$10,000,000 development of a tourist park. After initial assistance through Crown land being made available, they will be able to paddle their own canoe. I use the word “paddle” advisedly because that is one of the things tourists will be doing on the site. The promoters will be developing at a cost of \$10,000,000. It will be their \$10,000,000 and they will be paying taxes on the profits they make. The 200 or so employees will also be paying taxes. It will not cost us a cent as a nation and it will be a tremendous contribution to its welfare.

That is the sort of proposal that we should be assisting, but strictly short term, strictly by way of promotion. I do not approve of these great, grandiose schemes that go on under the general heading of getting fair dinkum about assisting the tourist industry. I do not think that the people want them, the taxpayers cannot afford them, and in the national interest they ought not to happen.

There is no doubt that one of the things that have really hurt the tourist industry in recent times is the penalty rate paid to employees.

Mr. Davis: That's a lot of rubbish!

Mr. AHERN: I wrote into my speech notes, “Pause for applause from the Opposition”, because I expected it. There is no doubt at all that this is completely realistic criticism.

If a person goes up there on any week-end and wants a meal after ordinary hours, as I did recently, in a very high-quality restaurant, what does he find? Mum, Dad and the kids have to serve him. It is possible to find excellent accommodation understaffed, and we can understand this problem. There is no doubt that there will have to be a rethink in this area. There is no doubt that a lot of employment has been killed by what has happened with penalty rates in the tourist industry.

Recently a publican told me that it costs him \$132 to employ a barmaid to serve at the local hotel on a Saturday and Sunday. He said that those barmaids were doing nothing else.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Why don't you use the correct term and call them bar attendants?

Mr. AHERN: I am quite happy to use that term, but the principle is the same.

I do not blame the girls particularly; I blame the person who brought down the awards. Those girls are getting \$132 for working Saturday and Sunday. They are doing nothing else; they can live quite comfortably on that amount. If we are to provide some realistic employment in the tourist industry—and the opportunities are tremendously extensive—we will have to do something about penalty rates. Undoing this sort of thing will not be popular but it will have to be done.

I was interested to hear the Minister, in his introductory remarks, make some reference to development bureaus. They have made a significant contribution to the tourist industry in Queensland. Not the least of them is the one that operates in my area. When we are talking about the tourist industry and all of the things that will happen in the future, journalists, politicians and entrepreneurs alike are exhilarated about the tremendous opportunities that are being created by cheap air fares to bring a lot of overseas tourists to this country. I have no doubt that that proposition exists but people have been talking about it for years.

The great contribution to the tourist industry in our area is made by interstate and intrastate tourists. It is the development bureaus throughout the State that have realised this fact and have paid major attention to bringing people from inside Queensland to holiday on the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast, in Cairns and other places, and have provided very valuable interstate promotions, too. I think their work needs to be supported and assisted wherever the new corporation can do so.

Mr. Hodges: About 80 per cent of Queensland tourists travel by road.

Mr. AHERN: Yes, which means that most of them are Australians.

I do not think we need to get carried away in the euphoria that has existed since we began talking about overseas tourists. The tremendous opportunities that have existed and will exist in the future have come from Australians who have come to the Sunshine Coast and other destinations.

The Local Government Grants Commission has come under criticism from me in recent times. I have not seen any logic at all in their determinations, and all I can say is that there is room for some improvement in the future. There is no doubt that tourist areas need special assistance. In areas with a limited number of ratepayers and a large tourist population, particularly at week-ends, there is a need to provide toilet accommodation, to clean up and repair dunes, and to do this sort of thing generally. The average ratepayer worries about whether his council can afford this work. The people who represent the average ratepayer also say, "Should we be spending this amount of ratepayers' funds to clean up after tourists and provide facilities for them?"

To my knowledge, most local authorities have accepted their responsibilities, but they see this problem as something which should be recognised by the Local Government Grants Commission, although it has not been recognised to date. In fact, to date some local authority areas have been penalised because they were tourist areas, growth areas and so on. When the Labor administration in Canberra first set up the Local Government Grants Commission, the tourist areas received nothing—nothing at all—and it was just a complete lack of logic—

Mr. Prest: Of course they did. They got it through regional development.

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about. During its first two years of existence, the Local Government Grants Commission gave to my electorate the princely sum of \$30,000, and that did not go anywhere near paying for the paper work to apply—

Mr. Bishop: The Gold Coast got nothing.

Mr. AHERN: That is a matter of fact, and there ought to be a recognition of the problems that are thereby created. It is absolutely essential that the Local Government Grants Commission recognise these problems, and I hope that it does so in the future.

Perhaps today the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau will come in for some criticism about what it has and has not done over the years, but for my part I want to say that, with the resources we gave it, it did a very good job. I have to say that, with the resources that we as a Government gave them, those representatives of the

Queensland Government Tourist Bureau with whom I have been associated did a very good job.

I think the setting up of this corporation is a natural progression. Today's tourist industry needs more; it needs a type of development different from that which was appropriate in the past. I want to say a "thank you" to those officers in the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau who assisted me in my work. I know that my area has benefited tremendously as a result of their dedication. The corporation will provide a flexibility and a modernisation which is essential in today's environment. I think the opportunities for the future are tremendous.

There were a couple of points raised in the debate today—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. AHERN: Opposition members are unduly restive this afternoon.

Mr. Prest: You're just making a fool of yourself. You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member for Port Curtis spoke about a conference which was held last week in Townsville.

Mr. Prest: It wasn't; it happened in Mackay.

Mr. AHERN: All right. Apparently a lot of Government members did not attend. What happened last week in the State of Queensland? The Parliament was sitting. Where does the first responsibility of a member of Parliament lie? In the Parliament!

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! The Chair will tolerate reasonable interjections, but not interjections en masse. The Committee will come to order.

Mr. AHERN: The assertion that there should be a large number of Government members attending a conference away from the Parliament when it is sitting is just not on as far as I am concerned. The tourist industry has always received generous support from Government members, and I have no doubt it will continue to receive that support in the future.

It surprised me today—it really should not have surprised me; it has been going on in this place for years—to see the denigration by Opposition members of any person who sounds at all like favouring private enterprise or is a private company or an entrepreneur. People who have been successful in the private-enterprise field are labelled as con men. Frankly, Sir Bruce Small, Keith Williams and other people have made a tremendous contribution to the

tourist industry in this State. The reason why we are in government is that we have supported private enterprise, and will continue to do so. The reason why the Opposition has remained out of government in this State is that it always rubbishes anybody who it thinks might make a profit. That is silly, because anybody who makes a profit pays half of it in tax.

Another point that needs to be understood is that if we are going to create new jobs in Australia, and that is what we should be doing—that is what I am trying to do, anyway—half of those new jobs have to be financed out of profit. That is something that must be realised. That is something that the Opposition has not realised, and that is why it will be the Opposition for many years to come.

I rose in this debate as one who represents a tourist area. I represent an area that has actually the biggest tourist attraction in Australia, namely, the Sunshine Plantation. It is reputed to be the biggest tourist attraction in Australia, and I have no doubt that it is. This is the type of development that this State wants. It epitomises all that I have been talking about here today. I trust that many members have been to my area to see it.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (5.32 p.m.): In the last hour or so, I have heard some of the most ridiculous statements that I have ever heard. I refer in particular to the statements of the member for Landsborough. As usual, he got up and read from a prepared speech. Probably it was prepared by Sir Bruce Small, the well-known donor of \$100,000.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. DAVIS: He could, naturally, because he used to support him when he was here.

Mrs. Kyburz: Who wrote yours—Jack Egerton?

Mr. DAVIS: No, Jack is not a friend of mine. He has left the party.

Mr. AHERN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member says that my speech was prepared by Sir Bruce Small. Nobody prepares my speeches. For the sake of readers of "Hansard", I ask that the imputation by the honourable member, which I find to be offensive, be withdrawn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! The honourable member for Landsborough wishes the imputation to be withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIS: I withdraw. When I was in Parliament previously, Sir Bruce Small paid \$20,000 to buy his knighthood.

The honourable member immediately went on in his usual way to attack the unions. That seems to be the trend followed by National Party and Liberal Party members of Parliament not only in the State sphere but also in the Federal sphere. They attack the unions on this penalty caper. It is a deliberate attempt by these Governments to try to turn attention away from the real cause of unemployment. They say that a reduction in the penalty rates paid to workers in the tourist industry will fix unemployment. Anybody who has been to New Zealand knows that New Zealanders have very heavy penalty rates but they do not seem to have the same problem as that encountered by Queensland or Australia. These dangerous and deliberate misconceptions are put about in order to justify a reduction in real wages.

I shall give an example regarding motels. I would say that the best motel accommodation from the point of view of rates, etc., is to be found on the Gold Coast, where there is a competitive situation. A reasonable standard of accommodation is provided and one is not clipped for it. That is one good thing about the Gold Coast. Throughout Queensland there are quite a number of motels in which only a husband and wife work and in which no penalty rates are involved. I assure you, Mr. Row, that those motels charge the same rates as are charged by some of the big motel chains that claim to have hundreds of employees working for them.

Mr. Goleby: That isn't right.

Mr. DAVIS: It is correct. I can show the honourable member dozens of motels at which I have stayed that are run by a husband and wife and in which no penalty rates are involved. The situation of those people is exactly similar to that of a husband and wife working in a service station. They are in it for what cop they can get out of it. Let us forget all this rubbish about penalty rates.

I shall quote now from the comments of a major employer. Mr. R. G. Kirby, managing director of Travelodge, who employs 3,200 people, said—

"It would be unthinkable to reduce their take-home pay. I believe penalty rates are here to stay. Abolishing penalty rates would only reduce accommodation by 50c per night."

So if honourable members opposite think that penalty rates are the be-all and end-all of factors affecting tourism, they are quite wrong.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! There is far too much noise in the Chamber. It is almost impossible for the member speaking to be heard. I ask honourable members to co-operate, or I will not allow the debate to proceed.

Mr. DAVIS: Members of the Liberal and National Parties continually suggest that the tourist industry would not have any problems if penalty rates were abolished. That is poppycock. Penalty rates are here to stay; they will not be abolished.

Mr. Goleby: So you say.

Mr. DAVIS: That is for sure. If the Government does try to take them away, it will have a battle on its hands. Penalty rates affect not only accommodation houses but also restaurants and other sections of the tourist industry. If it is good enough for penalty rates to be paid in other industries, it is good enough for them to be paid in the leisure industries. I am sure that the A.L.P. will support the payment of penalty rates.

As the Opposition spokesman said earlier, members on this side of the Chamber are concerned about the position of tourist bureau employees when the corporation is established. We are concerned about ensuring that their seniority is considered, and we are concerned also about ensuring that this will not be a case of jobs for the boys or the girls. I say that with due deference to one member of this Assembly. If people are to be appointed to the board, let us ensure that they are appointed because they are people of quality, not because they have contributed certain moneys to the National Party.

Mr. Prest: What chance has Ivan Gibbs got? He only put in \$6,000.

Mr. DAVIS: I am told that it was \$5,000. If Sir Bruce Small contributes \$100,000, another chap contributes \$25,000, and the honourable member for Albert contributes only \$5,000, that should not have anything to do with appointments to the board. The best brains available, whether male or female, should be appointed to operate the corporation.

Mr. Frawley: You won't be a member, that's a certainty.

Mr. DAVIS: I don't know about that. In talking about tourism, we hear a great deal about what appeals to the overseas tourist and what the overseas tourist wants. The only point on which I agree with the honourable member for Landsborough is that 80 per cent of tourists in Queensland come from interstate. For the first time ever, the honourable member for Surfers Paradise made a speech that was not parochial. I do not know whether he is trying to become Minister for Tourism in the next Cabinet.

Mr. Prest: He didn't speak about Coolangatta today.

Mr. DAVIS: No. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise tried to be statesmanlike today. However, surveys and research prove that the three things that overseas tourists wish to see in Australia are, first, the Barrier

Reef; second, kangaroos; and, third, Ayers Rock. The State Government is trying to get rid of the Barrier Reef and has done its best to get rid of kangaroos.

Mr. Prest: They can't go to Aurukun or Mornington Island because they don't allow tourists up there.

Mr. DAVIS: That is right; no tourists at all are allowed in that local authority area. What should be remembered is that leisure time is going to increase when the 35-hour week is introduced. It is all right for people to say that it will never come, but I say that it has to come, whether the Tories or National Party members over there like it or not. The 35-hour week is certainly going to come, so we have to plan for this extra leisure time. The people whom we must look after are the Queenslanders and the other Australians themselves.

We must also look after the motoring public. The Opposition spokesmen on main roads and tourism mentioned this subject. What they said is certainly true.

Mr. Frawley: You fleeced the motoring public for years when you used to mix standard and super petrol.

Mr. Prest: He has still got an outstanding account of yours.

Mr. DAVIS: If the honourable member doesn't mind, I would like that account paid, too.

It has been pointed out that motorists, not only those driving cars but also those towing caravans and driving campervans are our most important tourists. We will have to do something about the shocking state of our roads. For too long now we have been passing the buck to the Federal Government. Last year during a debate on a primary industries matter I pointed out that more than \$600,000,000 in additional tax had gone straight into the Commonwealth purse, with hardly a murmur from any member of the National Party. Of course, they are nice and quiet when anything is done by their own kind.

Mr. Frawley: You haven't got a clue on primary industries. The last time you arrived on a farm you tried to milk a bull. Why don't you admit it?

Mr. DAVIS: With his brains, I wonder how the honourable member for Caboolture ever became a member of the National Party. I have told the old story before about Billy Hughes being a member of about three or four political parties and finally being asked, "Why don't you join the Country Party?" He said, "What do you take me for—a rat?"

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! The Chair would appreciate knowing who is making this speech. At the

moment it is very difficult to determine. The honourable member for Brisbane Central will continue with his speech.

Mr. DAVIS: I would like to refer to a very enlightening leader article in "The Courier-Mail" of 21 June 1971 which was headed, "Tourism our top industry?" It goes on to state—

"The confidence of the Labor and Tourism Minister (Mr. Herbert) that by 1980 tourism will rival mining as Queensland's most important industry will surprise many."

We are now getting very close to 1980 and we see that we have not improved much.

While we might be doing the right thing by setting up a corporation, I believe that the old tourist bureau was not given a fair go. It was attacked time and time again by people within the tourist industry. Members will recall that in 1974 a question was asked about the wearing of ties by employees of the tourist bureau. The Government was so far behind the times that its employees were not even allowed to go without ties. The Government would not even allow them to wear floral shirts. That had nothing to do with tourist bureau policy; it was Government policy. Because of Government policy and the miserly amount of money made available, Queensland Government Tourist Bureau did not flourish. When I wrote to every tourist bureau throughout the world in 1974, I was amazed to learn just how much money other Governments devoted to their tourist organisations.

The honourable member for Landsborough said that he did not believe the tourist industry should be assisted to any great extent. He did not believe that tax concessions should be granted to it. If he cares to read the latest report presented by the House of Representatives Joint Party Committee on Tourism, he will see throughout the report recommendations on tax concessions for buildings and plant; recommendations that the industry should be treated as an industry. As the honourable member for Surfers Paradise has said on numerous occasions, if people are to build new motels and boatels, and provide plant, they must have taxation concessions.

Mrs. Kyburz: Why?

Mr. DAVIS: I do not know the honourable member's attitude to tourism, but this is one matter on which I agree with people in the tourist industry.

I think it was in 1972 that Mr. Schofield, the manager of the Chevron Hotel, told me during a discussion I had with him that the hotel was starting to cost too much money: that it had outlived its useful life.

Mr. White: It was the penalty rates.

Mr. DAVIS: It was not the penalty rates; the honourable member should get off that rubbish. I assure the honourable member that penalty rates were not mentioned in the discussion.

Mr. Schofield blamed wear and tear. Locks, cisterns and other things wear out.

Mr. Bishop: Are you aware that Australia is one of the few countries in the world that does not have a taxation depreciation allowance?

Mr. DAVIS: That is correct; Australia is one of the few countries in the world without that provision.

As soon as the corporation is set up, it should go to New Zealand to see what assistance is given there. When a new project is to be developed in New Zealand, the tourist organisation visits the area, assesses its potential and helps in the establishment of the tourist facilities.

A Government Member: That is the National Party for you.

Mr. DAVIS: Oh, the National Party!

Mr. Wright: The only problem is that later they hand it over to private enterprise.

Mr. DAVIS: That was Sir Robert Menzies's policy with the National Line and everything else. The only thing that he did not hand over was T.A.A. That was because he entered into a deal with Ansett concerning the two airlines.

As to the query raised by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise on why wide-body jets are not operating, it is a fact that Ansett lost \$25,000,000 through its A.S.L. investments. That loss will have an effect on joint-airline policy, whether we like it or not. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise also referred to the 800-odd people who will be arriving in Sydney each week and who will be travelling throughout Australia. In referring to the airport facilities at Bilinga, I would point out to him that the shed provided as an airport terminal will not cater for many additional passengers. The new terminal is still on the drawing-board.

The member for Rockhampton has spoken to me about the Iwasaki project. I ask honourable members to visualise hundreds of jet-travelling Japanese coming from Japan when the project is completed, after millions of dollars have been poured into Yeppoon. Where will they land?

Mr. Prest: Did you note that in the local government elections the council that wanted the Iwasaki project almost got thrown out?

Mr. DAVIS: That is a good example of what happens. Like many others, they went to the well too often. They accepted a

free trip to Nippon and were feted and so forth by this gentleman. They paid the price; the electorate made sure that they paid the price.

When the Government establishes the corporation, I hope that it looks well at all proposals. For instance, if a scheme such as that favoured by the A.L.P. for a casino on the Gold Coast is put forward, the corporation should make thorough investigations after public opinion in the area has been fully canvassed.

Mr. Bishop: It is one of the ideas that you stole from the Liberal Party.

Mr. DAVIS: The member for Surfers Paradise knows that that was pirated straight from our document. I wish he would speak the truth. That sort of scheme is one that would attract overseas tourists. Cheap fares are No. 1. I hope that the airline schemes will be incorporated so that there is a better system of cheap fares. I hope the Laker airline will operate to Australia. That obviously will bring tourists here.

However, when they get to Australia, what do the overseas tourists want? We have nice beaches and, as I said before, the Barrier Reef—if the Premier and his Cabinet do not ruin it with oil-drilling. Tourists are attracted to something that they have not seen overseas. We cannot just rely on our beaches. If we think about it, Hawaii has just as much beach to offer. They are not going to come over here just to see beaches. To attract them, we have to be able to offer a package deal. Australia has a number of attractions. If tourists are interested in casinos and first-class hotels and they have the money to pay for them, by all means offer these facilities to them. However, at the same time, let us not forget the bread and butter of the tourist industry—the ordinary motorist; the ordinary family man who likes to get around his State. We must ensure that we have first-class caravan parks, first-class hotel accommodation and first-class motels. That is the way the industry will get on its feet.

Mr. WHITE (Southport) (5.52 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to support the Minister's introduction of this Bill. It also gives me a chance to refute some of the wild statements that have been made by Opposition members. I see this legislation, when it is passed by the Parliament, giving a completely new thrust to a lagging industry, an industry that, unfortunately, has been slipping back over the last few years. I believe that this corporation will be the catalyst for a new-look tourist industry in this State. We are talking about an industry that is probably the fastest-growing industry in the world. We must secure our share of that growth. In Queensland, tourism is our fourth largest industry. We have the potential to make it our biggest industry.

I hope that the corporation set up under this measure will be the means by which tourism becomes the No. 1 industry in the State.

It is imperative that we get our share of the tourism business. In the first place, it provides a tremendous spin-off for business generally—for light industry and other forms of business in this State. One of the reasons why my own area is seeing a growth in light industry is that it is a significant tourist centre. Light industry is required to support the tourist industry. For instance, there is capital development in buildings and all the other things that go with the tourist industry.

The other important reason why I believe we must expand the tourist industry is that in a time when unemployment is high it is the one industry that has the greatest chance of providing real employment opportunities for young people. It is highly labour-intensive. The more we can support and encourage the tourist industry, the more it will be in a position to soak up the unemployment in this State and throughout Australia. Another reason why we should support tourism is that it has the potential to become a massive income-earner for this State and Australians in general.

We all know that there is a certain amount of criticism about some of the provisions of this Bill. Some of the criticism voiced by Opposition members is valid, I believe. I will refer to that in a moment. I have two reservations about the measure. One is that it provides yet another statutory authority in this State. The other is that to a certain extent it competes with private enterprise. However, no legislation is perfect. Nothing that can be produced satisfies everybody. Although I have reservations on those two grounds, I am quite convinced that the great advantages this Bill will bring to the tourist industry in Queensland will far outweigh the disadvantages of another statutory authority and an element of competition with private enterprise. Although I would prefer the circumstances to be such that there was no room for criticism, the advantages of this proposal will be immense and will outweigh any criticism that I have expressed.

The current promotion of tourism in this State is not working as well as it might and something must be done if we are to obtain our share of the gains from realisation of the potential of this industry in this State. For a certain time—perhaps longer than we anticipate—the promotion of tourism will need a certain amount of Government support. There is no doubt that it is receiving support to a large degree. The corporation has to provide only 10 per cent of its operating costs. I should be very happy, as I imagine everybody else would be, if it did not have to provide any money. However, 10 per cent is not a large proportion and the Government is

picking up the tab for the remainder. That is a very real indication of the Government's support for the tourist industry. The big thing about this new corporation is that it will create the incentive to grow. All of the money over and above the 10 per cent required for its operating costs will be used exclusively for promotion. That should be a challenge to this corporation and to the board that will direct it. All of the additional money that it can earn will be spent on the promotion of Queensland.

The Bill also provides that the corporation will be allowed to provide loans for various schemes that meet its criteria and are in the interests of tourism in this State. This will provide a great new thrust in tourism because some of the ventures in certain areas—particularly in North Queensland, which has tremendous potential but perhaps not the capital to develop it—will have money channelled into them.

Mr. Yewdale: You have to fix up the roads first.

Mr. WHITE: I will refer to roads in a moment.

I see the corporation's power to provide loans to worthwhile enterprises, and not only big ones, as a major, new initiative.

Mr. Hodges interjected.

Mr. WHITE: I take the Minister's point. It is something that we discussed and something that may be brought up here later on, along with all of the criticism about some of the people who may be put on the corporation. It will be of interest to everyone to know that no directors or members of the board of the corporation will be allowed to participate in any of these loans. I point that out in case Opposition members have it in mind as a matter on which they can criticise the Bill later.

Mr. Jones: Does it say that in the Bill?

Mr. WHITE: It will.

Mr. Jones: That will be interesting to read.

Mr. WHITE: I will give my guarantee that that will be in the Bill. Opposition members should not get too excited about knocking Keith Williams or anybody else on that score.

Let me turn to the composition of the board. A good deal of criticism has come from members on the other side of the Committee on the composition of the board of the new corporation. It is important—and if they are fair they will agree—that it must be run by people who are experienced in tourism and in the promotion of tourism. Therefore, it would be wrong to exclude people from it simply because they are involved in the tourist industry.

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

Mr. WHITE: Before the dinner recess I was speaking about the composition of the board of the new corporation. I believe that it is of the utmost importance that persons of the highest calibre be appointed to this board; people who will give their services part time to promote tourism in this State. They must be people who are experienced not only in the conduct of tourist activities but in the promotion of tourism. They should be people who know Queensland well, and they should be widely representative of the tourist interests in this State. We cannot afford to have them all representing only one particular area.

There will be arguments, I think logical ones, from both sides of the Chamber about whether they should be appointed or elected. I think initially there is a case for appointment, but I see no reason why, in the long term, some or all of the members of this board should not be elected by the various tourist industry interests. I have been referring to the composition of the board because there has been a lot of criticism today about a man who comes from the area I represent.

Mr. Davis: Who—Bruce?

Mr. WHITE: No, not Bruce. It is assumed that this man will be a member of the board. I refer to Keith Williams. There has been a lot of criticism of this gentleman from the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. Davis: He only gave \$25,000; Bruce gave \$100,000.

Mr. WHITE: I have no brief for Keith Williams. It is well known in my area that in the past he and I have had some barneys, and there are a couple coming up in the future. But I will not stand by and see this man denigrated because he has given \$25,000 to the National Party. That is his choice. I would have much preferred his giving that money to the Liberal Party, but at least it has gone to the right side of politics. Whatever he has or has not done, this man has made a massive contribution to the tourist industry in this State. He has built up tourist enterprises on the Gold Coast and elsewhere that are without peer in the world, and it is the sort of promotional and developmental expertise that this man has at his fingertips that I believe should be represented on the board. I can assure honourable members that no-one will be more surprised than Keith Williams when he reads those remarks in "Hansard".

I would now like to deal with a few other matters. Firstly, there has been some criticism of the roads in this State, and rightly so. It is important to the tourist industry that people are able to drive to the various tourist spots whenever they wish by means of all-weather roads on which it is safe to travel with both cars and caravans. This cannot be done at the moment, and our No. 1 highway is a good example of why it

cannot be done. It is very important for the future of this State as a whole, and particularly our rural industries, that our roads be upgraded. This would benefit both the tourist industry and rural industries. In this way we would get two for the price of one.

I do not believe it is any use fiddling around with the sort of money we are spending now. Obviously the Commonwealth has to come to the party. The road system in this State needs a massive injection of capital. We could tackle this problem in much the same way as we tackled our education problems earlier. Until the great problem of sub-standard roads in this State is recognised, tourism and other industries will continue to suffer.

The next point I would like to make concerns international airports. We all appreciate that Brisbane airport will be upgraded by 1982, but that is not enough. We must be considering international airports at Townsville and Rockhampton, and it is hoped that they will be established in the not too distant future. It does not matter much where the airports are located, but obviously they must be situated close to the major tourist attractions. It is no use being parochial about this matter, because the fact is that there is a massive spin-off into other areas from the place where tourists land in the first place—whether it be Townsville, Cairns, Rockhampton, the Iwasaki Yeppoon project or the Gold Coast. People will not stay at Townsville or at the Iwasaki project all the time; they will want to go to other parts of the State. Just as it is important to upgrade our roads, it is also most important that we have positive programmes to upgrade our airports to international standards to take full advantage of the cheap air fares that are prevailing, and which it is hoped will get relatively cheaper still.

Of course, one of the things that goes with the development of international airports is a reduction in internal air fares. I think that most members in this Chamber, no matter to which party they belong, would agree that the future of our tourist industry depends on a reduction in domestic air fares. I state unequivocally that the first necessity is a complete review of the two-airline policy which has served us well in the past but which is now outdated. If we are really serious about the tourist industry, there should also be cheaper no-frills flights at times which are more conducive to the attraction of tourists than businessmen. Hundreds of thousands of people are prepared to travel at various times of the night or day on no-frills flights just to get to their destinations. Such flights operate in Europe, and it is time we faced up to the fact that we have to introduce them here in order to move people around this country cheaply.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: I agree with you.

Mr. WHITE: I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: There is one question, though. When you say that it is "outdated", do you mean that there should be a third local airline operating? What is your proposal?

Mr. WHITE: If the honourable member had been listening, he would know that I did not propose anything. What I said before I was rudely interrupted by the honourable member opposite was that the two-airline policy must be reviewed, because it is not serving the travelling public.

I should like to say one or two words about the concern that is felt by the public servants who will be transferred to the new corporation. I know that the Minister and his committee have looked at this matter very thoroughly, and I am quite sure that these public servants will be well looked after. I think that a two-year moratorium before a decision has to be made is fair and will provide enough time for anybody to make up his mind. I am quite sure that the Bill will satisfy members of the Opposition and the public servants themselves that their rights and entitlements will be protected.

I think that those who will be affected really have the best of both worlds. Here they are in the Public Service and being offered the chance to try out a new career without detriment to their rights and entitlements in their present careers. A whole new life will open up for those who decide to stay with the corporation, that is, those who feel that their future lies in the tourist industry. If they do not want to remain with the corporation, they can return to the Public Service without any detriment and with all their rights and privileges protected. I think that they are very fortunate public servants. If I were one of them, I would see it as a challenge for the future.

Mr. Houston: What is the Minister going to do?

Mr. WHITE: The Minister will make quite sure in the Bill that rights and entitlements are protected.

In conclusion, as I said at the beginning of my speech, we have here a Bill that will open up a whole new future for this industry. I do not believe that the tourist industry in Queensland has received sufficient support in the past, and the stage is now being reached at which that lack of support is about to be redressed. Queensland has more natural tourist advantages than any other part of the world that I have visited, and it is up to the Government to capitalise on those advantages.

Mr. WILSON (Townsville South) (7.26 p.m.): Let me say at the outset that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau has served Queensland and interstate people capably and well over many years. Because of its expertise, it is the logical body to continue to provide services to tourists in

Queensland and throughout Australia. The Tourist and Travel Corporation that the Government intends to set up will not be able to do better anything that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau now does—unless it is providing jobs for the boys.

Let us find out first, Mr. Gunn, who the tourists are. It is claimed that 80 per cent of tourists in this State are people from other States of the Commonwealth. In the main, when we speak about tourists we are speaking about workers on holiday, not about millionaires coming here from overseas. The greatest number of people who travel over the length and breadth of this country are workers on their annual leave. So if we are to cater for tourists instead of holiday-makers, let us cater for the biggest number, that is, workers on holiday.

We must be concerned first about what happens when a worker goes on holidays and is termed a tourist. The very fact that he is termed a tourist allows those who provide the services in tourist resorts to rip him off. Let me say quite candidly that it is the greatest rip-off of all time; there is no other word for it. Another honourable member said, "They charge." Let me tell you, Mr. Gunn, that they charge like a bull at a gate. There is no way in the world that they cannot afford to pay workers in tourist areas penalty rates at week-ends, taking into account their exorbitant charges. In my travels recently, I have seen instances in which there has been a charge of \$35 a night for a room.

Mr. Austin: You stay at the Chevron-Hilton.

Mr. WILSON: Never mind about that. If the honourable member stays at Travelodge, it will cost him \$50 a night. I remind honourable members that \$35 a night is \$245 a week for a room. And that does not include breakfast; breakfast is extra. In many places there is no service for breakfast. One is expected to go to the dining-room and help oneself at a type of smorgasbord. The motel provides only a cook.

If there are any problems in the tourist industry and for those who cater for the tourist, they are the result of greed and the ripping off of ordinary workers on holidays trying to get away from the weekly grind of their employment. People cannot meet the charges set by those providing the services, and I have seen that happen in Cairns. When the present Federal Government set about creating the unemployment that we see in this country today, there was a great fall-off in the tourist industry in North Queensland. Consequently, those providing services for tourists put up their prices in an endeavour to recoup their losses. All they did was stop the few who intended to visit the area. They could not afford the new exorbitant prices. Those operators killed the goose that laid the golden egg. That is what is wrong with the tourist

industry. We are allowing people who provide services in the tourist industry to rip off the ordinary workers who are on holidays. I am not concerned about the silver-tails from overseas.

Mr. Tenni: Don't you want them to bring their money into Australia?

Mr. WILSON: I am concerned about the 80 per cent, who are decent Australians.

Mr. Tenni: I want the 80 per cent, too; but I want the other 20 per cent. Don't you want them? Tell your electorate up there that you don't want them.

Mr. WILSON: We will only get them there if the honourable member's counterparts in the Federal sphere are prepared to build an international airport in Townsville so that people from overseas can fly direct into Townsville to have a look at the Barrier Reef, whether it be north of Townsville or south of Townsville, instead of being forced to fly into Sydney and then pay the exorbitant air fares within the Commonwealth of Australia. At the moment a tourist from San Francisco can fly all the way to Sydney and back cheaper than he can fly from Brisbane to Perth. So much for this Government's attitude towards tourism! We are denying 80 per cent of tourists in this country a chance to travel and see their own country even though the Queensland Government circulates the "See Queensland First" sticker to be put on motor cars. Quite rightly, the Labor Party then circulated one bearing the slogan "See Queensland First before Joh sells it". Anyone who considers the Iwasaki deal in the Yeppoon area would realise that we had plenty of reason for doing that. As we are Queenslanders, we should be concerned first and foremost about Queensland.

If we are to consider Queensland, we have to get above the Gold Coast. In order to get tourists north of Brisbane, it is essential that this Government pressure the Federal Government to bring the Bruce Highway up to a decent standard so that people can travel on it without the extra expense of repairs to their cars and caravans.

Mr. Tenni: Why didn't Whitlam, that socialist mate of yours, do something about it years ago? He did nothing about it.

Mr. WILSON: The honourable member reminds me of a bird squealing its head off in the night when it has nothing to squeal about. As a matter of fact, he reminds me of "The Wounded Curlew", the poem we learned at school. He comes from one of the best tourist areas in Australia, yet he is interjecting and has nothing to say. I dare say that he has no intention of getting to his feet and saying anything to improve the position of those people in North Queensland who provide the services in the best area of Australia. It is necessary

to raise the Bruce Highway to a decent standard to get people to travel to the North by car and caravan. If the Government is concerned about attracting tourists to the better part of Australia, which is North Queensland—and let there be no mistake about that—

Mrs. Kyburz: Who is being parochial now?

Mr. WILSON: When I speak about North Queensland, I mean areas further north than Caboolture, which seems to be the northern limit in the Government's thoughts. I am talking about attractions a thousand miles further north.

If we are to get tourists up to North Queensland, into the hinterland, and right throughout Queensland, we have to improve rail services. I suggest to the Minister that he look into the services that the Railway Department provides for tourists.

Mr. Frawley: There is nothing wrong with them. I have travelled by train to Townsville, and it is a good trip.

Mr. WILSON: The honourable member for Caboolture last travelled by train when he jumped the rattler during the Depression.

Trains going to Rockhampton and Cairns would provide a better service if they were speeded up. There is no reason why they should stop for every jam tin on a post. Services into country areas should be provided from the main centres, while trains travelling long distances should run express to reduce travelling time. If the railways provided proper facilities, there is no doubt that they would outdo road transport. If proper facilities were provided I would never concede that bus transport could compete with rail transport. Rail transport is far superior.

I spent many years on locomotive footplates. Nowadays diesel-powered engines draw trains from Townsville to Brisbane without pit work having to be done on the way and without having to be exchanged in this journey of 832 miles. Despite the great advances claimed by the Government, the time saved on the journey is only four hours. I point out that formerly the four hours would have been taken up with pit work, cleaning fires, trimming coal, taking on water and changing locomotives before arriving at Rockhampton. All in all, the Government is running a slower service than pre-war. Let no-one quibble about that. That is an absolute fact.

If we are to attract tourists, we must do something for them. We must ensure that they are not ripped off, that they have proper facilities and that they get what they pay for. We must ensure that they leave in the right frame of mind, that is, with a wish to return. But today they are being ripped off and are leaving without any intention of

returning. People from southern States are only too willing to tell us all about it. Proper services are practically non-existent.

We say that tourism is one of the biggest industries in the Commonwealth. The State of Queensland should enjoy the major share of tourism. However, the Government is not acting to bring tourists here so that the people of Queensland may reap the benefit of the great tourist attractions the State has to offer.

Mr. Sullivan: You don't seem to think much of the railway worker. That surprises me, as you were one yourself.

Mr. WILSON: I have the greatest respect for railway workers. However, when we talk about administration, we are talking about a completely different set of circumstances. If the ordinary railway worker is unable to do a job, it is because those above him have not done theirs to allow him to look after the travelling public and the goods that are being carried by rail. Let us have no qualms about that. If the Minister would like to debate it, I would be quite happy to do so.

If we are to improve the tourist industry in Queensland, first of all we have to improve the services in order to get people into the areas that have tourist attractions. Up on the tableland—Tenni country, if the honourable member likes to call it that—a motorist can go miles and miles, passing many tourist attractions and not seeing a sign to show him where those attractions are. A person can drive within three miles of the beautiful Lake Barrine and Lake Eacham without finding a sign showing where they are. Many a tourist has got to Yungaburra, only a few miles from Lake Eacham, only to go 20 miles round through Malanda to be directed to Lake Eacham on another route by the people of Malanda. That is the way this Government and the shire council of that area treat the tourist.

The Great Barrier Reef is known throughout the world. It would be one of the best-known places in Australia. People want to see it. However, the only way they can get there is to fly into Sydney and then be saddled with the exorbitant air fares I mentioned before. As has been said earlier, the two places in Australia that are known throughout the world are the Great Barrier Reef and Ayers Rock; yet only 4 per cent of overseas tourists visit the Great Barrier Reef and 2 per cent go to Ayers Rock. Why is that? It is simply because the international airport is in Sydney. When people arrive here from overseas, they find they are going to be saddled with more air fares costing several hundred dollars to get to the Barrier Reef. So what do they do? They give it a miss.

What is required, as the tourist workshop in Mackay pointed out, is an international airport in Townsville. Townsville was not

picked because any spokesmen for the tourist industry came from there. People at that workshop came from Sydney and from areas all over the Commonwealth. However, it was realised that Townsville is centrally situated for access to the Barrier Reef. From Townsville, tourists would be within easy reach of the Barrier Reef, whether they wanted to visit it from Cairns, through the Whitsunday Passage or from Rockhampton.

If we intend to do something for the tourist trade, that is the way we should attack it. We should get down to providing facilities for tourists and seeing that they enjoy themselves. If we see that they get the commodity that they pay for, they will return.

(Time expired.)

Mr. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (7.45 p.m.): I rise to support the Minister in the setting up of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Mr. Davis: Is this a League of Rights document?

Mr. McKECHNIE: Sometimes I think that the honourable member for Brisbane Central might be employed by the League of Rights. He is sitting over there and trying to make political capital by saying something that he knows is not true. I sometimes wonder if he is a secret agent of theirs.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, as I see it, is planned to marry the benefits of private enterprise and the Queensland Government employees in the Department of Tourism and the Government Tourist Bureau. I have the utmost regard for the officers in those departments. I think it is wise to widen the field of advice they are getting by putting successful businessmen on the corporation and perhaps rearranging the funding of tourism in Queensland so that private enterprise and the Government can go forward together and continue to help the tourist industry in Queensland to prosper.

The members whom the Government appoints to this corporation will need to be men of vision. I am sure that when their names are announced we will find that that is what they are. Tourism is becoming very complicated. It is not just a matter of a worker and his family or a grazier going on holidays. We are moving into the field of international tourism. While the Australian tourist is by far the most important tourist and will continue to be for a long time, the cheap international air fares will encourage many Australians to leave the country rather than visit Queensland. If this is likely, we must redouble our efforts to retain more Australian tourists in Australia and, at the same time, encourage more overseas tourists to visit Australia and, I hope, Queensland.

When we attract overseas tourists, we bring new wealth into the country. Tourists bring money with them to spend. Because of the balance-of-payments problems that Australia experiences from time to time, export industries play a very significant part in the economy of the country. Attracting tourists to Australia brings money into the country just as assuredly as selling wheat to an overseas country provides wealth in Australia.

As well, tourism is an on-going asset. I am a great supporter of the mining industry, as honourable members well know. By the same token, the disadvantage is that mining can use resources only once. With tourism the assets, such as the Great Barrier Reef, the Gold Coast and the lovely Granite Belt, will remain. Tourists can come and go and, provided they exercise a little responsibility, those areas will remain unspoiled.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. McKECHNIE: I cannot hear the honourable member. Unfortunately he is not very intelligible tonight.

We know all of the advantages of encouraging tourism in Australia and, in the balance, the advantages by far outweigh the problems. But many of us complain about overseas interests owning industries in Australia. One of the problems is that Australians tend to waste their money—to blow it—instead of investing in Australian industry. The one disadvantage of encouraging tourism in Australia is that we will continue to let overseas companies own our mining assets and buy our farms, because we are not saving to buy those well-producing interests. That is one disadvantage, but on balance tourism is very important and we must encourage it.

In my electorate I have, among others, the towns of Wallangarra, Stanthorpe, Texas and Goondiwindi. These towns, along with Coolangatta, are the gateways to Queensland. I have a constructive suggestion for this new corporation, and that is that we should pay greater attention to motels in these towns and others within 100 miles of the border. We should disseminate information to motels on either side of the border.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What would that achieve?

Mr. McKECHNIE: I will take that interjection. From what I am told, a lot of tourists coming to Queensland know about the Gold Coast, the Barrier Reef and so on, but there are lots of not so well known tourist attractions in Queensland. These motel operators and the local authorities do not have information on some of these little-known tourist areas and, as many of our tourists come from interstate by motor car, I think we should make a special effort to get information about them to motel owners in these

border towns so that they can encourage people to travel all over Queensland and not just to the better known spots.

Mr. Prest: You would certainly prefer to visit Brisbane than Inglewood, wouldn't you?

Mr. McKECHNIE: As a matter of fact, I would prefer to visit Inglewood.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Why are you so rapt in it?

Mr. McKECHNIE: I like the peace and quiet of the bush. I like to visit the lovely Coolmunda Dam. Peace and quiet are what a lot of city people are looking for today, and I think we should encourage them. If property owners do not have men working for them, we should encourage them to make their workmen's cottages available to tourists. They could let the cottages out and allow people to get out and enjoy the peace and quiet of country living.

I am sure that members are pleased that the Queensland tourism department co-operates with the departments in other States. There are no borders as far as tourism is concerned. The New England Highway runs through my electorate, and the people in Stanthorpe and Wallangarra are very keen to promote increased traffic on that highway, just as the people in Goondiwindi are keen to see increased traffic on the Newell Highway. If the people in these areas, and those over the border, want to promote their respective highways, the various departments should co-operate and try to help them. I think it is good to see co-operation between the States.

Mr. Kruger: Do you think the Gold Coast is slightly overrated at present?

Mr. McKECHNIE: No, I do not think it is. I enjoy the Gold Coast, and I am sure that most members would agree with me that it is a wonderful spot. But, for myself, I prefer the peace and quiet of the bush.

I think this Government can do more to help tourism. I see that the Minister for Primary Industries is in the Chamber.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. McKECHNIE: No, I am going to praise him. What this Government has done for the wine industry is a typical example of how a sympathetic Government—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What has the wine industry to do with tourism?

Mr. McKECHNIE: Opposition members are very noisy tonight, Mr. Gunn, but I will endeavour once again to answer them. I am in a very co-operative mood. The wine industry is one of the reasons why Stanthorpe is growing very quickly. In fact, it is one of the few country towns that is growing. It is rapidly gaining a name as a tourist area. People like to visit the lovely Girraween

National Park and get away from the hustle and bustle of Brisbane. They also visit the wineries in the area. For instance, it is nothing for the Zanattas to get 10 or 20 buses visiting their property on a busy week-end. Those tourists spend money in other areas around the district. As a sympathetic Government, we have reduced charges to wine-makers and have thus encouraged the industry. This will also play a major part in decentralisation and the development of tourism.

Mr. Prest: I read in the paper a while ago about a couple of people who went up there to pick some fruit. They attended a Saturday night dance and after the treatment they got they reckon they will never go back again.

Mr. McKECHNIE: I am aware of what the honourable member is talking about, and I understand that the real story is a great deal different from what he has read in the Press. He has been in politics long enough now to realise that one does not believe everything that one reads in the Press. We are talking about the tourist industry, not the Police Act or anything like that.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. McKECHNIE: Opposition members prattle on. They had an opportunity to make their speeches. I did make a few notes of some of the things that they said. I was very interested in the speech of the Opposition spokesman on tourism. I expected to hear some very worthwhile advice from him, but in the first part of his speech he dealt solely with his concern for the employees in the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. We, too, worry about our Crown employees, but when we introduce a Bill to encourage tourism in Queensland, surely to goodness the Opposition spokesman on tourism should devote the major part of his speech to ways in which we should develop tourism rather than conditions of employees who he knows will be well looked after.

Not long ago I was talking to a public servant, who told me that when the change in Government occurred in Queensland 20-odd years ago public servants feared for their jobs. They really did. Over the years, they had been indoctrinated with the belief that if ever there was a change of Government in Queensland, if ever a Liberal-Country Party Government came to power, public servants would be far worse off. This particular gentleman said to me, "Weren't we conned!" The Liberal-Country Party Government has looked after them much better than the Labor Government ever did.

The Opposition spokesman on tourism went on and on worrying about the employees in the Queensland Tourist Bureau, when he knows only too well that the Government will look after them. His speech shows the degree of importance that the Opposition places on

tourism. Opposition members had a chance to outline a blueprint of what they would do for tourism in Queensland; but the Opposition spokesman on tourism hardly mentioned the subject.

Another Opposition member rambled on about the 35-hour week. That is wonderful, it sounds great, but I represent an area that has an export industry, and if people only realised how much this country depends on export income, they would not be so concerned about trying to introduce a 35-hour week.

Another Opposition spokesman talked about how sinful it would be to get rid of penalty rates. I have news for that honourable member. I do not believe in getting rid of penalty rates in the way that he suggests. I think that there has to be a little bit of negotiation between the unions and the employers. A rate has to be struck. There has to be a 7-day week, but I do not believe that it has to be achieved in such a way that the employees will suffer. There has to be quid pro quo.

Dr. Scott-Young: Don't you think that the Taxation Commissioner should allow a little depreciation for the tourist industry instead of choking it?

Mr. McKECHNIE: I agree with the honourable member.

The Opposition tries to scare people unnecessarily.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. McKECHNIE: I have taken enough interjections. The honourable member is like a sparrow in the biscuit tin.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! The honourable member is not compelled to take interjections.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What is the story about the sparrow and the biscuit tin?

Mr. McKECHNIE: If the honourable member does not know, I am not going to tell him.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You only titivate our interest.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will have an opportunity to speak very soon.

Mr. McKECHNIE: The Big Pineapple is not in my electorate; I think that it is in the electorate of the member for Landsborough. It employs up to 140 people. It does not get any subsidy from the Government. It promotes the fruit industry in that area, and it earns export income by encouraging overseas tourists to go there. The principals of the company pay pay-roll tax, personal tax, company tax and rates. They provide their own parking. They are paying

out all the time and they are not costing the Government one cent. That is why I say that although there are some disadvantages with the tourist industry, on balance, because of the number of jobs that it provides and the fact that it very seldom comes to the Government cap in hand asking for hand-outs, it is a very important industry to Queensland and to Australia.

Some honourable members have mentioned the need to have good roads to promote tourism. Good roads are needed not only to foster tourism but also to encourage the export of primary products, and so on. However, Mr. Gunn, we are talking about tourism today, and an Opposition spokesman said that giving away \$5,000,000 in revenue would mean that \$5,000,000 less would be spent on roads. I do not believe that that is true. In a free-enterprise society, there will be competition in the road transport industry.

Mr. Davis: Ha, ha!

Mr. McKECHNIE: The honourable member talked about his area. I am telling him what happens in my area. One private contractor charges the orchardist \$31.50 a tonne to carry his fruit and he pays his subcontractors \$26 a tonne. In my book, that is pretty fair when he has to provide everything else. Some private operators are doing the wrong thing, but I do not think that there are very many of them in my electorate. I have enough confidence in the orchardists to believe that, now they know that road maintenance tax has been removed, they will negotiate a cheaper freight rate or prevent a rise, and the consumer will benefit.

Under Labor Governments, for years and years Queensland was known as the Cinderella State. Now it is one of the fastest-growing States in the Commonwealth, and I believe that much of that lost revenue will be made up by the expansion of the economy in Queensland as a result of development that is in the pipeline. Opposition members know about it but do not want to talk about it. When they see a sign "See Queensland First", they try to make a joke or political capital out of it. It is a genuine attempt by the Department of Tourism to promote Queensland.

Mr. Kruger: We have a problem with tourism when you see the sort of accident that Rex Pilbeam's bulls had in Rockhampton a while ago. You promote an attraction like that, then vandals do that sort of thing. It is not very encouraging, is it?

Mr. McKECHNIE: I am not aware of Rex Pilbeam's bulls, but I am aware of someone on the Opposition benches who resembles them.

Members of the Opposition also had a great deal to say about rip-offs in the tourist industry, and there is no doubt that there are rip-offs. But there are also many tourist

operators who go broke, and the Opposition never talks about them. What about Marine-land, for instance? What if someone wishes to invest a little money by buying a unit on the Gold Coast? I took out a few figures recently. If someone can save \$10,000 and buy a unit for \$30,000—and he would not get one cheaper than that—he would have to borrow \$20,000 at 10 per cent, and he would be lucky to get it at 10 per cent. In round figures, he would have to pay \$40 a week in interest, \$40 a week in redemption, and \$10 a week in rent and body corporate fees—\$90 a week before he starts.

If we want to have units at the coast so that workers, graziers and everybody else can go there for a holiday, somebody has to build units and houses. There has to be a little bit of encouragement for people to do that if we are to see homes in which people can live or have a holiday.

I commend the Government for doing something worthwhile to try to revamp the tourist industry in Queensland, and I support the Bill.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (8.4 p.m.): In rising to speak on the proposal to set up a Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, let me say at the outset that it is long overdue. There has been much kerfuffle over the last 18 months to two years about the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. Lane: How do you spell "kerfuffle"?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is spelt "L-a-n-e".

At long last the Bill is a reality, and I take this opportunity to wish the present Minister well in his capacity as the foundation member of the new Tourist and Travel Corporation. He will certainly fill the position with dignity and decorum. In taking the position of chairman of the new corporation, the Minister, has shown that he is very astute and has a good deal of common sense. The Minister, like a lot of other members, is a political animal, and he has been a member of this House since 1957.

An Opposition Member: He has had a lot to say about the Port of Brisbane Authority.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I will not come into that. I have a lot of respect for him; he can sniff the wind, and he realises that this Government's days in office are numbered. Of course, when he does leave and there is a by-election in Gympie, we will win the seat. He reminds me of the old saying about rats leaving a sinking ship.

Mr. Bertoni: If your speech is like your imagination, it will be terrific.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I will make a prediction that we will soon see the passing of the member for Mt. Isa; he certainly won't be here after the next State election.

There is a great need for price control in the tourist industry. We have heard a lot of noise from the Government members, particularly the honourable members for Surfers Paradise and Southport. They make plaintive pleas on behalf of the tourist industry and claim that penalty rates are killing it.

Mr. BISHOP: I rise to a point of order. That remark very much upsets me and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it. He said that I referred to penalty rates. I did not mention them. I find that remark offensive.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order! I ask the honourable member for Archerfield to accept the denial.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I accept the denial, Mr. Gunn. Certainly the honourable member's colleague the honourable member for Southport made the comment.

Mr. WHITE: I rise to a point of order. If the honourable member had been listening to my speech, he would have heard that I made no reference at all to penalty rates. They were mentioned by way of interjection. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that comment.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Southport has asked for a withdrawal.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: As a matter of fact, I didn't take much notice of the honourable member's speech. He made it in his usual mumbling style and it was very hard to hear what he had to say. But I accept his denial.

Mr. Kruger: Do you think the Joh hat will rival the old Mexican hat that they used to have over there?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That interjection isn't worth taking.

We have heard a lot of malarkey about penalty rates in the tourist industry and the abolition of them, but we all know that even if penalty rates were abolished the high prices in the tourist industry would not come down. A campaign is being waged by certain interests in the tourist industry to have penalty rates abolished. The Opposition is certainly against the abolition of penalty rates from the tourist industry. We must take into consideration that most people who work in it give up a lot for their jobs.

Mr. Lee: They tell me you were an advocate for reducing the union fee.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: What an inane interjection from the Minister for—what's his present portfolio?—administrative services and pencil sharpeners! He made such a botch of the Works and Housing portfolio that he was unceremoniously dumped after

the last election. This portfolio was created to keep him in a job. In his case it is a matter of "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise".

In relation to tourist attractions such as Sea World, land has been given to this organisation on the Gold Coast and it has been allowed to sell strong liquor under a booth permit similar to that granted for the local cricket match at Birdsville. It is quite obvious that the Sea World boss, Mr. Williams, received extremely favoured treatment from the Government and we all know, although I am sure the Minister will deny it, that Mr. Williams will be appointed to the proposed tourist board. It is probably only coincidence that Mr. Keith Williams donated \$25,000 to have dinner with the Premier. If Williams, despite his tough times with the tourist industry, can afford to give away \$25,000, it is quite obvious that he is guilty of overcharging and blatant profiteering.

Opposition Members: Hear, Hear!

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I am glad to note the "Hear, Hears!" from members of the Opposition indicating that they agree with me.

I am sorry that I missed the speech made by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. It is possible that if I had interjected during his speech he would have agreed with me. From conversations I have had with some Government members I am quite confident that he, too, realises that Keith Williams leaves a lot to be desired so far as honesty and integrity are concerned.

Mr. Lee: Don't bring him into it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I am not trying to bring him into it. I know that he would agree.

The board of the corporation will comprise National Party stooges and ageing political hacks. I am not referring to the Minister as an ageing political hack. The Minister is a political animal; he sees the writing on the wall and he will get out before the axe falls.

Mr. Davis: Do you think Sir Bruce Small has a chance?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: He has no chance.

I bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that Frank Moore, a prominent member of the National Party at Longreach, will be another beneficiary under the Government's nepotism. I feel that there is a lot of truth in the slogan sweeping the traps in Brisbane at the moment, namely, join the National Party and see the world—certainly see Queensland.

On a more serious note, I draw the Committee's attention to the frequent collapse of travel agencies in Queensland and throughout the rest of Australia in the past two or three years. They have done the tourist industry

serious damage. I draw attention particularly to the collapse of the P.B.S. Travel Agency late last year. I think most honourable members who watched T.V. on the night of that collapse would agree with me that they witnessed the harrowing incidents concerning people on low or fixed incomes who lost their hard-earned holidays.

Mr. Goleby: What about the A.U.S.?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I take that interjection. That was another one that left a lot to be desired; it had nothing going for it in the way in which it collapsed. But neither can we take up the cudgels on behalf of P.B.S. I hope that the honourable member for Redlands agrees with me.

I think you would agree with me, Mr. Gunn, on the urgent need to license travel agents. It is ridiculous that, simply because of the lack of proper guide-lines and legislation, anybody can advertise as a travel agent. Travel agents have no obligation to account for money taken from clients as a deposit or full payment for a trip. When a company folds up suddenly, as did P.B.S., people can be left stranded overseas, or lose money paid for trips not yet taken.

Mr. Frawley: Can I ask you a serious question?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It will be the first the honourable member has asked since being elected to this Assembly.

Mr. Frawley: Would you agree that the Auditor-General seriously curtailed tourism?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I will take that interjection. In relation to the honourable member for Caboolture, that was long overdue. I heard that he was getting a reputation amongst his colleagues as a perennial traveller. When I spoke to him one day in the House he told me that he was suffering from serious jet lag because he had just arrived back from New Zealand after throwing the javelin and tossing the caber.

The Government has done nothing to protect people who have been taken by the racketeers and con-men in the travel business. When P.B.S. collapsed, no charges were laid. I am told on good authority that some of the crooks and con-men who controlled P.B.S. set up in business again under a new name.

Because of the very nature of their industry, it is essential that we place travel agents under Government control. In order to protect people, travel agents should be licensed and required to place all money received in trust accounts. Provision should also be made for the regular audit of trust accounts, as is required of real estate agents and solicitors. I do not think any honourable member would disagree with what I am putting forward tonight. It is long overdue.

Mr. Lee: That is the most sensible contribution to come from your side of the Chamber in this debate.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I can tell that the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services agrees with me; I can hear him shaking his head.

The public should be educated about the means provided for their protection. The licensing of travel agents would protect the industry as well as the public. As it is at present, consumers have no protection against the sudden folding of travel firms. I ask the Minister to give this serious consideration. I will be interested to hear his summary.

Mrs. KYBURZ (Salisbury) (8.15 p.m.): In rising to speak to this Bill, I cannot say that I totally support it. I don't. However, I am speaking to it with a feeling of ambivalence. I feel rather guilty because those who have spoken to it have been so laudatory about it; yet they haven't a clue what is really in the Bill. Once I have seen the Bill, I will make my decision on whether I agree with what is in it. Philosophically, one cannot but support it; but whether or not we support it in practice will not be known until we see the Bill. It is rather funny to hear everyone saying, "Isn't it wonderful what good things the Government has done?"

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mrs. KYBURZ: I am not listening to the honourable member for Archerfield. He didn't even take an interjection from his colleagues—and that is why he made such an excellent speech.

The importance of tourism to this State cannot be denied. Tourism as such is an extremely important industry of this State. There has been a great deal of concentration on tourism.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Do you support the goings-on on the "Melita"?

Mrs. KYBURZ: It is difficult to keep to the provisions of the Bill, Mr. Gunn.

The setting up of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is an important facet of this Bill that we ought to be looking at. "Government Business—Orders of the Day" says—

"Committee to consider introducing a Bill to provide for The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, its functions and powers".

In his introduction the Minister glossed over what I believe the functions and powers of the corporation will be. I do not believe that at the joint-parties meeting we had a genuine run-down of the corporation's functions. I think there will be quite a few surprises when we see the Bill. I have no doubt that it will have far wider ramifications than we have ever guessed.

The Government must come clean, so to speak, and show that it is genuine by naming the people who are to be on the board. Those names ought to be in the Bill. Many names have been bandied around tonight. I do not care one way or the other who is on it, except that I do say that there ought to be someone from each and every part of the State and they should not be people who have a vested interest in tourism itself. There should be a person from the Far West; there should be a person from the Far North; there should be someone from the Central Highlands; there should be someone from the Townsville area; someone from the North Coast; and one person from the Gold Coast.

Mr. Bishop: That is the mentality that has ruined the tourist industry.

Mrs. KYBURZ: I do not see that the Gold Coast has a monopoly on tourism in this State. It has had things its own way for far too long. We must know who is going to be on this corporation. When we actually read the Bill, I hope to see those names there—but, of course, I know that that is a false hope right from the start. However, we can always hope.

The honourable member for Surfers Paradise made a point about there being too much accommodation. Then he said that the accommodation industry needs help to provide more first-class beds. I find those statements rather contradictory. The simple fact is that there is too much accommodation and too much of it is second class. I do not see how this corporation will be able to get rid of the second and third-class accommodation. It is logistically impossible for that sort of accommodation to be wiped off the map.

The member for Landsborough asked for industries that do not require tremendous support or increase the deficit to be augmented by the Government.

Mr. Bishop: Are you summing up for the Opposition?

Mrs. KYBURZ: The member for Surfers Paradise has had his go. I didn't agree with him, but I sat quietly while I tolerated his Gold Coast spiel. He should sit quietly and tolerate mine or get out of the Chamber.

Taxpayers must not support new buildings, expensive infrastructure or expensive "frap-frap" in the name of advertising—advertising that is often of a very sexist nature. We don't need to see pictures of aged mayors surrounded by females in tiny bikinis to know what a place is all about. We need to know in fact the genuine things that can be done in a place rather than the opportunity to sit on somebody's knee.

Many points have been made about 85 per cent of tourists coming from within Australia with the remainder coming from abroad. I

wish for that 85 per cent that we could stop pushing the kitsch as much as we have been and start telling them the truth. After all, so much in the name of tourism is pure gaff that a person would need to have been abroad to realise the difference. I have seen so many weird things—and not only in Queensland, I must say—such as holes in the ground enclosed by a fence and described as extraterrestrial footprints. Then there are houses of bottles, cans and shells and all sorts of other weird things. There are areas that push themselves as beach areas, yet they allow ghastly tall buildings to be erected so close to the beach that they cast a shadow over the beach early in the afternoon, thus destroying the attractiveness of the beach.

The best tourist facilities are natural ones and there is no doubt that this State has a surfeit of them. I include our beaches, the Great Barrier Reef, the sun, our native marsupials, our natural rain forests in the Far North and the southern corner and hundreds of hectares of flat plains. There is no doubt that the Far West has a great deal to offer. Equally Australiana has a lot to offer.

The Minister said that the corporation will have as its principal mandate the promotion and development of our State in the face of intense and highly professional competition. I see that as its entire mandate. I do not see any mandate for this corporation to train staff or to buy facilities for the training of staff in either the service or catering industries. I do not see its having a function to undertake research. I do not believe that seven or eight businessmen—and I am quite convinced that all of them will be men—have in fact any expertise to undertake research. I believe that one of the powers given to the board will be the publishing of documents and periodicals. I would like to know who will pay for that publishing. I really think that what we are setting up is an altruistic extra bureaucracy in this State simply as a fob off for the fact that the Tourist Bureau has not been able to attract here as many people as some involved in the tourist industry would like.

The Minister said that tourism is one of the fastest-growing and most labour-intensive industries. If it is, why can't it help to pay for the corporation? In fact, why can't there be a levy on all tourist facilities and their owners to help in some way to pay for this corporation? I instance the R.E.I.Q. After all, real estate agents have an extraordinary and extremely vested interest in the R.E.I.Q. in seeing that it functions, prospers and does everything else they wish it to do. However, I wonder how this corporation will regulate itself and the people who will be involved in the tourist industry. How will it give ratings to accommodation? How will it rate a second-class caravan on top of a beach, without any facilities within half a mile, compared to a first-class unit on the North Coast? I would really like to know that.

The Minister said that the corporation will stimulate further business and local privately owned agencies and certainly materially assist the many thousands of tourist-oriented enterprises. I hope that we are not going to see thousands of dollars or amounts as large as \$500,000 given to people who erect a fence around a hole in the ground. Who will make the decision on who gets the money? Will it be a parochial decision made on a political basis, because, if it is, I do not want a bar of this Bill. We see far too much of that in this State. Those who squawk the loudest and the longest—and one might say cynically those who pay the most—get the most. I think it is rather a tragic situation.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mrs. KYBURZ: Was that Mr. Queensland Cement & Lime interjecting?

Mr. Lee: No.

Mrs. KYBURZ: I hope not.

I would like to see this corporation assist in other than material ways. I believe that there are many things that can be done in the name of promotion and that are not just hand-outs. After all, we are seeing all sorts of hand-outs from the public purse that nobody likes to see. I believe that the people who benefit should pay.

The Minister also mentioned the forthcoming Commonwealth Games. Of course, one is not allowed to hesitate on the Games, or the money that will be spent on them. In fact, to even pause over the fact that there ought to be a Commonwealth Games brings down upon one's head the wrath of everybody except those who are disgruntled at the spending of \$30,000,000-plus for an event that I believe will be of nebulous benefit to anyone other than those directly involved. There is no doubt that the business houses and accommodation industry on the Gold Coast will benefit greatly from the Games. I notice that the Commonwealth Games committee has hired public relations men to try to talk us all into supporting the Games. I would like to know the wages paid to those men. If this corporation is going to take over the whole Games fiasco, I do not know what is likely to happen. If that is part of selling Queensland, we are leaving out nine-tenths of the State. If we sell only Brisbane, we are leaving out the beautiful North and the interesting West. If in fact we are going to be pushing the Games all over the world, then the people who benefit from them ought to be paying heavily towards the \$7,000,000 that has to be raised. I suggest that a levy of at least \$1,000 should be imposed on each accommodation owner on the Gold Coast.

I am concerned about another function of the board, which is to materially assist the development of new tourist enterprises. I have already asked how decisions will be made. I suppose the answer will be that it will depend on whether or not such an enterprise will pay. But whether or not it will pay is largely dependent on the type of facility provided and the desire of people to visit it. It is all very well to rant and rave about nobody coming to Queensland. People do come, but it is what they get when they come here that is important. There is no doubt that natural attractions are far more important than a man-made one that is roughshod or second-rate. We see seedy, disgustingly expensive accommodation all around us, and that is something I abhor. Of course, one finds that in all the major cities of the world such as Paris and Rome. In those cities more often than not the accommodation is seedy and it is exorbitantly and disgustingly expensive, but the local inhabitants do not think anyone from another country can speak French or Italian, so one is supposed to just pay up and shut up.

During the summer holidays our beautiful coast of the Far North has managed to hide its box jellyfish from everybody else. I believe there is a conspiracy of silence about it in the Far North. I can understand why. One cannot swim in the sea up there during traditional holiday periods, yet the island resorts off the North Queensland coast are still charging \$70 or \$85 a day. There is something rather funny about that. The fact that black marlin fishing is now *de rigueur* for the nouveau riche in North Queensland seems rather disgusting when one considers that those people are paying \$1,000 a day for a second-rate boat. Needless to say, I am referring to the "Melita".

I now turn to the new corporation's powers. I am concerned that we know who is on the board of the corporation and what their powers will be. I hope the Bill will spell this out very explicitly because I do not believe that it should be the function of any Government-created corporation to establish training facilities, provide scholarships or any other such thing in any shape or form. I do not believe that any corporation should become an employment agency, although I think this is probably what is intended by the setting up of this corporation.

If the corporation intends to encourage improvements in standards, it will not have far to look. It can begin quickly with little things such as encouraging better meals and discouraging small tourist enterprises from charging 60c for a cup of ghastly instant coffee and other expensive titbits which irks the travelling public.

I also think that the powers given to the corporation to acquire real estate should not be there. The corporation might wish to rent property in the major capital cities

of Australia, but I do not believe that it should have the ability or the power to purchase real estate. I cannot see the need for such a provision. I can see that there will be an opportunity for criticism if real estate is purchased at over-inflated prices from cronies of the people on the board of the corporation. I think that that is a matter of great concern when we are setting up a board. After all, it is just another board. No euphemistic terms are applied to it; it is just another board. I have no idea whether it will be better than any other board.

The Minister has had this advisory board for some time. Are we going to see the same people shifted across to the board of this corporation? Are they to be given a nice title? Are their office fronts to be titivated a little bit to make everybody think that their functions are far more important than they really are? Let us hope that we are not going to see these people overreach their capacity.

In his introductory speech, the Minister said that this corporation will be set up under Government control and under the control of this Parliament. I have yet to see that happen with any board set up in this State. However, one can only hope that in its annual report, which I presume it will make to Parliament, we will see not only a clear, concise, precise and total financial statement but also a list of the corporation's priorities and how it sees itself to be performing its primary function of development of tourism in the whole State and not just in the south-east corner of the State.

I am concerned about the fact that the corporation will be able to appoint consultants and legal advisers. Are these consultants going to be the nefarious, hula-waving people who fly in from Hawaii and tell us how to build huge villages, or are they going to be people who have an idea of what the down-to-the-bone structure of the tourist industry in Australia is? As the member for Townsville South pointed out, most of the people who travel are very ordinary people on their annual holidays. The fact that we are all workers here is quite conveniently overlooked, but I am sure that not many of us want to go away and spend \$200 a day on a very overrated island holiday.

In summing up, my support for this Bill is almost non-existent. In fact, having made my speech, I am beginning to wonder why I rose to speak—

An Honourable Member: So are we.

Mrs. KYBURZ: The honourable member has had his go. We listened to the boost that he gave to his little area. I believe that major safeguards will have to be written into this Bill. I will be very interested to see the Bill when it is presented to the Committee. If I believe the Bill is a whitewash, I reserve the right to move amendments to it.

Mr. WARBURTON (Sandgate) (8.34 p.m.): There is no doubt whatever that both the tourist industry in Queensland and the present employees of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau are cautious and somewhat concerned about the establishment of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in this State; in other words, the establishment of a further statutory body that some would tend to think is somewhat divorced from the people.

The Minister has given assurances regarding the future of public servants presently employed by the bureau. In the light of what has occurred, for example, with the statutory electricity authority, commonly referred to as the electricity take-over, how much do these assurances mean? Of course, since the take-over we have witnessed nothing but problems associated with wages and classifications. Although it is commendable for the Minister to indicate that public servants in the bureau have the protection of the Minister, what of the employees in other Government departments who will now be denied the opportunity of transferring to the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau? In other words, the Minister should be concerned not only about present employees but also about potential employees of the bureau and the department.

The Minister claims that the corporation will have a greater capacity to adjust to the times. Of course, that remains to be seen. The inference to be drawn from the Minister's statement is that the tourist industry is at fault, that it has failed to promote efficiently and effectively, and that it should be earning more than the \$200,000,000 to which the Minister referred in his introductory speech. But what of the Government's responsibility to an industry that many, particularly experts in tourism, regard as destined to become, with certain provisos, Queensland's biggest industry? What is wrong with the present organisation, which, incidentally, received the highest praise from the very Minister who now tries to convince honourable members that it should be discarded for what will, in my opinion, surely be a very expensive innovation and addition to the Government's long list of statutory authorities?

As an aside, I say that it is about time we, as members of Parliament, looked at the number of statutory authorities that have been set up by National-Liberal Governments, the way in which they operate, and certainly at how many reports come back to us that we can truly say are proper reports.

The truth is that the demise of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau can be likened to what has happened—we read about it in this evening's newspaper—to the Bellevue building. If the Government wishes to discredit something in the eyes of the public, it lets it run down and does not provide it with sufficient finance to allow it to operate efficiently and effectively. The

74754—135

Government has starved the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau of money, and the Minister freely admitted that in his address to the Eighth Queensland Tourist Industry Seminar held at Alexandra Headlands in November 1978, in which he said—

"We all know we are lacking funds—and I make no apologies here in condemning my own government for not recognising the tourist industry in the way that it should be giving it sufficient funds to do what should be done to assist you in your industry.

"This year we got a little more than last year by way of money, but the little money we did get is hardly enough to keep up with the inflationary spiral and therefore we cannot do as much as we want to do to promote tourism."

Those are the Minister's own words. I know that he said that with great honesty, and I commend him for that, because what he in fact was saying was that the Government did not give his department and the bureau sufficient money to enable them to operate effectively.

Incidentally, I am sorry to see the honourable member for Surfers Paradise leave the Chamber at this stage, because I was going to advise him that, if the Minister is correct, we cannot take much notice of what he said in this debate. If the Minister is correct, we can discard completely the comments of the honourable member for Surfers Paradise, because the Minister certainly paid out on him at that conference.

Only a few months ago the Minister recognised that the essential problem of his department was lack of funding—in other words, that the Government was starving the department and the bureau to the extent that they were unable to function as well as they were willing to function in the interests of the tourist industry in this State. The industry is well aware of the limitations that were placed upon the department. Is it any wonder, therefore, that people in the industry are suspicious about the changes that are now proposed?

The Minister's new-found hope in the form of a corporation is of more concern to me when we examine a further statement made by the very Minister who introduced the Bill when he addressed the seminar to which I referred previously. That was the eighth seminar of the tourist industry held at Alexandra Headlands not more than four or five months ago. This is what the Minister had to say about his own department—

"We have the expertise, we have the men with the knowledge within the tourist department in Queensland. They are highly skilled men—men like Joe Wilson who has spent nearly his entire working life in the industry, and the men under him, and I feel that if given the proper facilities they will be able to do an even better job for the government than they have achieved in the past because of the paucity of funds which they have received in the past."

There we have it. The Minister is not only admitting to a miserable allocation of funds, but is also praising the very department that he now seeks to disband.

Mr. Davis: To destroy.

Mr. WARBURTON: Yes, to destroy, as the honourable member for Brisbane Central says. The Minister praised the department, and he also praised the expertise that it had acquired over a period of many years.

It is a most peculiar circumstance that honourable members find themselves confronted with tonight. On the one hand, we have a Minister praising the new proposal of a corporation for what I suggest are rather dubious reasons. On the other hand, we have the same Minister praising the expertise of his own department and admitting quite freely that the only reason why that department has not functioned effectively and efficiently is that the Government has starved it of the necessary finance. It is not that it does not have the right people or the necessary expertise.

I gave the analogy before of the Bellevue building. If we let anything run down so that it attracts public scrutiny and public wrath, the public will then say, "Well, let us get rid of it." This is exactly what is happening with the bureau. The Government has let it run down until it has reached the stage where the public is saying, "Well, why aren't they doing this? Why aren't they doing that?" In a recent editorial in "The Courier-Mail" it was said that it is a disgraceful situation when the bureau cannot even get enough brochures to advertise our great tourist potential in the international field.

I think one can be excused for asking the Minister just what is really behind the move to form the corporation, and that is why the Opposition is highly suspicious of the Government's motives. Perhaps when we get down to the meat of the Bill at the second-reading stage we will be a little more knowledgeable about exactly what the Government hopes to do. I can assure the Government that at this stage we are concerned, and we are even more concerned when we realise what the Minister said only four or five months ago. He was then all praise for his department and he properly identified its problems. Now he is foremost in advocating the tossing out of the bureau on its proverbial ear and substituting for it something that must surely be regarded as an unknown quantity.

I noted in the 1978 annual report of the Director-General of the Department of Tourism that he is a member of the consultative committee of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. This brings me to a very recent tourist workshop that was conducted jointly by the marine park authority and the Department of Tourism. At this stage I might ask the Minister whether he will give when he is replying some indication of what is going to become of this representation and how the new corporation that he

talks about is going to be involved with the marine park authority. Is there to be any involvement at all?

The recent workshop was mentioned today when the honourable member for Sherwood directed some rather pertinent questions to the Minister concerning attendance at it. Topics such as "The Great Barrier Reef in the International Tourist Setting", "Selling of the Great Barrier Reef", "Reef Tourism and Development", "Preparing for the Eighties" and "The Future of Reef Tourism" were dealt with. The workshop on Great Barrier Reef tourism, brought together resort managers, entrepreneurs, travel agents, Government and teaching organisations, with the aim of presenting an overview of the present and potential tourism on the Great Barrier Reef and adjacent coastal areas. The importance of the workshop should not be overlooked. It is very relevant, I believe, that only two Government back-benchers attended. There were no Ministers and, from what I gather, no prospective members of the corporation in attendance.

I can understand the problems confronting the Minister. I do not suggest that he would not have attended if he had been able to. Probably the problems associated with the Brisbane Port Authority kept him away. He attended the workshop or seminar held at Alexandra Headland and played a very important part in it. It is relevant that no senior member of the Government attended the recent workshop, nor did any member of the proposed corporation, as became evident from the question asked by the honourable member for Sherwood. That is very relevant, because the Great Barrier Reef is Queensland's greatest draw-card for international tourists.

My worry is that whilst we have a marine park authority developing a closer interaction with the Queensland tourist industry, which will undoubtedly have a beneficial effect on tourist development on the Great Barrier Reef, we have also a clear indication that senior Ministers of the Government favour oil drilling in waters within the Great Barrier Reef region.

The Government of Queensland must accept its responsibility. It must realise that it has not provided the essentials for which it is responsible. It is all very well for us to talk tonight about the wonders of the corporation and what the Minister will do. It is reasonable for the Minister to talk about his bureau, his department, the lack of finance and what the department should be doing, but the Government has a responsibility to act in the areas administered by the Minister.

It has a responsibility to ensure, for example, that the roads used by tourists in Queensland are adequate. Anyone who saw a certain T.V. show last night could scarcely disagree with the comment that the Bruce Highway is one of the greatest shames of the State of Queensland. How can we

expect drivers and caravanners from within the State and interstate to visit Central and Northern Queensland resorts when the road is in such poor condition? That is where the Government's responsibility lies. No corporation will fix the Bruce Highway or build an international air terminal at Townsville, which was one of the resolutions that came from the tourist workshop held in the Mackay area recently.

Irrespective of the changes that are made, let us not pretend that there will be tremendous changes. The tourist bureau and the Minister's own department, given adequate finance, could do the job. That is the point I make. He said himself at Alexandra Headlands that they have the expertise and that, if they had the finance, they could do the job. So what is the real reason for the corporation? That is something that we hope the Minister will clearly outline.

I will reserve my comments till I have seen the Bill; but I regret to say that I see the formation of the corporation as simply an admission of this Government's failure to give its department and the bureau the support that those two areas needed and deserved.

I see that the honourable member for Surfers Paradise is back in the Chamber. My mentioning him earlier is probably the reason why he returned. I indicated that we would have to disregard his previous comments here tonight, particularly if the Minister's criticism of him is true. I will quote what the Minister said about the member for Surfers Paradise—I think it is very relevant to tonight's debate—at the Queensland tourist seminar. I will cut it down so we can get the meat of the sandwich. This is what he said—

"When I went through my records yesterday, I saw that one letter was a request for some pamphlets and some photographs to decorate his electoral office in Surfers Paradise. The second letter was a condemnation again of some wording in the Government printed Executive diary. The third letter was not even directed to me but was directed to the Treasury and it was sent from the Treasury to me. So there you have a man who suggests that he has such heartfelt sympathy for the promotion of tourism yet he carries out such condemnation of the inactivity of the government and the Parliamentary Tourist Committee of which he is a member himself."

Mr. Bishop: Where does your sudden interest in the tourist industry come from?

Mr. Warburton: Here is the crunch for the member for Surfers Paradise—and I would have to agree with it—

"You would think he would spend more time, more energy and more initiative trying to promote tourism, but no, not him. All he seems intent upon is agitating. It

is no wonder that the Gold Coast City Council was sacked when they had as their head a man like that."

So much for the Minister's consideration of the honourable member for Surfers Paradise.

I finish on the note that we in the Opposition have quite a deal of misgiving about what this Government means to do with the corporation. At this stage we would have preferred the Government to give a clear indication that it was providing more finance for the Department of Tourism and the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau.

Mr. I. J. Gibbs (Albert) (8.54 p.m.): I support the Minister's introduction of this Bill. However, I preface my remarks by correcting a few incorrect statements that have been made by the Opposition.

Much criticism has been levelled tonight at members of the advisory committee for not attending the seminar in the Mackay district. Their job was to help set up the basis for the Bill now being introduced, which is in itself the foundation of the new corporation. That is where their job so far has stopped. They have no authority to go to seminars, except perhaps on their own say-so. However, they certainly do not have any authority from this Government to go.

The Minister has been criticised for not going. It was a day on which Cabinet met. I think that this was the day that this Bill was being put through Cabinet, when a lot of work was proceeding on it. The member for Townsville West attended. I believe that the honourable member for Sherwood also attended on his own behalf. I should like to make the point that, to my knowledge, no invitation was received by any back-bench member of this Assembly. I should like to put that matter straight. Had somebody made arrangements for members to attend, even though it was a sitting day there might have been more people there.

The honourable member for Port Curtis offered some criticism of Sea World. My colleague the honourable member for Southport commented on this matter. I do not carry any flag for Mr. Williams but, as the honourable member for Southport said, some defence must be offered on behalf of a person who cannot defend himself in this Chamber.

It has been said that there is a rip-off and that it costs \$8 to enter Sea World. It so happens that I have the correct figures. The admission prices are \$5 for an adult, \$2 for a child, with one free ride thrown in, and \$3.50 for a pensioner. That price entitles the visitor to see all static shows, such as the ski show, the dolphins, diving, and sea lions. In fact, a person could enter at 9 a.m., spend the whole day there and depart at 5 p.m. It is possibly one of the best family shows, for value, anywhere in Queensland.

Regardless of what a person thinks of Mr. Williams, he must admit that he has done

a professional job in producing Sea World and has played a great part in the tourist industry in Queensland. Some criticism was made of his staff facilities. Those who watched the Telethon on Channel 7 in aid of the Children's Hospital will know that the Gold Coast section was televised from the staff section at Sea World. On behalf of people who cannot be here to defend themselves, I should like to clear those two matters up and refute some of the accusations that have been made.

It is very good that the Minister is introducing this "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." To use the Minister's words, under this proposal the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau and the Department of Tourism in their present form will cease to exist and be replaced by a statutory authority known as the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, and this corporation will be responsible to the Minister and to the Parliament.

I had the pleasure of going to Melbourne with the chairman of the advisory committee, Mr. Frank Moore, and Mr. McKechnie, the Minister's Press secretary. We visited Victoria to speak to the people responsible for setting up Victoria's tourist authority which is charged with the responsibility of marketing in that State. We were very grateful to Mr. John Macfarlane, the chairman of the committee, and Mr. Peter Brown, the deputy chairman of that authority.

We received tremendous help from those people who have already instituted this type of authority. We were able to learn quite a deal from them, both the good and the bad parts. They had had many successes in the initial setting up, but they were having certain problems and were very free with their information. They have been of great help to us in establishing the basis and framework of this legislation. It was obvious that one of the major problems was the transfer from the Public Service to the corporation of the people already working within the framework of the tourist bureau and in other sections.

The Tourist Bureau has, with its limited budget, done an excellent job for Queensland for a long time. History shows that it was an extension of the ticket-selling section of the Railway Department. It developed into the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau, and it has done a tremendous job. I know that there are a lot of dedicated men with a great deal of expertise in the department who will play a tremendous part in the establishment of this corporation. They will be picked not only on seniority but also on ability. I know that there are a lot of people with ability who have not been able to do the job they would like to do in the present organisation.

I believe that the Minister has done a good job in allowing for a two-year secondment period. Employees will then have

the opportunity during that period, if they so desire, to rejoin the Public Service without the loss of any of their privileges. I believe this will be satisfactory to those employees and will give them the security that they must have during the setting up of an organisation of this type.

I believe the corporation will be run along the lines of a public company. It will have to rub shoulders, and in fact compete, with private enterprise to promote Queensland. I do not believe that the corporation should prop up the tourist industry. The industry should be able to stand on its own feet on a State-wide non-parochial basis. We should support the promotion of the tourist industry in order to gain a greater slice of both the local and the very large overseas tourist markets that will emerge with the introduction of cheap air fares. The corporation will have to promote Queensland vigorously on a non-parochial basis. This should be done on a world-wide basis. Corporation members should be able to go anywhere in the world where there is a market to be tapped in order to gain for Queensland the large number of tourists we want to come here. This is very important not only to the State but to the nation. We need foreign currency to help us in our world trading.

The corporation must work in conjunction with existing organisations in this State such as the Gold Coast Visitors' Bureau, which is a long-established organisation. I believe it has done a tremendous job in the promotion of tourism. It has raised almost all of its funds with just a little help from the Government, as have many other similar organisations throughout Queensland. I know that most local authority areas in Queensland have a development board or a tourist board. I believe there is a ready-made army of people with local expertise who will be able to make a tremendous input to the corporation.

We have recently seen the setting up in Brisbane of a visitors' bureau which will co-ordinate the activities associated with the Commonwealth Games, which will be important not only to Brisbane but to the whole of Queensland. I believe the hosting of the games is a tremendous step forward, and, with the continuing development of the Queensland Cultural Centre, Brisbane will have a lot more to offer tourists in the future, whether they be travelling through Brisbane on their way north or south. We also have the Iwasaki project, which will be one of the biggest things that has ever happened in the tourist industry in Australia.

Many comments have been made from both sides of the Chamber about Queensland's airports. They are nothing to be proud of at this stage, although we hope there will be improvements in the near future. We hope that Townsville airport will gain full international status so that overseas aircraft will be able to fly directly to Townsville as well as to Brisbane. We also have to look to retired people as a potential market to

be tapped. People are retiring on much higher superannuation payments than was the case in the past, and thus have the ability to travel more.

On the subject of airports, the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, has come in for a lot of criticism recently. But I believe that he has done a tremendous job on a world-wide basis in getting cheaper air fares for Australia. He has started now on domestic air fares, and certain commitments have been given regarding cheaper travel within Australia. I believe that this will continue, and that eventually we will see introduced a package deal similar to that offered in many of the top tourist areas overseas, which will include all travel within Australia, including car travel. This has to be a two-way deal. If Australians are to leave Australia and travel overseas, we have to get a similar number of overseas tourists to come to Australia. I believe that the corporation has the best chance of doing this on a world-wide basis.

We have to look at something that will happen at Montreal a little later this year. The Lions International Convention is to be held there from 14 to 23 June. The Australian headquarters will be set up in the Montreal Aeroport Hilton Hotel. I believe that this will provide a tremendous opportunity to promote the Australian tourist industry. Assembled in one area will be 60,000 Lions from all over the world. I understand that 400 Australians will attend the convention. What an opportunity! Someone could be sent there to set up an Australian tourist headquarters to try to tap the large tourist market presented by 60,000 people from 151 countries throughout the world. Such a tourist headquarters would be able to give those people brochures on Queensland. I suggest that the Minister should consider sending an officer of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau over there with a large amount of project material on Queensland in order to try to promote Queensland at that level. Where else could we find 60,000 people from 151 countries assembled in one convention centre? Where else could we reach people in such numbers?

I believe that we will have to consider things of that sort. We will have to make an effort to promote ourselves at such gatherings. If we cannot send someone there, we should ask the Australian Lions attending that convention to take brochures promoting Queensland as a great place to visit. I know that they are willing to do so. We could promote the Great Barrier Reef, Mt. Isa, Cairns, the Gold Coast and the western country. I believe that we have some of the best tourist areas in the world to offer to people. It is interesting and still perhaps untouched by world standards.

It is very important that airports be allowed to operate on a 24-hour basis. I believe that buffer areas of sufficient size should be established around airports to

enable them to operate on a 24-hour basis. Landing times should not be restricted; operators should be allowed to land planes at any time. The people living near the airport should not be affected. If necessary, the airports should be built with the runway projecting towards the sea so that the planes can approach from over the sea and not be a noise nuisance to residents living in areas near the airport. This is something that I believe we should all push. The Opposition, too, has also mentioned it. I believe that it should be brought about. I believe that the present Brisbane airport could serve very well for years to come if the runway projected into the sea, as the Sydney airport runway does. The planes land and take off over the sea and no-one is affected. That is what happens in many overseas countries, and I believe that we have an opportunity to do it here.

Mr. Davis: At Coolangatta.

Mr. I. J. GIBBS: The Coolangatta Airport is not large enough. The hills are too close to enable any large aircraft to land there. But that is another story.

We are looking at the make-up of this new board. It should be made up of experts in the field, who have been successful and who will have to put their time into the board for little or no reward. This board should be set up and it should operate on a world-wide basis with the sole purpose of selling Queensland. No-one is doing that in a proper way now. Everyone is having a go at this and that, but we must have one body that works with private enterprise to sell Queensland and to get other people to sell Queensland.

Penalty rates must also be looked at. They must be considered sensibly from the point of view of the workers in the industry. I know that penalty rates do not suit many people who are happy about part-time work and broken shifts. The tourist industry cannot be run like a boiler shop, and we must get down to the basics and allow people to work, as is done in America, whatever shifts they wish at an hourly rate as long as they work 40 hours in seven days. I do not wish to see anyone working seven days, but they should be able to work 40 hours over five days at times to suit themselves. I believe that a tremendous injustice is done to people working in the tourist industry by demanding that they work to union rules. For example, it suits people with a family to work broken shifts so that they can earn additional money and enable the family to do the things that it wants to do.

The corporation has a tremendous opportunity to promote tourism from the north. New Guinea and other countries to the north have great tourist potential, if we can get the co-operation of many of the airlines that are now operating. Although they may not be operating in such a big way as Qantas, the opportunity is there to promote more tourism from that area.

Much has been said about roads during this debate. Some criticism of roads may be justified, and more money must come from the Commonwealth for the construction and maintenance of roads. But it should be remembered that in travelling from Brisbane to Cairns, one covers a distance equal to that from Brisbane to Melbourne, or possibly to Hobart, and back again. Bearing in mind relative distances in Victoria, which is the size of a pocket handkerchief, and New South Wales, which is a little bigger, I believe that Ministers and officers of the Main Roads Department have done a wonderful job over the years in constructing roads in this State. As I said earlier, Queensland must get more money from the Commonwealth—"a massive injection of funds" was one of the phrases used earlier—to enable major works to be undertaken, and they must be undertaken quickly even if they have to be paid for later. The Government has a responsibility to do that.

I conclude by congratulating the Minister for the basic principles of the proposed Bill that he spelt out in his introductory speech. I know that the corporation will do the job that it sets out to do. I hope that those who transfer from the Public Service to the corporation will find rewards in this new venture, and I am sure that those who stay on after the two-year period and make it their career will get a tremendous amount of self-satisfaction from promoting the tourist industry in Queensland and doing a job that has perhaps been necessary for a long time. The Government must accept greater responsibility for funding the activities of the corporation to ensure that it does its job in the best possible way.

(Time expired.)

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (9.14 p.m.): The debate to date has been one of wide canvassing, and it is interesting to see as many members as possible entering it. It is quite obvious that this is an issue that affects every member's electorate. Too often we have legislation here that is very specific and narrow, and to some extent this prevents members from participating in comment. But tourism affects every electorate, so it is understandable that there is so much interest.

I am interested in the proposals that the Minister is putting forward in proposing a Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. It is a very interesting concept, and it is indicative that the Minister realises, as does the Government, that it is time to re-think the very basis of tourist promotion in this State and to re-think the structure of the instrument that is used, at least on behalf of the Government, to promote tourism. The legislation before us is a realisation that there have been major problems. In fact, it is an admission that whilst the bureau has done a tremendous job—and we would all agree that it has done a tremendous job within its terms of reference—there is a need for a different structure and a different approach to upgrade and streamline the Government's role.

It is important that the Government have a share in this lucrative business that is now the fourth industry of the State, one that employs so many people and earns so much money. It is also important that the State play its part in selling Queensland. We always have to be sure that we do not sell out Queensland. This is always a danger when this Government brings forward legislation. It is no wonder that the Opposition spokesman has voiced some concern. He has some reservations and his main interest in the debate has been concern for those persons who have been involved in the bureau and the way in which the legislation will affect the individual member. This will have to be answered at a later date and no doubt the Minister, who has shown an interest in tourism over a long period of time, will come up with some of the answers.

I took note of the remarks of the previous speaker, the honourable member for Albert, when he started talking about wages. One might start to say, "Yes, there are problems in the tourist industry because of wages. There is a huge cost factor here." I think there would be many people who would say, "Yes, let us look at this question if there is some guarantee that any benefit will be passed to the consumer in the tourist industry and that lower costs to the entrepreneur will not simply mean increased profitability." However, there is never any guarantee. When Governments do move in and cut costs and taxes, we find that profitability increases because that benefit is not passed on. I cannot go along with the argument of the honourable member for Albert. It has to be realised that in today's industrial environment we all have to pay our way, and this means that we have to pay our men and women, those who work in the semi-skilled and skilled areas in industry, reasonable remuneration for their contribution to industry.

Mr. I. J. Gibbs: What? \$60 for three hours' work?

Mr. WRIGHT: I know of some second-hand car dealers who will charge \$400 or \$500 for second-hand cars that they themselves probably bought for \$40.

Mr. Prest: They're rubbish.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is true, and maybe the honourable member for Albert can comment on this as he has an interest in the car industry.

Mr. I. J. Gibbs: I rise to a point of order. I find those words offensive. I do not think the honourable member really meant them, but the inference is there and I would like him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not prepared to, Mr. Miller; they are not offensive and I think your wise ruling would be that I did not even refer to the honourable member for Albert.

Mr. I. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member was referring to me by implication and I ask that the words be withdrawn. They are offensive.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton did not refer to the honourable member for Albert personally so he cannot be asked to withdraw the remark.

Mr. I. J. Gibbs: I have wasted a minute, anyway.

Mr. WRIGHT: That shows that the honourable member is out to destroy the contribution made by Opposition members, no doubt for good reason, because the Opposition continually puts the Government on the mat.

Mr. I. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I am not out to do anything to the Opposition. I find that remark offensive.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think that the honourable member for Albert would find anything offensive, but let me just say, "If the cap fits let him wear it."

Mr. I. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I find that remark offensive also and would like it withdrawn. As Mr. Speaker said today, debate is falling to a very low level.

Mr. WRIGHT: I humbly apologise to you, Mr. Miller, to the Committee and to the honourable member. We certainly have some thinskinners in this Chamber. That is a great pity, because we are supposed to be able to give and take in this Assembly.

The point I was making is that the tourist industry is an important one. It employs many people. In fact, the Minister made the point that it employs 10 per cent of the work-force, that it is the fourth largest industry and that it is very labour-intensive. Therefore, it is important that we do sell it and that we expand it in order to maximise its potential. It is also the greatest earner of foreign money, whether we define it as money from overseas or from other States. It is an important industry to Queensland.

The proposal we have before us at this moment is an admission that this industry has been somewhat neglected and that there is need for a change. It is a pity that whenever we start talking about change, Government members always raise the socialist bogey. They want Government involvement, they want Government assistance and help, but let not the Government participate in any way so that it becomes a major shareholder in the industry. I think it is a great pity that this attitude is adopted because we cannot expect the people to pay for all these advantages without some return. We have to pay our way, too.

I hope that this corporation, which has a socialist theme or colour to it, may look very carefully not only at the avenues discussed by the Minister in his introductory

speech but also at ways and means by which the Government can participate directly. Regardless of how far the Government goes, the important thing is that the industry be given incentives, and here lies the greatest lack. It is a real risk-investment industry, one in which hundreds of thousands of dollars can be lost overnight.

Unfortunately, losses do not relate only to wrong commercial judgments. The industry is at the mercy of dozens of factors. Means of communication come readily to mind. Irrespective of how good an enterprise may be, or how careful a person may have been in selecting the site for an enterprise, the means of communication can determine whether or not it is profitable. The roads, the airways, available transport facilities, overseas exchange rates, the advertising or lack thereof, climatic conditions, environmental circumstances, economic circumstances from both the public and Government point of view, all have a major bearing.

Parochial matters then come into consideration. Region fights region. Little towns compete with one another, often to their detriment, and State rivals State. That is evident in the Tweed Heads and Gold Coast areas. Whilst such rivalry creates competition, it can be detrimental to tourism. Government apathy is also a problem.

Recently I sighted a paper titled, "The Blueprint for Australia's Tourist Industry; Tourism the Economic Way out." It is subheaded, "Action necessary for improving Australia's balance of payment through tourism", by Norman Elson, the travel broker. Honourable members could well read this interesting document. Its main point concerns Government apathy.

Of importance is Government selectiveness. I am sure that members representing areas of Central Queensland will listen carefully when I say that the Government has been very selective in its promotion of tourist facilities and enterprises throughout the State. For some reason, Central Queensland seems to miss out. I do not want to start beating the parochial drum.

Mr. Elliott: It is a bit that way.

Mr. WRIGHT: It may be that way, but I have a right to do it. If I did not do it, I am sure that very few members other than the honourable members for Rockhampton North and Port Curtis would do it.

The Government must realise that it has a responsibility to the whole State, not just some small portion of it. The industry deserves special consideration because of all the problems and influences affecting it. It has a clear case for special direct financial assistance. That could be provided by way of loan arrangements, guaranteed loans, the provision of property, as is done under the industrial development policies and by allowing tax deductions. The last method is surely most important, and it was referred to by the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

Indirect assistance is needed. That can be provided by State Government advertising and promotional programmes, and also by national coverage through the general and private media. All local facilities should be promoted. However, assistance is not always forthcoming.

I sometimes think that the only place worth visiting in Queensland must be the Gold Coast. That is certainly not true. When I look around the State, I find many places that leave the Gold Coast for dead. It seems that a closed-eye attitude is adopted in relation to the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast has received so much publicity, thanks not to the Government but to one person. Whilst I dislike his politics, I must give credit to Sir Bruce Small for all the tactics and tricks that he used to attract attention to his area. He did it through the use of meter maids and so on. Whilst he may have used the female body in his promotions in a way that some of us may not have approved of, he still attracted attention to the Gold Coast.

When talking about direct and indirect assistance, the most important theme is hard-cash incentives. They must come in the tax sphere. If primary-industry areas can benefit through Government policies and assistance, why not tourist areas? When I visited other countries—I appreciated going overseas with the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads and other Government members; unfortunately the rules did not provide for more Opposition members to go—I learnt a fair amount about the tourist industry and the incentive and assistance given to it. In Queensland, the private entrepreneur has to take the risks. He has to find the total capital investment. Some type of benefit or assistance should be available to him so that he can wipe out those costs over three to five years. I am told that in Singapore this type of assistance is given. It is a role for the Commonwealth, and I accept that; but the Commonwealth Government will not act unless this and other State Governments start putting pressure on it.

The other aspect is that of a promotional campaign. With all the media coverage that this Government and its departments get, it sometimes amazes me that the tourist industry is forgotten. There are so many departments that somehow have a link with tourism, be it through national fitness or industrial development. There are so many areas that could be promoted indirectly, yet the Government does not bother to think about these things. When it comes to Government funding—when the public purse is involved—the advantages and opportunities should be maximised. Every section of the media should be used, not merely a film that might be made through the Public Relations Bureau.

Magazines, radio, newspapers and also picture theatres should be used to make sure that people realise what our State is all

about. Nowadays anybody wanting to see a good tourist film goes to a drive-in theatre and sees a film produced by Benson and Hedges, not by the Government. Yet that in one way is promoting tourism, because such advertising films show the wonderful country we have here.

There is a need also for the Government to promote overseas visits, especially on tourism. The Government ought to have a good look at New Zealand and the schemes that have been used there. The member for Brisbane Central raised this matter, too. When delegations from overseas are received, let us make sure that they realise what we have here so that when they return to their own countries they will promote this State of ours.

For all these things—and some steps forward have been made—the difficulties will not be overcome without getting back to the first matter I raised, which is communications. While we have airlines that duplicate services, and roads that are not fit to be goat tracks, and while there is a lack of co-ordination between buses, trains and other means of transportation, it is no wonder that the tourist entrepreneur faces the industry with some despair. There is a role here for Government, surely, whether it be local, State or Federal. It is a role not just in funding these things, but in direct and actual involvement.

If this Government really got involved in the tourist industry in a direct and physical way, no-one would mind the money being spent, be it on a road from Rockhampton to Yeppoon as a tourist highway, because money would be earned by it. I counsel the Government to realise that tourism is an important revenue-earner, and not just for the whole community and not just from the point of view of a multiplying factor on the tourist dollar. In actual hard cash terms, this Government could make a lot of money if it really wanted to get involved in actually earning that money.

The financial problems of local authorities are many, yet these could be overcome if the Government gave subsidies and financial guarantees to local authorities so that they could involve themselves in the tourist industry by setting up their own caravan parks, by promoting environment reserves in their shires, by owning, purchasing or building their own hotels and motel complexes, and also running or operating their own tourist agencies. Why not? This would certainly help the finances of local authorities. It could also be done by the State itself. It could be described as participatory socialism—but what is wrong with that? I believe that it would be in the interests of the total community to do that.

If the Government really wants to come to grips with the problem of the tourist industry in this State, it has to get away from centralism and start to decentralise. There is no better way to do this than to use the local authorities organisations that

exist today. Let us have a dual concept—a system of co-operation between private enterprise and State enterprise. Let the local authorities develop these facilities with the private entrepreneurs. After all, the facilities that are usually developed are resources owned by all people. They are community resources. The environmental reserves and the tourist attractions, whether they be mountains, reefs or whatever, are not owned by one individual. They are not man made; they are nature made. They ought to stay the property of the State, and they ought to be promoted by the State.

I make one final comment, and it is one of criticism. If it is not careful, the tourist industry will price itself out of existence—not because of wages and overhead costs but because of the way in which it operates. In Queensland, we have to have a long, hard look at ourselves and at the service that is rendered to the tourist. In some of the places I have been to, I have been treated like a second-class citizen. Some of the places are absolutely filthy. In some of the cabaret and eating areas the tables are rarely cleaned down. Yet some of these places are passed off here as international hotels.

Another aspect is pricing, which is unnecessarily high. This comes back to liquor, soft drinks and food commodities. The tourist entrepreneur or promoter must make a profit or he cannot expand and cannot employ. I suggest that profiteering is going on in certain parts of the tourist industry and that the Government ought to have a good look at it.

I hope that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will not only put forward suggestions using these part-time directors or experts, as the Minister calls them, but also will keep the tourist industry in the spotlight and will be rather critical, introspective in itself, and will determine what is best for Queensland.

Tourism is an important industry worth a good deal of money to us. I am afraid that at the moment that money is being lost. This situation could change if the proposals put forward by the Minister are implemented, but it will change only if a different attitude is adopted by both the private entrepreneur and the State. The State has a right to play a role and to benefit from the tourist industry of Queensland.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (9.31 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill providing for the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. A good deal of ground has been covered tonight and I certainly do not wish to traverse it again. However, I would like to make a few comments.

The tourist industry is the fastest-growing industry in the world. This is due to the higher living standards enjoyed throughout the world, particularly in many South East Asian countries close to us. We must take positive steps to tap the potential in those countries. In addition to enjoying an

improved standard of living, the people there have more leisure time, which they can use to visit places such as Australia and particularly Queensland.

The tourist industry is a labour-intensive one. The Minister indicated that 10 per cent of the Queensland work-force is employed by the tourist industry. It has the potential to far exceed that figure, considering the potential of some areas for tourism. I refer not only to the areas along the coast, such as the Gold Coast, which are very important, but also to some inland areas where the potential is staring us in the face. The Minister has visited my area and has seen some of the fairly important tourist attractions. We have a composite attraction called the Heritage Trail. It takes in Old Gowrie and the Bernborough Statue and Bernborough Tourist Centre at Oakey, which the Minister was kind enough to open. It includes Brookvale Park, which is in the centre of my electorate. It is probably one of the most unusual tourist attractions in the world and is one of the few attractions of its kind in Australia. It is contributing a tremendous amount to tourism in this area. There is also the Jondaryan Woolshed project.

Only a small number of people are employed at each of those attractions. By forward projection, however, we realise how many people we have the potential to employ with such facilities. If we get out and help to establish projects, such as the Stockman's Hall of Fame at Longreach, we will have real potential to foster the tourist industry and so earn revenue for Australia and Queensland and provide employment for many young people in that area. We do not need to be very clever to realise that an unemployment problem exists in most rural areas. So that is potentially one way of getting rid of the problem. I was a director of the Jondaryan Woolshed project and there is no doubt that it has the potential to employ 20 or more people. I feel certain that there are many other projects around Queensland of a like nature.

I also suggest that we will run into increasingly intense competition because these days more and more people are travelling and other States and other countries will begin to utilise their resources to try to encourage tourism.

Mr. Davis: What are you doing about the On Our Selection project?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The On Our Selection project on the other side of Greenmount is also quite a tourist attraction. I thank the honourable member for Brisbane Central very much for the interjection. As I said, we have to compete with attractions in other States and in other countries.

I believe that the cheaper air fare structure will be of tremendous benefit to our tourist trade. I would like to make a few comments about air fares because I am

becoming sick and tired of the criticism levelled by people of all political persuasions at the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon. He may be known as "Peter the Terrible" to some of the people on my right. I believe this criticism has been unfounded and unfair, particularly when it is realised that it is impossible to negotiate all these different air fare structures simultaneously. It is an ongoing process.

Unfortunately, as is often the case, a lot of blame can be laid on the Press. I remember the comment by a gentleman at the Agricultural Outlook conference in Canberra that one of the most difficult things with which he had to contend when making a wheat deal with China was the Press. I believe they have been responsible for many of the problems we have experienced with regard to air fares. Members of the Press are too ready to go off half-cocked and make comments and criticisms without first having the good manners to talk to the Minister and seek his comments on certain aspects of the problem.

I believe that in the long run we will come up with a fare structure, both internal and overseas, that will be realistic and will help the tourist industry. Obviously, it will also help people who wish to travel outside Australia. That is their democratic right, and I do not think anyone would deny it to them. I know there are plenty of people on my right here who have travelled overseas at different times, and good luck to them. Everyone should have the right to travel overseas, but we must also ensure that we get Australians to have a look at Australia. This has always been my approach to the problem. I have always felt that it is important, if possible, to see one's own country first. There is nothing more embarrassing to a person than to be overseas and have someone ask what such-and-such a place is like and not be able to answer the question simply because he has not been there. I think this is something we should drum into our young people.

I also believe there is merit in Peter Nixon's attempt to rationalise the airline industry. There have been suggestions that we should use Qantas as a carrier on some of our longer internal routes such as that from Perth to the east coast. If this was done, Qantas 747s could cross the continent with a full load. This would obviously make it possible to slash the present fare and would be a step in the right direction. Conversely, I think the Government should ensure that both T.A.A. and Ansett utilise some of their aircraft on some of the shorter overseas flights that Qantas is not presently servicing with its bigger aircraft.

When one looks at all the changes that are taking place, and which will take place during the next decade, one fully realises that there is a need for flexibility to cope with the changing face of the industry.

I believe that in any sort of private enterprise or business system—and basically this is not going to be any different; the concept will be the same—there is a need to make snap decisions on the spot. It is no good saying, "We have in the executive of the outfit people with the ability to make these decisions." I am sure that that is true. But it is vital that the people at the front counter should be trained. They should know what they are talking about. They should be personable. They should be interested in what they are doing. They should be able to tell the public what they want to know. There is nothing more frustrating than to walk into a place and be told by a person that he has not a clue about what one is inquiring about. I believe that standards must be maintained right throughout the structure that we create. I hope that the Minister recognises this point, as I am sure he does.

I also suggest that these people should be provided with some sort of a distinctive dress marking so that the public can recognise them. I am not suggesting that they should necessarily wear a full uniform, but I think that they should have some distinctive marking on their apparel so that the public can recognise them immediately. We are setting up a body that can make such a decision. I think that my suggestion is worth noting and should be considered.

Once again, in considering this proposal, I think that we must look at the people who will become members of the board of the corporation. Opposition members have engaged in much discussion and slandering of the people who will possibly become members of the board. As far as we are concerned, these people will not have anything to gain from this area of activity. If one thinks about some of the people whom Opposition members have tried to slander here tonight, one realises that all that they will get from being members of the board will be fees for meetings. Are Opposition members telling me that some chap, who is a multimillionaire, will go on the board of this corporation and spend his precious business time on it in order to get some miserable amount of money in meeting fees? That is a laughable suggestion. I think that these people are genuinely interested in the industry.

I do not often disagree with what the honourable member for Salisbury says, but I do disagree with a couple of the points that she made tonight about the board of this corporation. I do not believe that we should pick people for this board on some sort of parochial basis. I think that the only acid test to be applied to people before they are appointed to the board is ability. I do not believe that parochial attitudes should be allowed to impair our judgment in selecting people for this board.

As far as I am concerned, we are not talking about a board; we are talking about a business enterprise. It is necessary that

we have on the board people of wide experience and the highest ability, people who have proved themselves in their own industry. If they have not done that, what chance have they of imparting their knowledge through the system and assisting the executive staff to run the corporation? That is what they are being asked to do. We already have in the bureau people with a tremendous amount of ability. I am not implying that we have not. But it is most important, as I said earlier, that people should be chosen on their ability. If we are fortunate enough to have available from different geographic areas people of ability, obviously they should be considered; but the fact that they come from different areas should not be the first criterion used.

I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the establishment of the proposed corporation. It is an excellent proposal and will assist in encouraging people to visit Queensland. This State is now only the third tourist State in the Commonwealth, and I hope that a year or two after the establishment of the corporation it will again be No. 1.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (9.47 p.m.): I have listened with interest to the many comments of honourable members on both sides of the Chamber, and I should like to begin by reminding the Committee that the Minister said in his introductory remarks that the legislation is designed to upgrade and streamline the Government's interest in tourism and to competitively promote Queensland throughout Australia and overseas. In my opinion, the tourist industry is one of the most underrated industries in this nation, and I believe that both the Government of this State and the Federal Government have treated it with disdain and contempt.

In New Zealand, the Government has negotiated with Japan Air Lines to fly Japanese to New Zealand at cheaper air fares—in other words, it is chasing the tourist dollar. Look at what is happening in Tasmania. Tasmania, with 403,000 people, has an annual return of \$100,000,000 from tourism. Queensland, with 2,100,000 people, has an annual return of only \$200,000,000. The tourist industry's contribution to total employment amounts to 2.5 per cent of the work-force, or about 125,900 people. Another important aspect of these figures is that the net tax earned by the Commonwealth Government from tourism in 1973-74 amounted to almost \$200,000,000.

What is wrong in a private-enterprise Government's wanting to delegate its powers to a statutory organisation? If need be, what is wrong with this Government's setting up a Ministry for Tourism so that we will have government of the people by the people? I am against statutory organisations—and I do not care who knows—because I believe that in establishing a statutory organisation a Government is delegating powers to a

group of people appointed not by the Parliament but by the Governor in Council. In this case, power will be delegated to six people. I want to know what part Central Queensland will play in this corporation before I support it any further.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: I take the honourable member's point. I believe that many tourist resorts throughout the State are very worried indeed about the Iwasaki complex. They are very worried indeed because at Yeppoon on the Capricorn coast he is going to build something that will be bigger than Disneyland. Somebody has said, "Let us have a corporation and let it do something." It must be remembered that when one starts competition in an industry one creates enemies within that industry.

What I would like to know is whether organisations like the Capricorn Tourist Organisation, which has done so much to promote tourism in Central Queensland, will be represented on this particular corporation and what representation it will get on this corporation. I want to know what representation the Capricorn coast is going to get.

If we look at Queensland as a whole, which is the way we are supposed to look at it, we find that from Tweed Heads to Cairns there are at least 12 places that have their own tourist organisation. There are also inland areas of this State—for instance, the Carnarvons and Mt. Isa. There are many beautiful hinterland areas in the State. If only six people are appointed to this corporation, irrespective of who appoints them and where they come from, we will immediately alienate certain sections of this State that will not have representation. I might suggest to the Minister, that, if he is going to appoint six people on that corporation, he should also consider setting up an advisory committee from other parts of the State, which can liaise with the corporation. They would then have some representation even though they were not directly represented. I appeal to the Minister to consider that suggestion.

When we look at tourism, we find that it is an ingredient of every department that constitutes this Cabinet, and in that regard I defy anyone to leave one department out. What can this corporation do that this Parliament cannot do? What authority will it have to go to Canberra to seek more money? What authority will it have to go to the airline companies and ask for international airports? This Government should be doing these things. This Government is responsible to the people, who have given it the mandate to govern them. On many occasions I have stood up for statutory organisations only to see them shot down because the elected members of this Assembly have set up a monstrosity. Let us not forget that this corporation is supposedly answerable to the Minister. If we have to set up an authority

that is answerable to the Minister, what is wrong with the Queensland Cabinet providing a ministry of tourism?

We should not forget that young people make up the greatest percentage of tourists today. I have been a constant advocate for the setting up of a ministry of youth. To our youth of today tourism has become an exciting exercise. Such activities as skin-diving, hang-gliding, safaris in the desert and horse-riding are exciting things that attract young people. In my opinion the Government has failed to recognise the responsibility that it owes in providing tourist attractions for these young people.

This corporation will be run by a part-time board of directors drawn largely from private enterprise, who will set guide-lines and benchmarks for a full-time executive staff. In my opinion every business house and every resident should play a part in attracting tourists to an area. It is not a matter of paying so many people so many thousands of dollars a year. What will that cost the taxpayers and the tourist industry?

I do not know who will be on the corporation, but I am very concerned about its membership. The Capricorn Tourist Organisation is very concerned about this legislation and has asked me to speak on it.

Road transport, railway transport, airlines and other means of communication affect tourism. The electrification of our railway system should be looked into. A good international airport is essential. The media seems to harp constantly on the fact that a cyclone is threatening Yeppoon. In fact, on one occasion, the finest day in a fortnight was the day when a cyclone was supposed to hit Yeppoon.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: They are entitled to tell the truth.

Mr. HARTWIG: They should tell the public a lot of what the honourable member said, which is just as reliable as their information about cyclones.

The tourist industry should not be kicked around. It is a very important industry controlled by a chow mein—a combination—of ministries or portfolios.

The Chairman of the Australian Tourist Commission, Captain R. Ritchie, told a Queensland seminar that Queensland tourists would not spend large sums of money to fly long distances for a holiday when they could have one closer to home for less money. Because of our geographical situation, people living in Melbourne are closer to Brisbane than are the people in Cairns. The cost of some accommodation is pricing us off the tourist map. A single bed, without breakfast, at the Wentworth Hotel costs \$56 a night. A good flat on the Gold Coast costs \$300 to \$400 a week.

Mr. Tenni: What do you charge at Yeppoon?

Mr. HARTWIG: \$20 a night.

Much is made about tourist promotion. I fly with Ansett and T.A.A., and I once picked up a brochure which said, "Rockhampton: Situated on the Tropic of Capricorn; known for its brignalow belt." A Federal member who came to the area thought that a brignalow belt was something worn by a woman.

This evening, an honourable member said that tourists should contribute. I am not averse to that. If honourable members travel to Asia, as many of them have done—and the Minister informed us that he will be taking another trip shortly—they will find that many places impose a tourist tax of \$2 a head.

An Opposition Member: What for?

Mr. HARTWIG: It is a tourist tax.

I cannot but feel concerned about the Minister's statement that we could become a 7-mile-an-hour country in a 70-mile-an-hour world. We could certainly get left behind. What the hell are we here for if we are only travelling at 7 miles an hour? We have been in charge of this State for many years. What is wrong with us that we seem to be giving away our powers? I believe that the industry needs an overhaul and that this corporation can do the job. I appeal to the Minister to have a good look at some way in which towns or divisions throughout the State can liaise with the corporation that he is about to set up. If he does not, we will alienate many places on the coast and many inland centres. I repeat that tourism belongs to the people.

Recently at Biloela we had a cotton festival. It was set up by one of the local committees as a tourist promotion gimmick. The cotton industry in Biloela is very important. At the present time the ginnery is turning out a bale of lint every four minutes. I will say that the Minister has always tried to assist me with the pineapple festival. However, I was not as successful in my approach for assistance for the cotton festival. What are we doing as a Government to promote tourism? Do any of our departments go out of their way? A few years ago, the Mines Department had a very good unit depicting various facets of the mining industry. That was very well received. I hope that those things are promoted, not demoted. At Biloela the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission put on a very good show. I do not know whether we are short of funds, or what it is, but many other departments could do much more than they are doing to promote tourism in country areas. As a Government, we are talking about attracting tourists to this State, but we are doing nothing about it. Never mind setting up a corporation. It is this Government that has been in power. We are the ones who should look at it. If we do not, we will have failed.

I refer the Committee to this newspaper article—

"What is going on in the Queensland Tourist Bureau? Director-General Joe Wilson and publicity and advertising officer Austin Lloyd would like to know."

This is what Joe Wilson said—

"Smoke hangs heavily over the battlefields and we seem to be as far away as ever from knowing our fate.

"First intimation we had in the department that we could be in for major surgery came in the government policy speech for the last Queensland election."

I do not know how this corporation is to be constituted, but for goodness' sake let us not ignore any area of the State. Let us all participate in the tourist industry.

Mr. BERTONI (Mt. Isa) (10.3 p.m.): I support the Minister's introduction of the Bill, but with a certain amount of reservation. I feel that I would not be doing my duty to the western people if I did not express my concern at its introduction. We have heard various remarks by honourable members that we must look at the State as a whole and certainly not be parochial in our attitude. However, I make no apology for expressing my concern. Firstly, when we talk about tourism, most people start to think of beaches, girls in bikinis, island resorts and, to a lesser degree, the Barrier Reef. One wonders why this is so. The millions of dollars that have been spent on publicity in promoting the various areas have been spent on the south-east corner, and the south-east corner alone. There is also the tie-up of the various resorts and islands by the two major airlines, Ansett and T.A.A. Therefore, the people in western areas are justified in expressing their concern.

This new corporation will do nothing at all to promote other areas of Queensland. If we take notice of the media, the composition of the board and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will do nothing at all to allay this fear. If the corporation is for the benefit of the whole of Queensland, the Minister should assure us that State-wide representation on the board is a certainty. I agree wholeheartedly with other members that this should be so.

In presenting a case, I remind the Minister that Queensland has 10 tourist regions, as well as many places not in tourist regions, such as Dalby. The western and northern areas of the State do not have enough representation. I said that I would not apologise for being parochial. The North West Tourist Development Region in my area covers one-sixth of the area of Queensland yet, if we can take any notice of the rumours in the media, it is not to be represented on the board. It is highly essential that all northern and western areas have representation on this board.

The northern and western areas have many people who are well qualified and sufficiently experienced to be appointed to this board. It is possible that they are qualified enough to teach some of the southern operators many a trick. They could bring a wealth of knowledge and experience to the board.

People usually travel to the western and northern areas by air or by road. This presents two problems. The first is that the air-fare structure to country areas is nothing but a rip-off being perpetrated by the two major airlines that operate in those areas. Recently we heard a good deal about cheaper international air fares and the proposed domestic super Apex fares which offer a 40 per cent discount on domestic air fares if the passenger pays and collects his return ticket 45 days in advance.

What Mr. Nixon did not say—and it did not appear in the media—is that this system applies only to cities along the jet routes. People in country areas will reap very little benefit from it, so it is useless for them. For example, a person living in Longreach has to travel first from Longreach to a jet route centre—that is, from Longreach to Brisbane—at normal air fares before he can reap any benefit from the concession. Another example is a person who lives at Richmond, which is 200 or 300 miles from the nearest jet route centre. He has to travel to Townsville or Mt. Isa under his own steam at the high rip-off fares charged for travelling on a Fokker Friendship. These people will suffer and no doubt will ask what will the board do to assist tourism in these areas.

The honourable member for Townsville South spoke about the need for an international airport at Townsville. I wholeheartedly agree with him. But I wonder how he can reconcile that statement with his statement that he was prepared to allow Bush Pilots Airways to take over the route between Townsville and Mt. Isa and from Mt. Isa to Longreach and through the Charleville area. They are not along jet routes, so nobody could benefit from the concessions unless he travelled direct from Mt. Isa to Brisbane or Darwin.

Further, how can he reconcile his remarks with those of his leader who stated over Cairns radio that he could see no reason why people could not use the Metro jets, and that the problem was not as insurmountable as country people indicated?

The foresight of the National Party members representing those areas allowed them to foresee the future and what is required in our area. If we are to ask for anything in regard to air travel in western areas, it must be jet airliners. Only if we get them will we benefit from any of the reduced domestic air fares.

The other problem in our area is the state of the roads. This has been mentioned by other honourable members. Over 90 per

cent of people visiting country areas travel by car, yet the Landsborough Highway is not completely sealed. It is boggy and dusty, and full of pot-holes. This is what we expect overseas tourists to travel over. Do we really expect overseas tourists to travel by road to these country areas? It will take another 10 to 12 years before the Landsborough Highway is sealed. For another 10 to 12 years people will have to drive over this pot-holed and dusty road, which becomes boggy each year. Yet we do nothing at all about it. We seal a mile or two of road every year and say, "We're working on it. Just wait, boys, till it's finished in 10 or 12 years' time and you can have a fully sealed road from Mt. Isa to Brisbane." It is an absolute disgrace to this Government and the Federal Government.

I would like to know exactly what this corporation will do for the people in the West. In his reply I would like to hear from the Minister whether it will be just another promotion of the south-east corner and its tourist attractions, or whether it will really help the whole of the State. I fear that it will do absolutely nothing for the western and northern areas of the State. It will be just another money-making concern for the south-east corner unless we in the West get effective representation on the board.

In country areas tourism could become the major, or at least the second major, industry. It could become the lifesaver for many of the smaller country towns. It can help to promote employment opportunities for the young and other unemployed in country areas. It can prevent the breaking up of homes where the bread-winner has to leave a town to look for employment, and thus it will enable small country towns to remain viable. The tourist potential of country areas is tremendous, but once again I express my deep concern that this corporation will do absolutely nothing for the people in western areas.

Mr. SIMPSON (Cooroora) (10.12 p.m.): I rise this evening to support this innovative legislation aimed at helping a free-enterprise industry. The tourist industry is one of the few unfettered industries in this State, and it has great potential. Naturally it has come in for a lot of criticism today from the Opposition because they are not in favour of industries with a private-enterprise base.

I am sure that what the Minister is trying to achieve with this Bill is the bringing together of a lot of innovative, thinking people who will go out and win for Queensland new markets in the very competitive tourist field, not only internationally but within Australia. Other States have justifiably realised the great financial potential in increased tourism.

Mention has been made of greater leisure hours, and we are all very much aware that here in Australia there is a 17½ per cent

loading on holiday pay. The other States have set out to have people with free-enterprise ideas promote their tourist industries, and we have to compete with them. I believe we have to seek the expertise of people with proven ability, people who have put their own money into what they do. I believe that is the criteria on which we should work to obtain the best possible people.

We need people with proven decision-making ability. Of course, if we put people of this sort on the board we will be criticised, because most or all of them will appear to come from only one part of the State. I believe that the acid test will be how they perform, and that is what worries me. Because there are so many knockers around, I wonder whether this Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has a hope of success. I have no doubt that there will be many people trying to shoot it down.

No doubt it will be struggling to obtain sufficient finance with which to compete with other organisations throughout the world. There are some 4,000 million people in the world. Australia has only 13,000,000 people. In other words, for every person in Australia, there are 300 outside Australia and many of them are potential tourists. The finance that they could bring to Australia is similar to the income earned from exports, except that it is the cream from the financial world. This money is spent and it provides ever so many extra jobs in Australia, not only in the tourist industry.

Overseas people come here to enjoy the rich resources that we have in Australia, and particularly in Queensland. I refer to our beaches, mountains, rain forests, vast plains and wilderness areas, the Great Barrier Reef and the islands, historic sites, cane fields, vast areas of agricultural countryside, mining sites, lakes, rivers, and national parks—the list goes on and on. We have so many natural resources. We have a few man-made ones, too.

Not only people from overseas want to get to these resorts in Australia; people from other parts of Australia want to get to them, too, to enjoy not only their leisure time but also their business time with business conventions. There are very rich people in the world who are waiting for top-class hotels to be provided in Australia, including Queensland. Australians who have travelled overseas and are aware of the standard of international hotels at overseas resorts know that there are people with a great deal of money who go only to first-class hotels in tourist areas. We are missing out on very large amounts of money for Australia, and particularly for Queensland.

The spin-off from tourism is very useful. Firstly, it provides employment in service and accommodation areas where it is so dearly needed. Then, of course, we have to provide food, and this is a benefit that flows right through our agricultural industries. We sell

garments and the benefit from this flows back to our agricultural industries, too. Tourism provides opportunities for manufacturing and tertiary industries, and also for cottage industries which, in turn, can be tourist attractions in themselves.

The tourist industry is labour intensive, and we immediately come up against the old hackneyed sacred cow of the Opposition, "Penalty rates! Hands off! You can't touch them!" I have heard so much garbage about penalty rates today. The Opposition has said, "Oh, no, you have to keep these penalty rates. They are very important." It is not facing the fact that it is denying the young people of Australia, particularly of Queensland, the opportunity to work. If Opposition members say that the tourist industry can pass on the expense incurred in paying penalty rates, they are just not facing the facts and they are not in tune with what is happening in the tourist industry in Queensland at the present time. Restaurants are closed at week-ends and public holidays because they cannot afford to pay the staff. Because of penalty rates, so many facilities cannot be used adequately. Opposition members can say, "Oh, no, we are not locking up jobs", but in fact they are. We cannot compete with the rest of the world because in other countries the tourist industry operates on a 40-hour-a-week basis, seven days a week, and that is the way it should be in Australia.

I have working in the tourist industry in my electorate people who want to work at week-ends and on public holidays without being paid penalty rates so that they can have their time off during the week when it is not so busy and when they can enjoy their leisure time in the resort areas. Many people wish to undertake part-time work but are being denied the opportunity to do so because restaurants and other tertiary industries have to close at week-ends and on public holidays.

I suggest that the day-trippers, the week-end trippers and the holidaymakers who make up the majority of tourists in Queensland do not know when they leave home that they must expect a Monday-to-Friday 9-to-5 sort of existence and take along a lunch bag in order to survive over the weekend. This is ridiculous. People on holidays are looking for service at week-ends, and in many places they cannot get it because of penalty rates. It is about time that we faced up to the fact that we are denying many people a job, and a very important job.

People should be trained to be more proficient in the tourist industry, and no doubt one of the duties of the corporation will be to ascertain where there is a need for more expertise and training. Maximum use is not being made of the opportunities offering for resource development. If members of the corporation are allowed to work in an unfettered and innovative way and to get out and compete as they did in the industries from which they came, tourism in Queensland will receive a tremendous boost.

At the moment, this State is slipping back because similar corporations have been set up already in other places.

It is obvious that if Queensland is to tap the international market it must have an international airport, or even more than one. There must be one in Brisbane; there should be one at the other end of the State to capitalise on the free plugs we get throughout the world for the Great Barrier Reef. Because it is a thousand miles in length, the reef is one of the resources that needs to be looked at carefully, and efforts should be made to overcome the present difficulty in getting people to it.

Those who understand the tourist industry realise that people throughout the world are no different from people in Queensland. When they wish to travel now they seek package tours and convenience travel, which bring with them competitive rates. People are looking for the best deal that they can get, and one of the tasks of the corporation will be to promote and co-ordinate travel of that type, to make it available and to sell it not only in Australia but throughout the world. Therefore, it is essential to have a private-enterprise corporation of this type to work with a private-enterprise industry.

One facet of public relations in the tourist industry within Queensland that worries me is reference to cyclones. The media often launch into a story that is emotive and brings a public response in order to sell newspapers in southern areas of Australia. When we look at the devastation wrought by earthquakes and typhoons in other parts of the world, we realise that we are very lucky in Australia, and in Queensland in particular. When we see the damage caused by what are termed storms anywhere south of the Queensland border, we realise that we are in fact being sold short. Whenever there is reference to a cyclone, I simply refer to it as a storm or a storm surge, and I believe that we would be much better off in this State if we could get co-operation from the media in this respect, because headlines such as "There's a cyclone in Queensland" in southern newspapers can have a devastating effect on holiday bookings. We discover then that it is out in the Coral Sea and may not come anywhere near an inhabited area. A co-operative effort from the media is needed within the tourist industry.

The Queensland people themselves form one of the most important elements in tourism. They are the ones who "sell" the returning tourist. Their smiles, their co-operation, their selling of the State can mean a great deal to Queensland. The attitude to people is a very lasting one. Tourists who go round the world tell us that it is finally the people who interest the traveller more than the actual places he visits. It is the way he is treated that is important. This means that we need well-trained, concerned, courteous people—a smile costs nothing—not only

within our industry but also in our community, because the tourist does not meet only those in the particular tourist resort or attraction. He also meets the average person in the street. This is why it is very important that we project a friendly image so that these people will return. If they go back with a favourable message and tell their friends, whether they be from within Australia or from overseas, what a good time they had in Queensland, it is probably worth 400 per cent in return future bookings. I believe this is most important in this industry.

I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill, which will set up a corporation that is intended to set the tourist industry in Queensland on a competitive basis. Our natural resources are second to none. I look forward to the tourist industry in this State going on to bigger and better things in this free-enterprise country, backed by this free-enterprise Government.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (10.27 p.m.): No-one can deny the importance of tourism to this great State of Queensland, and accepting that fact I think we must look at the best way to exploit it. One wonders whether we have been getting the best we can out of our salesmen in this field through the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau in the years since its establishment. I have certainly had good service from the gentlemen in the Tourist Bureau and in my association with visitors to this State I have not yet heard one complaint about the service that they received from the public servants who staff that bureau.

I have risen in this debate to say something about the industrial implications of this move being made by the Government. I am concerned about protecting in a real way members of the State Service Union, the public servants employed in that field. I must say that I was rather disappointed that very few members of the Opposition had a word to say on this aspect. I think the honourable member for Cairns made a few points, and he is to be commended for them. However, few of the other members of the Opposition sought to comment on this matter, despite the fact that the Opposition is full of retired trade union officials and full-time functionaries of the Trades Hall who are allegedly representing unions on this occasion.

Mr. Bishop: Dead-beats.

Mr. LANE: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise calls them dead-beats. I am not sure that that is the correct terminology.

The lack of interest displayed by the former full-time party functionaries and trade union officials who make up the Opposition is probably due to the fact that they do not have any deep-down affection for a moderate and reasonably responsible union, as the State Service Union has shown

itself to be over the years. It is a union that has not engaged in political campaigns or exploited political campaigns against the Government, as many of the unions represented here tonight by members of the Opposition have done over the years. It is a union that, basically, has stayed out of politics except when it has had a direct and real effect on the industrial interests of its members. Tonight I am very pleased to see three senior officials of the State Service Union in the gallery, led by Tom Wallace. Their presence demonstrates their deep concern for their members. I share their concern.

I have considered the provisions outlined by the Minister covering treatment of the staff. I must say that the Minister has gone a long way towards meeting the needs of the staff. However, in all such instances some people will be outside the broad provisions drawn up. I draw attention to the position of some of the staff of the Tourist Bureau who are in their later years of service. I refer to men who have made a career of selling tourism and travel on behalf of Queensland for 20, 30 or more years and have three, four or five years to go before retirement. Despite the fact that they have been given an opportunity to elect over a two-year period, what they will do? I wonder what many honourable members would do if, at 55 years of age, employed by the Government Tourist Bureau for 30 years, they had to decide after a lifetime career whether they wanted to opt out of the Public Service or find a place in another department in which the activities may be foreign to them and where they may have to learn a new administrative system and trade. It must be a matter of real concern to the men in that position.

I invite the Minister and honourable members to think about that. Many of these officers have done good, sincere, hard work in the bureau and I should like to think that they will be looked after. I note that their superannuation, long service leave and other entitlements will be transferred with them if they elect to go to the corporation, but the matter of choice is something about which they could well feel concern.

On the other side of the coin, when I consider the composition of the corporation, I see that the only person appointed automatically by virtue of his position is the permanent head of the Department of Harbours and Marine. He is a very senior public servant and a capable gentleman. I wonder if the corporation will really have the autonomy espoused by the Minister, and whether there is really a place for such a senior public servant on this body.

I can understand that the advocates for private enterprise in this place are prepared to try anything in order to catch a little more of the tourist market. Members representing the Gold Coast area have been concerned for many years about tourists slipping

away to overseas countries. They are deeply concerned in that, because of the high cost of internal air fares and accommodation, people from other States can fly on a two-week package tour to Fiji and Singapore cheaper than they can fly to one of the tourist resorts in Queensland for a similar period. They are prepared to say, "Let us give this a punt." I suggest that that is what we are doing. If the corporation is to go its own way in totality, why should the permanent head of the Department of Harbours and Marine, of all persons, be attached to it?

In the future, portfolios may well be reshuffled. In the past, responsibilities of Ministers have been rearranged. Some Ministers seemed to be placed in charge of departments that are little more than odds and sods whilst others were charged with administering departments with a great deal of responsibility. If these departments are sorted out and rationalised in the future, as one hopes that some of them will be, perhaps the Departments of Tourism and Harbours and Marine will not be in the one portfolio. I wonder what they have in common now. I have doubts about what they might have in common in future.

Mr. Davis: They have very little.

Mr. LANE: The only thing that the member for Brisbane Central knows concerning the Department of Harbours and Marine is the sludge in Breakfast Creek. The Government has cleaned that up, so he has nothing more to whinge about now that he is back in the Assembly. I hope he remains silent while I speak.

I wonder why the member for Brisbane Central has not had a word to say here tonight about some of the tourist attractions that we have in this great city of Brisbane that are of instant appeal to overseas visitors to our great city. This happens to be a very attractive city. Any member who has travelled about the world a little would know that Brisbane makes an interesting impact on any visitor. The sheer cleanliness and charm of the place in such a young country have instant appeal. Even though our history is short, we have many historic buildings that people can visit. That is one reason why I share the concern of other members about the Bellevue building, which for its tourist potential alone should be treated with the greatest of respect by the Government. The area surrounding Parliament House, which takes in the Bellevue building, the Queensland Club, the Botanic Gardens and Parliament House, is commonly known as the Parliament House precinct.

In other countries people would travel miles to visit such an area. In Bath, England, old buildings are preserved in many streets. Visitors can walk down these streets amongst buildings very similar to those we have here. They have been preserved and treated with loving care by the local authorities.

I suggest that not all the responsibility for preserving historic buildings for the purposes of tourism falls on the State Government. The local authorities, too, have a role to play. They certainly do in other countries, particularly in Britain and on the Continent; yet we see no effort by the Brisbane City Council in this regard. I know that in the last couple of years walks around the city have been advertised. Brochures have been made available for tourists to show them where they can walk around the city to see some of our historic sights. Many of those brochures have been prepared by the National Trust and private bodies.

I would like to see a little more done to exploit the attractions of our great city. I refer to the expanse of the Riverside Expressway, parks and gardens that are available to us, the Botanic Gardens and, of course, glorious New Farm Park with its jacaranda trees and its beautiful rose blossoms, which is a sight of which we can all be proud. No greater blooms can be seen at the Chelsea Flower Show, England, than can be seen in glorious New Farm Park. I invite some of the honourable gentlemen from the great dry Outback who are having a little cackle to themselves to come with me down to beautiful New Farm Park when next the jacarandas and the roses are in bloom. They might even feel inspired to move down here to share these wonderful things with me.

I was interested to hear some of the comments by members opposite about the Bruce Highway. On a television programme last night something was made by one of the famous, or infamous, television crews of the motoring facilities to the North and the Bruce Highway. Obviously, many of the members of the Opposition were lying idly in their rooms last night gazing with glassy stares at the television set because they all wanted to speak about the Bruce Highway here tonight. I have not heard them even peep about it before in this Chamber.

Another comment that I take the opportunity to make tonight relates to exported tourism, that is, tourists going overseas. I was gratified to hear the Minister say and to read in the explanatory notes that we have been given that the corporation will do business with anyone in terms of selling tourism. One would hope that it will play its part in selling tourism to South East Asia. In return one would hope that we might do something in South East Asia to sell Australian tourism there. I have long been an advocate of this Government's establishing a Queensland Government trade office in Singapore, which is at the crossroads of Asian commerce.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What about Bugis Street?

Mr. LANE: Bugis Street is something that the honourable member would know much more about than I do. Possibly he dressed in drag as do many of the other people who visit there.

Singapore is at the crossroads of Asian commerce. It is time that the Government set up an ASEAN trade office in Singapore so that it could do business at a commercial level with the great masses in the South East Asian area. That trade office could well have the ancillary role of selling Australian tourism to people in the East.

There are a large number of wealthy Chinese business people in the various countries that make up the ASEAN bloc of Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Philippines and Indonesia, the several nations that fathered the Association of South East Asian Nations. Those people love to visit a Western country so near to their home.

If we had our own tourist office in Singapore, working in conjunction with a trade office, we would do a lot of business for Queensland. I hope that the corporation, in exercising its quite comprehensive responsibilities, will do something about establishing an office there and selling our tourism in Asia.

Some of the responsibilities of the new corporation involve the holding of conferences, publishing papers, holding seminars, conducting workshops, liaising and promoting business. I hope that the corporation will have a few hard salesmen who will sign business up in the order book rather than people who stand around talking about it all the time among themselves and making one another feel very important in the field of tourism. We need people who will get out, as the old commercial traveller did, and sell Queensland.

Reluctant as I am to support any proposal that might inhibit or perhaps downgrade the role of the Public Service in this State, I trust that the Minister will ensure that the most sympathetic treatment is given to members of the Queensland State Service Union and that an easy transition is provided for those who wish to go back to other departments and work of a similar or somewhat similar nature to that carried out by them fairly well in the State Government Tourist Bureau for many years. I refer particularly to those gentlemen in the latter part of their careers. I hope that full consideration will be given to them under this proposal and I should like the Minister to give that assurance tonight.

Mr. INNES (Sherwood) (10.44 p.m.): I rise not to claim representation on the proposed corporation for the electorate of Sherwood, although there is as much talent in that electorate as there is in any other in Queensland.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. INNES: The honourable member for Archerfield is seeking the benefit of that expertise.

I rise to support some of the matters that have already been outlined to the Committee and to expand on a couple of others that have been mentioned in passing.

Firstly, in my view it is important that three areas of tourism should be identified. There is the overseas tourist potential in a pure sense; there is New Zealand, which has a very special situation in the market; and there is the domestic market. I separate the overseas market from the New Zealand market because whereas people from the rest of the world have to overfly the Pacific or other oceans to get to Australia, and overfly the many attractions which the domestic market finds at home, the people of New Zealand fly here to gain the benefit of sunshine and surf beaches which they cannot enjoy so readily in New Zealand.

Whether it be the New Zealand market or the overseas market, the problem facing the overseas tourist remains the same, that problem is that in Australia there is an international communications network which is based entirely upon internal domestic considerations. This is perfectly clear, and I support totally the call from both sides of the Committee for an international air link between North Queensland and the rest of the world. That link should provide services for routine flights, charter flights and New Zealand flights. I think it is incontestable that the overseas tourist does not want to fly into cul-de-sac situations and have to retrace his steps to fly out of this country. For the New Zealand tourist to fly to Brisbane, enjoy the benefits of the sunshine and the surf beaches of the Gold Coast, then to fly north to enjoy the Barrier Reef, the rain forests and the other attractions of North Queensland, and then to fly directly home would be a logical and highly appealing proposition.

For the overseas tourist, as the honourable member for Brisbane Central quite rightly said, the attractions remain those that appealed to Captain Cook and those who travelled with him. The Great Barrier Reef, kangaroos, koalas and Ayers Rock are undoubtedly—surveys have shown this—the things that appeal to the overseas visitor in Australia.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: When did Captain Cook go to Ayers Rock?

Mr. INNES: If he had had the foresight and imagination of the people on this side of the Chamber, no doubt he would have got there.

It seems to me that the natural attractions of Australia have not been developed, and this is important so far as the overseas market is concerned. The Great Barrier Reef is not the only attraction; there are areas which have already been reserved as national parks in this State.

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. INNES: I do not think there will ever be a great parthenium weed park.

In this State we have the great potential of combinations of natural attractions such as the Antarctic beech forest of Lamington, the desert scenery of the Simpson Desert National

Park, the rain forest parks of Cape York and North Queensland, and the Great Barrier Reef. Such a combination of natural attractions could not be found anywhere else in the world. There are single square kilometres of this State which provide a greater range of flora and fauna than is found in some entire overseas countries.

We have all heard of the Kruger National Park and the national parks of Kenya. In the years to come, the national parks of Lamington, the marine park of the Great Barrier Reef and the rain forest parks of Cape York will become as famous as any of these overseas parks. It is noteworthy that already 1,250,000 people visit the four small national parks in South-east Queensland. This is approaching the number of people which the great Californian national parks currently receive each year. The Yosemite National Park receives some 4,000,000 visitors each year, of whom 1,250,000 stay overnight. That clearly represents an enormous industry. Those people are serviced by a wide range of accommodation from first class to sleeping areas for people who backpack around the trails of the park. In the years to come, this State has to provide the range of accommodation that the overseas visitor as much as the Australian domestic traveller seeks.

Not all overseas visitors wish to be accommodated in first-class hotels. It is significant that there has been a rash of the adventurer-club type organisations all over the globe. One such club in the State of Illinois in the United States has 140,000 members and operates continually three of its own Boeing jets. Those charter services provide that reservoir of population in that single State of the United States with trips to all manner of general and specific places of interest in the world. It is that type of organisation that would provide, whenever it was allowed, charter services into such places as Townsville to see the scenic wonders of North Queensland.

In my view, it is an unfortunate indictment of this country and its so-called commitment to free enterprise and its so-called two-airline policy that charter operations have not yet been allowed into Townsville and that in fact home-grown operations such as Bush Pilots are not allowed to operate on domestic services and provide the international and the internal domestic traveller with the range of options that he needs.

It is clear that an international airport in Queensland would be totally logical in terms of both domestic and overseas travel. It would provide the capacity, with feeder services, for a person to go either north to Cairns or south to Mackay and the Whitsunday region, according to the weather conditions.

One of the interesting facts that were agreed unanimously at the recent workshop on the Great Barrier Reef was that frequently overseas visitors are disappointed with their trip to the reef. A majority of overseas

people wish to see the Great Barrier Reef. Of those who arrive in Australia, only 4 per cent get to the reef, and a significant number of them are disappointed because, notwithstanding previous endeavours, the industry is fragmented. They are disappointed because such basic facilities as an overflight of the Great Barrier Reef are not regularly provided, and that is the only reasonable and economical way in which one can get any idea of the magnitude of the reef.

They are also disappointed because frequently they do not actually stand on the reef so that they can say that they have been to the so-called Great Barrier Reef. They should first overfly it. They wish to inspect it at sea level, and they wish to stand on it. Obviously they wish to see the submarine beauties of the Great Barrier Reef. There are still only three or four underwater observatories, and most of them are of a very small and private nature, and of long standing.

It is quite clear that the State Government is the logical organising entity to encourage the flexibility necessary to meet all of the demands of the overseas visitor and to encourage the development, or to assist to finance or to guarantee the development, necessary to fulfil rather than shatter the dreams of the overseas visitor about the beauty of Australia.

In terms of the domestic market, it is significant that, of people who travel to the Great Barrier Reef region—that is, from Gladstone north—87 per cent travel in motor vehicles. The majority of those people vow never to repeat the journey. For the benefit of the economy of this State to realise the potential and the value of the tourist industry, it is necessary that the Bruce Highway be upgraded so that people never repeat that type of vow. I totally support the calls from members on both sides of the Chamber for the upgrading of the Bruce Highway to be given a top priority for the development of tourism and the tourist industry generally in this State.

I do not propose to trespass much longer on the time of the Committee, but I think it is pertinent to support the honourable member for Merthyr in his call for recognition to be given to the significant value of Brisbane, and the development of this city, to the tourist industry. In 1982, the Commonwealth Games will be held in Brisbane. Those games will bring with them special tourist responsibilities. Rather than having people coming to this country hoping to see as much of it as possible, we will have people coming to South-east Queensland for a very special purpose. If we can wed to that special purpose convenient trips to the many accessible natural attractions that are within one or two days' drive of the State's capital, we will serve to fuel an interest in Queensland and in Australia that one can readily expect will call for a return of those persons in the future to see more of this subcontinent. Its unique architecture

in the form of stump-built houses, its architecture that has hitherto been preserved, its architecture that can be restored to its full beauty—in particular, the parliamentary precinct—

Mr. Davis: What about the Bellevue?

Mr. INNES: And including the Bellevue, or the facade of the Bellevue, if necessary with a modern building behind it, would provide a unique opportunity to see architecture that is totally representative of the birth of this State. I support similar moves that have been made in places such as Charters Towers, where the Stock Exchange, which lay unused for five, six or seven decades, has been re-roofed; I support similar moves in Brisbane to restore the heritage of the capital.

I share the concern of some members of this Assembly on the question of the personnel of the corporation. It is perfectly clear—and it appears to be generally accepted—that the organisation of tourism on a governmental level has not achieved what it was hoped would be achieved, and the setting up of a corporation and the selection of the personnel who will guide that corporation and tourism in the future is of paramount importance. The selection of the personnel will be the crucial component in the setting up of the new corporation. Those personnel must reflect the full extent of the tourist industry in Queensland. In selling the State's natural assets, they must have horizons as wide as the borders of Queensland, and wider horizons in the attraction of tourists.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: The conclusion?

Mr. INNES: The conclusion is simply that I support the Bill. I share the reservations that have been expressed relative to the personnel who will fulfil the directorship, and I believe that the personnel must reflect the full extent of the tourist industry over the length and breadth of Queensland and not be concentrated only in the south-east corner.

Mr. D'ARCY (Woodridge) (10.59 p.m.): The proposal before the Committee has had a fairly extensive airing from both sides of the Chamber, and I think that most of the points relative to the tourist industry in this State have been made. The number of honourable members who have taken part in the debate indicates just how important the proposed Bill is to the future of the tourist industry. In effect, it virtually provides for the future of the tourist industry in Queensland, and I should say that its introduction, and the way in which it has been introduced, signals the end of the Tourist Bureau as it now exists. The Government has virtually admitted that under its administration the Tourist Bureau has been a failure. Opposition members have said that the bureau as it has existed over the past couple of decades has had the expertise in its personnel, but it has not had the

Government funding, Government where-withal and Government co-operation that are necessary to allow it to carry out its job of promoting tourism in the State of Queensland.

When we look around Australia and South East Asia we see that Queensland has lagged far behind other areas in the promotion of its tourist assets and we realise that the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau is a failure. It has been nothing but a jumped-up travel agency in this State and the problem has rested not with the personnel of the bureau but with this Government in its failure to fund the Tourist Bureau in the promotion of tourism in the State of Queensland.

A major question that arises with the introduction of the Bill is whether it is another cover-up. I am beginning to think that it is, in view of some of the names that have been mentioned in the membership of the corporation. Are they going to be the so-called experts? Who are they? Today we have heard names put forward already, names of those who have been advising the Minister, names of men who have vested interests in the tourist industry in one or two particular projects in this State or in a particular area of the State.

The name of Keith Williams has been bandied around the Chamber. He has had a fair bit to do with the tourist industry and with the promotion of tourism. No-one could deny that Sea World, on the Gold Coast, is an excellent attraction. It certainly is. However, when we remember that it is built on Crown land, how Keith Williams came to be there and how an extension of leases was granted, we realise that anybody who could not make a success of Sea World with the help that the Government gave him would be a complete dunce.

We have heard talk about the Gold Coast Tourist Bureau and about how Keith Williams started it. Of course he did, but he used other people's money to promote his project. Is he going to use this Government's money to promote his projects? He is already on the Queensland Marine Board and the Tourist Development Board. He has already got leases on the Great Barrier Reef from this Government and he has already got huge leases on the Gold Coast, on the most expensive expanse of land in Queensland. Is he going to be one of the gentlemen who are to be allowed to promote sectional interests? Or are we going to have truly independent personnel on the corporation? We need people of the latter type. We have to look for such people if the corporation is going to be a truly independent body. If the Government at long last is going to take a look at the funding of tourism in this State, possibly this corporation idea is a good one.

Mr. Davis: I reckon it's a matter of jobs for the boys.

Mr. D'ARCY: If it is jobs for the boys, the time of the Committee is being wasted, because what we are doing is introducing nothing more than another statutory body. Members have already expressed their concern about the number of statutory bodies that have been introduced by this Government as buffers in this State. I believe that had we given the Queensland Tourist Bureau its head in tourist promotion, we would not be the Cinderella State in tourism. Rather would we be to the forefront because we have the natural assets.

Natural assets are singularly important to the tourist industry. Tourists are attracted only when natural assets attract them. It is therefore up to the State to promote our natural assets and to provide the catalyst to assist in exploiting them. It is useless to say that we have a wonderful asset at Birdsville, or that we should put a casino at Birdsville. I have heard such suggestions made here before. Anyone associated with the tourist industry knows that natural assets attract huge numbers of people. For example, the Labor Party believes that a casino should be established on the Gold Coast because the Gold Coast is the centre of the tourist industry in Australia. The Gold Coast is Queensland's biggest single asset for the tourist industry. It developed over a long period, but because of lack of Government support it is lagging, as is our total tourist industry.

I believe that the right catalyst is essential. It certainly worked in Tasmania. When we consider the promotion of assets in various areas we should think of what has been done in New Zealand, Tasmania and, on a more limited scale, in South Australia. Although those places have far fewer natural all-round assets than Queensland and certainly have less-attractive climatic conditions, they leave Queensland far behind.

To some extent we are wasting our time when we talk about local and overseas tourists in the one breath. The overseas tourist industry is a completely different ball game. Neither the Australian tourist industry nor the State and Federal Governments have really understood it. At only one time in our history was there an upsurge in international tourism. That was during the Vietnam war, when R. and R. personnel came here. The figures are conclusive. It seems that the Vietnamese are now providing us with a great number of tourists when boatloads of them arrive undetected on our northern shores.

We must look to our tourists as holiday-makers within our own State and country. They certainly have not been catered for. When the honourable member for Sherwood spoke about the Great Barrier Reef I wondered how many Queenslanders, let alone interstate people, fail to realise that getting to the Barrier Reef is a very difficult exercise. Anyone who looks at a map of Queensland and reads some of the brochures could well come to the conclusion that one

could drive to Mackay and walk out on the Barrier Reef. Very few people, particularly southerners, realise that the beauties of the Barrier Reef are 20 to 30 miles off shore.

Because of the package holidays, and what the Government has not done, Queenslanders and people from other States are unable to enjoy the beauties of the Great Barrier Reef. As many honourable members have pointed out, they have endured the rigours of the Bruce Highway, the failure of the Government to complete proper tourist step-off points throughout the State and, as an honourable member pointed out, despite the fact that we have some of the best natural tourist resources in Australia and possibly in the world, have vowed never to return to Queensland.

The biggest problem in Queensland lies in the fact that the Government has limited the growth of the Tourist Bureau, it has failed to realise the worth of Queensland's natural assets, it has not instructed Queenslanders or Australians generally on how to best use our natural tourist resources, and it has placed in high positions men who have vested interests and are not concerned for the welfare of the average holidaymaker in Australia.

If the Minister, by introducing this Bill, intends to help the tourist industry—the average Australian looking for a holiday is our major tourist in this country—and if he intends to spend some money on it and pick the right personnel, perhaps he is on a winner. If we get the same tired old hacks with vested interests stuck behind a statutory board covering up for the Government, the industry and the bureau, this Bill will be a failure.

Mr. M. D. HOOPER (Townsville West) (11.10 p.m.): Tonight we have heard several hours' debate on this Bill and this indicates the interest of a great many members of Parliament in the development of the tourist industry in Queensland to a point far beyond its present state. What does concern me a little is the attitude of those Government members who are worried about the setting up of the corporation. Some have expressed the feeling that there will not be sufficient promotion of northern, central and far western Queensland. Surely this is the reason for the establishment of the corporation. It is intended that it will promote the whole of Queensland and not, as at present, sectional interests in the south-eastern corner and in Cairns and Green Island in the far north of Queensland.

In contrast, we have had the direct opposite from the Opposition, which claims that the Government is sacking the Tourist Bureau. This is obviously incorrect. It is a misstatement of fact. It is certainly not the intention of the Minister or this Government. The Minister has made it quite clear that the bureau is not to be sacked. Every employee of the bureau is to be offered a position with the new

corporation and with no loss of benefits, salary or superannuation. If within two years he decides that he would rather revert to an area within the Public Service, he may do so. It is totally incorrect for any member of the Opposition to create panic among employees of the tourist bureau by saying that they are going to be sacked by this Government. The jobs are still there. As a matter of fact, under the corporation that is being set up, they will have further opportunities for promotion by showing their ability. If they have exceptional ability, instead of being tied to the old adage of waiting until they are old enough to get a top job, they will certainly earn quicker promotion than they can presently expect under the normal Public Service idea of promotions.

The Queensland Tourist Bureau is held in very high regard by all tourist entrepreneurs in Queensland. It has a very high acceptance of bookings among motels, hotels and travel agents. Both Ansett and T.A.A. will confirm that the highest number of interstate bookings by any agent are made by the Queensland Tourist Bureau. What we are trying to do with the corporation is insert some new blood into the organisation and give it a new lease of life. We are helping it to promote itself and Queensland. We are making more funds available so Queensland can be promoted not just in our State but more aggressively interstate and certainly overseas.

A few years ago Queensland was looked upon as being the No. 1 tourist State. We have now dropped to third place. That is something we do not like. We are the leading tourist State and we have to preserve that position and improve it if we can.

It has been said by the Minister that in Queensland approximately one employee in 10 is employed in the tourist industry. That may or may not be an exaggeration. Certainly, when we look at the service industries—the suppliers of goods and services to the tourist resorts—it is not very difficult to realise (it could quite easily be a fact) that one in 10 in some shape or form owes his job to an association with the tourist industry. So many unskilled people, particularly females and juniors who perhaps have not had an academic education, find it very much easier to find jobs in service industries associated with the tourist industry. Possibly the reduced rate of development of the tourist industry is one reason why we have so many unemployed youths presently on the books of our employment offices.

It has been said that tourism is Queensland's fourth largest industry and that we expect it to improve. At the seminar on tourism held at Mackay last week it was said by an officer of the Australian Tourist Commission that tourism is No. 2 in world circulation of money. It ranks second only to the oil industry as a consumer of money,

yet Australia's share of that industry is only 0.07 per cent, which is a very tiny percentage of the world travel industry. Of the few hundred thousand visitors to Australia who make up the 0.07 per cent, only about 4 per cent find their way north from Rockhampton to where the Great Barrier Reef is the main attraction.

In promotions overseas the A.T.C. and Qantas sell Ayers Rock and the Great Barrier Reef as the two unique Australian attractions. It is no good Qantas and the A.T.C. telling people in America, Canada and Europe, "Come to Australia and see Sydney and Melbourne." Those countries have cities that are 10 times as large as ours and they are far more historic and are of more interest than Australian cities, including Brisbane.

When a person travels he wants to see something different, even in his own State or country, and when he travels overseas he wants to visit a place where he will see something different.

If an American is asked what he wants to see in Australia, what he has read about in the papers and the magazines, he will say, "You have a big lump of rock out there called Ayers Rock, which is somewhere in Central Australia and the Great Barrier Reef, which is somewhere off the coast." If he lives in New York or Texas, these attractions would seem to be a small point on a map but he knows that somewhere on the map is the Great Barrier Reef.

When he gets here he is told by the domestic airlines what it will cost to travel to North Queensland. To many tourists the amount is staggering and they cannot afford it. Those who can afford it come north and see the resorts. They ask, "How do I get to the Great Barrier Reef?" When they hear the dreadful tale that on only three days out of 10 is it fine enough to get to the reef they end up saying, "That's our bad luck. We picked the wrong day" or "the wrong month." They also find that not many boats are available in many of the ports along the Queensland coast.

As other honourable members have said, many tourists who come to Queensland go away disappointed that they have not seen the reef. Certainly they have been to some of the beautiful islands such as Green, Dunk, the Whitsunday Group or Heron and have had a good time. It is their fault if they have not. However, they go away with a small amount of dissatisfaction because they have not seen the reef. The Australian Government and this Government must find some way of ensuring that travellers from overseas and from southern States can put their feet on the reef.

Mr. Warburton: What do you think the corporation will do about that?

Mr. M. D. HOOPER: I have high hopes. I hope that the corporation will endeavour to persuade the Federal Government that

finance must be made available to provide access to the reef. My personal view is that a landing platform should be established at one or two places along the 1,200 miles of the reef. It could be a worn-out oil rig, a tanker or a worn-out warship. Something must be anchored on the reef so that aeroplanes can land there in any weather, except gales, and put people on the reef. It will cost money, but the Australian Government must make sure that people who want to see the reef can actually put their feet on it and not have to view it from an aeroplane 2,000 feet in the air, as one honourable member and I did last week.

It has been mentioned quite often that the overseas air fares being offered to visit other countries are one reason why people from the southern States such as Victoria, our traditional visitors, now travel overseas. It is so much cheaper. We have to meet that challenge. I believe that the airlines are doing so by talking about introducing fares which will be conducive to people using the North Queensland resorts. Certainly Queensland is the place they will come to if they can afford it, and more attractive air fares will be of assistance.

Another point of view expressed by tourists is that, from where they are sold tickets overseas, Sydney and Melbourne are only points on the map. When they get here they find that they are 2,000 or 3,000 miles away from North Queensland, which is where they wish to go. So we have to make Brisbane the first point of entry, and accelerate the building of the new airport. I know it has been programmed for completion in 1985, but it has to be completed much earlier than that for the 1982 games, which are only three years away. At that time many thousands of tourists will want to come to Queensland. We must make it easy for them to get here and not have them land in the southern States and then have to find their own way up here.

It has been mentioned by other speakers that there should be a second point of entry into Queensland. I heartily agree. Townsville was recommended by various authorities, including the Australian Tourist Commission and the Australian National Travel Association, as far back as six or eight years ago. Both of these organisations recommended that Townsville should have an international airport. If you know the area at all, Mr. Miller, you will know that at Townsville there is a very good airstrip that was constructed by the Department of Defence. The landing facilities are very good. If this can be arranged it will be quite easy for charter aircraft to come into Townsville from South East Asia and other overseas countries. But charter aircraft will not just bring 200 people to Townsville, drop them there and wait for a week or go home empty. They will want some passengers to take back on the next flight. So our travel agents—I hope the corporation will be able to help—will have to arrange for people in

North Queensland who want to go to Asia, for argument's sake, to be ready to travel on that charter plane the moment it is ready to leave Townsville. Then we will have a continuing service for people who wish to leave our part of the world in exchange for the people who come to North Queensland. They want to see something different, and that is why they will come to Townsville.

Mr. Tomkins interjected.

Mr. M. D. HOOPER: I am pleased to hear the Minister for Transport agreeing with me on that point.

I know from experience gained in attending travel conferences that the travel habits of the residents of various countries differ greatly from those of Australians. We in Australia have very good working conditions and most of us can afford to take three or four weeks' holiday, perhaps not every year but occasionally, and we are prepared to go overseas for that period. It has been found that Americans are prepared to travel overseas for two weeks, whereas a week or 10 days is the most that Japanese want to spend away from their own country. Even if they have the money to come to Sydney, and it takes them a whole day to get there, by the time they spend a few days looking at the Harbour Bridge, the Opera House and the rest of Sydney, they do not have the necessary time up their sleeves to come to North Queensland. They want to arrive at their destination, spend a few days there and then go home to Japan again. That is just part of their make-up. It has been said time and time again that, simply because they do not have the time, they will not come to Australia and see the whole country. That is another factor we must consider when we talk about establishing an international airport at Townsville. Such an airport would enable overseas visitors to see the whole of northern Australia and not just the southern parts of our continent.

In reply to some Government members who criticised the Government for not doing enough to promote some of our western and other remote areas, I stress the fact that those areas should do something to help themselves. The State Government presently gives grants of something like \$5,000 or \$6,000 per year to various regional tourist authorities that are prepared to raise money in their own areas for the promotion of tourism. I know that a couple of years ago I asked members of the Mt. Isa City Council what they were doing about tourism and how much they were putting in. They said, "Nothing. We don't believe in donating money. Our councillors don't accept the fact that we should donate money to promote tourism." I asked, "How do you expect the Government to promote you if you don't do something yourselves?" I think some of these local authorities should say to the organisations in their areas, "If you want the

Government to help, we are prepared to meet you dollar for dollar in order to do something towards helping our own industry."

Mr. Simpson: Self-help.

Mr. M. D. HOOPER: The honourable member is quite right; self-help is what it is all about.

There are many things which interest people in these remote areas. They certainly interest me greatly. A couple of years ago I went to Charters Towers when the new stock exchange was opened. A special train ran from Townsville and the big hit of the day was when everyone on the train was treated to a luncheon of corned beef and treacle baked in the old camp ovens out in the scrub. That is something one would not see in Townsville at any time of the year, but for those 600 people who travelled from Townsville that day the biggest treat was having a feed of damper and treacle cooked out in the open.

Mr. Burns: You said corned beef and treacle. That would be the funniest old meal you ever ate.

Mr. M. D. HOOPER: They could not afford corned beef. If they could I am sure they would have put it on, too. Many things like that in the remote areas need promoting. In the Far North there are the Quinkan Caves and the Cape York Peninsula, which is now one of our wilderness areas. People from overseas want to see places like that.

I can see that I have nearly exhausted my time. In winding up, I say how much I support this tourist authority. I know that it has great prospects for enhancing the tourist industry in North Queensland. I give it my full support.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (11.26 p.m.): I am pleased to see the introduction of the Bill because I think that the tourist industry has been a rather neglected industry. People do not even think of it as an industry at all. People go on a holiday and enjoy themselves, but they do not think of the consequences of the problems associated with their enjoyment.

At the present time the employees in the tourist industry are being grossly neglected by their unions, their employers and also by the Government. But it now appears that a sensible, balanced approach is being adopted to the whole problem. I hope that in this Bill consideration will be given to matters such as superannuation and long-service leave and to the various privileges that ordinarily are granted to employees who serve in an industry for a long time.

I always remember that for many years Queensland was a sort of Cinderella State in regard to hospital employees. This Government came into office and the hospital industry became a balanced, sensible industry. Superannuation was granted to the staff who

wished to take it and sickness benefits were provided. I hope that the same benefits flow to employees in the tourist industry.

At present, the employees in the tourist industry are rather disturbed because they consider that this corporation will be like a big monster that will take over and dismiss them at will. I feel sure that the Government does not intend that at all.

There will be three funds—the general fund, the trust fund and the loan fund. I consider that the whole business will be carefully controlled. I hope that the Auditor-General—not the one who inquired into my financial affairs—will provide for a rather balanced approach and that the corporation will not be controlled by a Premier, without any resort to this House of Parliament. I hope that the funding and the control of the finances of this corporation will be a balanced, well-judged business, without any personal animosity or personal persecution whatsoever.

Mr. Burns: Do you reckon that Joh should be able to override the board?

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: If the Premier or anyone else controls the auditing of a State, the State will become chaotic. There will be parliamentarian against parliamentarian, public servant against public servant and department against department. I sincerely hope that there will be none of that in the first audited report of the corporation.

The Parliament of this State has seen a rather vindictive vendetta waged against certain members of Parliament, and I hope that I never see such a thing in my lifetime again. I do not think that there is any reason for it, and I am quite sure that it will never happen again.

In Townsville, which is the city about which I wish mainly to speak, we have a most magnificent tourist potential.

Mr. Burns: Corned beef and treacle in a camp oven.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: Despite the member for Townsville, Townsville is still a nice place; and if the honourable member comes there I will entertain him most pleasantly.

Townsville is a most interesting place. Being an ex-Air Force man, the honourable member for Lytton would know that during the war years Townsville had a magnificent airport. Townsville has great potential. Unfortunately, it has never been developed, and that is because of one of two factors. One is the Federal Government; the other is the local council. No matter who controls whom, they have not played the game by Townsville, whether they are Federal Liberals or Federal Labor or local Liberals or local Labor. I am not interested in party politics when it comes to the development of Townsville.

Mr. Burns: Do you remember when Max Hooper was the mayor there? What did he do for the airport?

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: The Labor member has done nothing, and I will tell the honourable member a few stories about him.

Recently my wife and I went to the local council and asked what was happening to an area called Mt. St. John. We were told, "That has all been earmarked by the air traffic control section of the Commonwealth Government". My wife, who was not known to the fellow, said, "I want to buy it". She could not have paid 20c for it.

Mr. Burns interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Lytton is reminded that persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: That has been earmarked for the future international airport. That is what is going on in Townsville. Certain members of the community who are unknown to me are trying to sabotage the development of Townsville airport as an international airport. That is what is going on, and it reeks from the city council to the Federal Government.

Mr. Burns: The zoo there is the only place where I have seen a crocodile with the mange.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: It is a pity that he did not eat the honourable member. I looked after the old man that he ate, and he ate him up very well, too.

Mrs. Kyburz: They fed him on beer.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: They did not. They fed him on lungs and liver and other offal from the meatworks. I think his name was Tarzan.

Mr. Burns: They used to get it from the hospital after you operated.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: If the former Leader of the Opposition had come there, I would have been delighted to feed him to the crocodile. I would have operated on what was left of him in the same way, and the operation would have been successful.

Let me get back to serious business, Mr. Miller. Townsville has the greatest tourist potential in the world. Beside the airport there are 2,000 acres of the most beautiful country that God ever made, full of ducks, brolga and water. All the waters from the mountains flow back into it. It is tied up, I think, by the Commonwealth Government and the local council. If Mr. Iwasaki wanted to establish a project in Queensland, that is where he should have established it, because it is God's own country. It will fatten cattle in a drought; it is absolutely magnificent. For some unknown reason it is tied up. If the tourist industry wishes to look at a

good project close to the Barrier Reef, that is where it should look—fertile ground within 200 yards of an airport. Nothing is happening because somewhere in the background someone is holding up its development.

Other honourable members have mentioned the history of various areas of the State. There are some magnificent old buildings in Townsville, and in another electorate in close proximity to Townsville that is not held by me there are some other magnificent buildings. Their history goes back to the 1860s. The old Queens Hotel has been taken over thanks to the foresight and enterprise of a man named Cec Carmody, who started with very little. He believed in free enterprise and had intelligence and endurance. When you come to think of it, Mr. Miller, those are great things to have when you come up against the Commissioner of Taxation. Telecasters North Queensland Ltd. has spent a million dollars restoring the historic Queens Hotel to its old beauty and has set up its office there. The Bellevue could be restored in a similar way. What is stopping the people who want the Bellevue restored setting up a business enterprise there and paying their own costs, as Telecasters did, without asking the Government to foot the bill? There is a big difference. Everyone wants the Government to do things. They think the poor old taxpayer has a bottomless pocket.

Another magnificent development in Townsville has been carried out by Dr. Lillicrap, who has restored the late Mr. Justice Douglas's home to what it was 100 years ago.

The other magnificent project was carried out by a shire council in the electorate which my colleague the honourable member for Flinders represents. It concerned the old building in Charters Towers which was formerly the Mining Exchange. This is a most magnificent building, and the work was not done by the Government. What we should all be working towards is getting private individuals to put their backbones to the wheel, the same as our forbears did, to help restore our country's old monuments. We should not be relying on the Government to do this for us. I believe that if the proposed corporation can stimulate people to think in terms of helping themselves to restore the old monuments and not leave it to the Government, it will be a worthwhile one.

Motion (Mr. Hodges) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT
DISALLOWANCE OF REGULATION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Honourable members, I wish to inform the House that, in regard to the motion for the disallowance of the regulation moved by Mr. Wright this morning, the date on which the regulation was made was inserted as usual by an officer of the House in order to clarify the particular regulation. Unfortunately, the regulation looked at was the same number as the original regulation made on 20 December 1978, and that is No. 127D (a) (ii). The misunderstanding is therefore regretted.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (11.38 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That Regulation 127(D) under the Public Service Act 1922-1978, as made on December 20, 1978 and tabled in this House on March 13, 1979, be disallowed.”

Earlier today I outlined some of the reasons for moving the disallowance of this regulation. I made the point that the Opposition had no alternative because every effort was made to convince the Government and, in particular, the Minister to reverse the decision whereby the right of appeal was being removed by this regulation. I made the point that the issue had gone on for some six months. I first raised the issue on 10 October 1978. I made the point at that time that the removal of this right would open the appointment system to a wide range of Crown employees and that the scheme that was being promoted here was detrimental to the clerks of the court. The Minister questioned what I was saying and he claimed that only recommendations had been made. He did admit, however, that there were moves afoot to remove the right of appeal, but he said that this was still under consideration.

That was contrary to the remarks in a monthly meeting notice put out by the Stipendiary Magistrates Association, which was in these terms—

“At a meeting with the Board—that is, the Public Service Board—it was revealed that the Board had decided in August last that there would be no ‘right of appeal’ to appointments to the Magistracy and this will be achieved approximately a fortnight after the new Award is promulgated by an Order in Council.”

I ask honourable members to note that that was in October 1978. Now, over six months later, we have the regulations tabled in this Assembly.

The whole procedure should be questioned. We should question how bureaucracy can initiate law in this way, and how we, as an Assembly, have no say over it. It certainly raises a question about the whole decision-making process because it tends to place the bureaucracy above the Parliament. Instead of the Public Service being an instrument for delegated authority, the Parliament itself

becomes subordinate to the Public Service. It seems to me that Parliament and Cabinet can sometimes be a little more than a rubber stamp.

I know that this matter is of concern to other honourable members. Certainly it has been of concern to Opposition members. I am aware that Government members have raised this matter with the Minister for Justice and, I believe, the Premier. Unfortunately, no move was made to change it. We therefore have no alternative to moving for the disallowance.

It is our opinion that the regulation must be set aside. It is a pity that we cannot move for the setting aside of only those two parts, that is, Divisions II and III of the magistracy. The way the rules work, we have to move in Parliament for the disallowance of the total regulation.

We are interested in ensuring equality of opportunity for clerks of the court throughout this State. As honourable members realise, this is a career for many dozens of men who are prepared to take on country service, that is, do the country circuit. The removal of this right of appeal places at risk their ever becoming magistrates. It also leaves the Government open to criticism on the ground of providing jobs for the boys. It destroys the career concept of the C.P.S. Some of our public servants who entered the C.P.S. service have spent 10, 15 and 16 years gradually gaining expertise to make them suitable as magistrates. They have acted as magistrates for a long period of time. I should think that they are the more suitable people to carry out this role.

Originally, two proposals were put forward. The first was to open the floodgates for appointments and the second was to remove the right of appeal. Cabinet changed the first part in that it closed the gate in many ways on those who could become magistrates. But it certainly has not removed this anomaly. Some 113 clerks will therefore continue to study. I point out that 49 of them are already solicitors. They have completed their studies and gained their qualifications. They have spent many years in country areas but they may never get a chance to become magistrates. The incentive is gone. In fact, it will become a deterrent to service in country areas. These officers may as well act like so many others and remain in Brisbane because the requirements are that a man get his legal qualifications and spend five years in the service and thus become eligible for appointment.

A typical example of what is happening concerns the most senior clerk of the court who was bypassed when the last three or four appointments were made. It has been suggested to me that his chances of entering the magistracy are very slim.

I have heard the argument advanced that we need to broaden the realm of people from which magistrates are selected, but do not destroy the incentive that exists. Let the

Government ensure that the people who go into these areas and devote many years of their lives to serving the State are compensated in some small way. If the right of appeal is taken away, incentive is removed, and the men who have done so much for the State and for country areas and small towns will be beaten by political appointments. That is what it will boil down to. It will be an avenue for men who have never left Brisbane. A man will say, "I would rather stay in Brisbane. Why bother to go to country areas? Why serve on the circuit? I may as well stay in Brisbane, get to know the departmental heads and the Ministers because the day will come when appointments are to be made and I will be number one."

Mr. Gygar: Don't you support the concept of magistrates being judicial officers?

Mr. WRIGHT: What a stupid question! I saw in the Press that the honourable member stated that he had no legal knowledge. I understand why he made that admission.

I am surprised at the silence of some Government members on this issue. I should think that National Party members especially would be prepared to take a stand. It is difficult to understand how they can condone the change. It is difficult to understand how they support a regulation that is pro-Brisbane and anti-country. The aim in this Assembly ought to be to maintain an equality of standard of service. This can be achieved if the status quo is preserved. The remote areas must have the same advantages as the cities and other populous areas. So this regulation should be opposed. The right of appeal is a protection for the clerks of the court, it is a protection for the community and it is a protection for the magistracy. I know it is theoretical, but it is possible for a person to come virtually straight out of university with a degree, do five years in the service and then become the top magistrate in the State. That is wrong.

Mr. Lickiss: You don't want to see any outside appointments at all?

Mr. WRIGHT: No, that is not right at all. I accept the need for broadening the entrance possibilities of people. In fact, it is A.L.P. policy that that be done.

Mr. Lickiss: You would take anyone from the legal profession anywhere?

Mr. WRIGHT: No, we are not saying that. I believe it has to be broadened. However, it comes back to ability, qualifications and also the experience that a person has gained, and not to political appointments. That is what this does. That is the whole essence of the debate here. By removing the right of appeal, the Minister is preventing the person who has had the experience, who has spent time in the bush, who has faithfully served the State, the Government and the people for 15 or 16 years, from getting his due reward. The

Government is ensuring that the political appointment will prevail. For that reason, the regulation ought to be opposed.

Dr. Scott-Young: What do you mean by "qualified"?

Mr. WRIGHT: The qualification is academic, theoretical, but there is also the viewpoint of practical experience.

Dr. Scott-Young: You would agree that anyone passed by examination, say, as a solicitor—

Mr. WRIGHT: No. Surely a person on the bench must have academic qualifications—but he must also have some experience and practical qualifications. Under the new rule, we will have magistrates appointed who have never been near a courtroom before. They will not have had any experience whatsoever.

Mr. Lickiss: How?

Mr. WRIGHT: Because of the Minister's qualifications under the regulations.

Mr. Lickiss: Why don't you read them?

Mr. WRIGHT: I have read them. If the Minister had read them, he may not have been beating about the bush when I raised this matter back in October. The Minister did mislead the House on this issue. He made out that it was only under consideration; but the whole thing was well in train. He knew exactly what would happen. The Public Service Board had met in August, yet in October he was saying that nothing would occur. The regulation should be disallowed.

Mr. FOURAS (South Brisbane) (11.48 p.m.): I am pleased to second the motion of disallowance of regulation 127 (D) under the Public Service Act 1922-1978. As stated by the Opposition spokesman for Justice, this regulation deals with the removal of the right of appeal against certain appointments within the Public Service. The Opposition is seeking total disallowance because the regulation includes the positions of Stipendiary Magistrate Division II and Stipendiary Magistrate Division III among positions not subject to appeal. We have no objection in respect of other positions listed in the regulation.

The Opposition supports the proposition that very senior positions in the Public Service should not be subject to appeal. However, the new regulation will make it virtually impossible for most clerks of the court to become magistrates. I ask why this Government has withdrawn the right of appeal for magisterial positions. When appointments are made in the Public Service, it is on the basis of efficiency first. Then, if two applicants are of equal efficiency, seniority is taken into account. The basis of the whole appeal system is the selection of the most capable person for the job.

As the member for Rockhampton has just said, the Government has made the positions of stipendiary magistrates not appealable in order to provide jobs for the boys, jobs for public servants who are currently employed in cushy jobs in Brisbane and who have not travelled throughout the State as acting magistrates. Many clerks of the court have now qualified as solicitors. I think the member for Rockhampton gave the number as 49. Most received those qualifications after many years of part-time study. If this new regulation is not disallowed, it will make the hard study and the many years of country experience—some 10 to 15 years for some of them as acting magistrates—totally worthless. I believe that this regulation, if not disallowed will remove the incentive for Magistrates Courts officers to improve their qualifications and even stop people from undertaking a clerk of the court career. Moreover, it will probably discriminate against them, shattering their hopes and aspirations.

I should like in passing to comment on the refusal of this Government to institute a system of service-wide assessment, contrary to recommendations by the Public Service Board. I wonder why this Government, which is so keen on efficiency and choosing the right person for the job, has refused to accept the recommendation of the Public Service Board to have service-wide assessments. This would have dovetailed very well with the new Public Service appeal system.

Why not allow appeals against promotions to the position of magistrate? I should like this Parliament to be told the reasons and then be given the opportunity to consider this regulation. If the explanations are reasonable—and I doubt whether we will get very much in that line—perhaps honourable members could make up their own minds. I am concerned that this Parliament will rubber-stamp an Executive decision, or a decision taken by bureaucrats, that is against the interests of a particular group of people.

As I said before, Opposition members realise that certain positions in sensitive areas, such as the positions of directors and under secretaries, which carry the classification I-23, should not be appealable, but I have not been convinced of any reason why Magistrates Division II and Magistrates Division III should be included.

I ask all honourable members opposite to consider whether we have been placed in a fairly fortunate situation. It is because and only because all of the regulations covering appealable positions were to be changed that this one was even gazetted as a regulation, which gave members the right to have a look at it and move for its disallowance, as the Opposition spokesman did. The opportunity arose only because all of the others were brought in as one amendment. But for that, this change could have been made in a way that would not

have required it to come before Parliament as a regulation. It is because it came out as a regulation that we were given the right to move for its disallowance and debate the matter tonight.

I ask all Government members to think about this and to consider whether they want to give the Executive or the bureaucracy the power to make these rules for no reason whatsoever. As I said, we support the right to have certain non-appealable positions. We see no reason why Magistrates Division II and Division III should be in that category. I ask all Government members to give serious consideration to this motion for disallowance.

Mr. KATTER (Flinders) (11.53 p.m.): I should like to comment briefly on the charges made by both A.L.P. members about appointments and political patronage and point out, for the benefit of the House, as I understand it, that the honourable member for South Brisbane was appointed, as a prominent A.L.P. man, to the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing in this State. So much for political appointments. I think we can be very proud that politics has not entered into most appointments that we have made.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. KATTER: There is no implication that there is a minority to which that does not apply. All I am saying is that I know that in most of them it did not. I know that. I do not know about the others. I put forward as evidence of our fairness the A.L.P. member himself who preceded me in the debate. It is a very good example of how fair we have been in making appointments.

I should like to agree with the honourable member for Rockhampton about equality of opportunity but, unfortunately, of the number of clerks of the court in Queensland, I have known four myself. One I would describe as a drunk. One was told that criminal charges would be levelled against him unless he resigned, and he agreed to resign. The third was a notorious womaniser. The fourth was an inveterate illegal gambler. In those cases the people were not evil in the sense that they were doing things that were wrong, but they were not suitable people for such appointments. I do not think that any honourable member on either side of the House would agree for one moment that they were suitable people to judge their fellow man. They could not be put into that position.

To stop them from going forward became a very difficult task without bringing up these facts about their private lives. We are changing the system in such a way that such things will not come forth. I think that members of the Opposition have to agree that that is more than a reasonable proposition.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. KATTER: What they are saying is that everytime we want to stop a person from taking such a position we must come forward and present this evidence. If we do this, we destroy not only their careers but in many cases their family lives as well, and we also take their jobs away from them. Surely what is prescribed is a far kinder way of going about it.

The honourable member for Rockhampton stated that it is A.L.P. policy to widen the base from which magistrates are drawn. He and his party have advocated that magistrates be drawn from a wider base than the ranks of clerks of the court. I must object strongly to that sort of move. Many of us on this side of the House made very strong representations to the Minister for Justice to prevent him from doing what was stated by the honourable member for Rockhampton as A.L.P. policy, that is, drawing magistrates from outside the area from which they are presently drawn. I would be very disappointed if any A.L.P. Government moved in that direction.

For those who are not familiar with the role of clerks of the court, I will explain what I mean. I think that if anyone wants to sit on the bench as a magistrate in this State, he should have some sort of experience of the type of life and conditions that exists on the other side of the Great Dividing Range, away from the big cities. That is an extremely valuable and important background which is needed by clerks of the court in order eventually to be appointed to the magistracy.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. KATTER: I disagree strongly. A large number of magistrates are appointed in this State every two or three years and they are drawn from a relatively small group of people, only about 100 or so. So I would agree with the honourable member for Rockhampton in his remarks about the tremendous job that clerks of the court have done in country areas. Therefore I cannot understand why he would call for a widening of the base from which magistrates are drawn.

Mr. Wright: Would you take an interjection?

Mr. KATTER: No. The honourable member has had his go, and he can have another go later. I think that any person who is appointed as a magistrate in Queensland should have had some sort of experience of life in the smaller communities on the other side of the Great Dividing Range. Under no circumstances whatsoever should anyone be appointed to the magistracy without having that sort of background knowledge. I would like to state my wholehearted and total opposition to the A.L.P. policy of drawing magistrates from outside the ranks of clerks of the court.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (11.58 p.m.): I would like to say a few words before the Minister for Justice has his final say. To me as a citizen of this country, the removal of a right of appeal is a detrimental step for democracy. I cannot agree with this proposal at all. Irrespective of whether or not a man has been a clerk of the court, if he applies for promotion and is refused he should have the right of appeal. There is no position in the Justice Department or any other Public Service appointment I know of, to which the right of appeal does not apply. I think this is a detrimental step for democracy in this State and I cannot be party to it.

[Wednesday, 18 April 1979]

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (12 midnight), in reply: I never cease to be amazed lately at the way in which A.L.P. Opposition members can back themselves so easily into a corner when they are marching forward to try to score political goals. I will start with one example given by the honourable member for Rockhampton when he said just recently that the senior clerk of the court had been passed over and the system had broken down. Let me remind the honourable member that it is correct to say that the senior clerk of the court was passed over when recent appointments were made, but all officers promoted were clerks of the court who had served in many centres outside Brisbane.

Mr. Wright: But 10 of your applicants came from the Solicitor-General's Office.

Mr. LICKISS: And not one of them got the appointment.

Mr. Wright: It doesn't matter; that's this time around.

Mr. LICKISS: Let me just comment on that profound statement made by the honourable member. There has been no broadening of the base, and had we done nothing those 10 people could still have applied for the position of magistrate because they had had five years' experience in the Magistrates Courts service. The honourable member should back down now because he is wrong, as he was the other night.

An Opposition Member: And this morning, too, I suppose you mean.

Mr. LICKISS: And again this morning he was wrong. It is quite obvious that the honourable member does not want to hear the truth. He has made a statement, and now I am going to make a fool of him. The Industrial Commission granted increases in magistrates' salaries, which became effective from 2 July 1978. Because of the large increases granted by the commission, Division I magistrates received a salary which automatically places them in the category of positions in respect of which there is no right of appeal.

An Opposition Member: There is no argument about that.

Mr. LICKISS: I thank the honourable member. This is provided for under Public Service regulation 127 (D) (a) (i).

The recommendation of the Public Service Board to remove the right of appeal was approved by the Governor in Council on 19 October 1978. The right of appeal has been taken away from Division II and Division III magistrates because virtually all positions of similar classifications in the Public Service that is, I-18 and above, have no right of appeal. The honourable member did not make mention of that.

For the information of honourable members who know Public Service ratings, a Division III magistrate, as far as the Public Service is concerned, rates between a I-18 and a I-19; a Division II magistrate rates between a I-20 and a I-21; and a Division I magistrate rates between a I-23 and a I-24.

This was done to ensure that the most efficient officer is appointed to the position. It was noted from the many representations received that everyone is in agreement that the office of stipendiary magistrate is an important position with responsibilities that require a specially qualified person.

The duties and responsibilities of a stipendiary magistrate are such that it is essential that these positions be filled by persons with particular abilities, and I am sure that the honourable member would not deny that. It was considered that the present restrictive qualifications cannot adequately cover all of the attributes required for professional positions of this standing. Previous appointments of stipendiary magistrates show that in almost all cases the senior officer has been promoted. In no other branch of the service does this occur. In fact, it is contrary to Public Service regulation 105, which provides that seniority applies only when equal efficiency is involved. Maybe honourable members opposite would like to change that and make seniority, not efficiency, the prime requisite for higher appointment.

Mr. Jones interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: That is what the Opposition is saying. That is what the honourable member said here, when he was taking away the right of appeal.

The right of appeal was removed not to prevent any efficient officer of the Magistrates Court from being promoted but to ensure that inefficient officers are not promoted simply because they are senior. In view of the finding of the Industrial Commission—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: They will squeak more in a minute.

In view of the findings of the Industrial Commission that the functions of a magistrate are predominantly judicial, and in view

of the important position that magistrates hold in the community, this proposal must lead to a raising of the status of magistrates. While I am the responsible Minister, that is what I will be looking for.

The honourable member will be aware that the Government is not restricted in the appointment of judges to the Supreme and District Courts. I am sure that all members of the House will agree that the appointments so made ensure the highest standards in dispensing justice throughout the State. This is very important. An efficient Magistrates Courts officer should have nothing to fear in the system. The experience gained as a clerk of the court and in acting as a stipendiary magistrate will be a factor for consideration when vacancies are being filled.

For the information of honourable members, the filling of positions in respect of which there is no right of appeal is a matter for the Public Service Board. I am confident that the board will ensure that no section of the Justice Department will receive preferential treatment when vacant positions in the magistracy are being filled.

Mr. Fouras: What would an appointed magistrate have to fear if he had to go through an appeal? Explain that to us.

Mr. LICKISS: I can see why the honourable member is embarrassed. He is sorry that he had to second the motion. Frankly, I am surprised that the honourable member has expressed such concern for the future of officers of the Magistrates Courts service, because this concern strikes me as being completely out of step with the draft policy approved at the recent A.L.P. conference held in Rockhampton.

In case the honourable member is not aware of the policy of his own party, the A.L.P., I shall quote an extract from it—

“At the level of the Magistrates Court, we believe that, in addition to legally qualified members of the Justice Department,”—

and the honourable member is complaining now because certain members of the Justice Department were not members of the Magistrates Court service and could have been taken into consideration—

“there should be appointed lawyers of appropriate experience from outside the Public Service.”

Mr. Wright: That is right.

Mr. LICKISS: For a start, there would be no right of appeal if they are from outside the service. It goes on—

“Lawyers from private practice have experience and independent attitudes that will enhance the reputation of the Magistrates Court Bench.”

So in fact, even if there are worthwhile people in the service, the A.L.P. will take them from outside the service to broaden the base of the Magistrates Court service.

Mr. Wright: There will be a right of appeal, won't there?

Mr. LICKISS: The honourable member is condemning himself outright in the motion that he has moved.

Mr. Wright: No.

Mr. LICKISS: On the one hand, he says that there should be a right of appeal; on the other hand, he would set up a system that would prevent a right of appeal.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: It is no good the honourable member trying to worm his way out of it. The A.L.P. policy, if implemented, would set up a system that would prevent a right of appeal by making outside appointments to the service.

Mr. Wright: Wrong!

Mr. LICKISS: I leave it to honourable members to judge for themselves how genuine the honourable member for Rockhampton is in moving this motion and how genuine the honourable member for South Brisbane is in seconding it. Conversely, in view of the fears expressed by the honourable member, I suggest that he does not understand what is A.L.P. policy. As spokesman—or magsman—for the Opposition on Justice matters—

Mr. Jones: That is very unparliamentary, coming from the Minister for Justice.

Mr. LICKISS: I should say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if one looks at the contribution of the honourable member for Rockhampton this evening it will be obvious that it is not the contribution of a statesman; so it must be the contribution of a magsman.

The A.L.P. states clearly in its policy that it would make appointments to the Magistrates Court service from outside the Public Service, from the legal fraternity in private practice. I say again that the only people now eligible to be appointed as magistrates must come through the Magistrates Court service. To be eligible to be appointed a magistrate in Queensland, a person must have served at least five years in the Magistrates Court service.

The question of the right of appeal—

Mr. Wright: That was not what you were proposing.

Mr. LICKISS: I am telling the honourable member what the law is.

Mr. Wright: I know, but what were you proposing before you had to withdraw it?

Mr. LICKISS: Oh!

Mr. Wright: Tell us. Come on!

Mr. LICKISS: May I give the honourable member a bit of advice? On a number of occasions he has made statements that he believes are winners for the A.L.P., and he has flopped on every one. May I advise him to recoil into his seat and go to sleep? From a Justice point of view, the A.L.P. would be better off if he did that.

In trying to argue, for political purposes, that it wishes to preserve the right of appeal, the A.L.P. has shown quite clearly that it wishes to destroy the Magistrates Court service and make outside appointments so that there will be no right of appeal, which will leave the way open for those about whom they are worried—their own political appointees.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Wright) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

In division—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! If the honourable member for Chatsworth is not suitably attired by the time the division bells stop ringing, he will have to leave the Chamber.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am doing the honourable member for Chatsworth the courtesy of telling him while he still has time to do something about it.

AYES, 21

Burns
Casey
D'Arcy
Davis
Douras
Gibbs, R. J.
Hansen
Hooper, K. J.
Houston
Kruger
Milliner
Prest

Scott
Shaw
Vaughan
Warburton
Wilson
Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:

Jones
Mackenzie

NOES, 49

Akers
Austin
Bertoni
Bird
Bishop
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Camm
Doumany
Edwards
Elliott
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby
Greenwood
Gunn
Hartwig
Hewitt, N. T. E.
Hodges
Hooper, M. D.
Innes
Katter
Kaus
Kippin
Knox
Kyburz

Lane
Lec
Lester
Lickiss
McKechnie
Miller
Moore
Müller
Neal
Newbery
Porter
Row
Scassola
Simpson
Sullivan
Tenni
Tomkins
Turner
Warner
Wharton
White

Tellers:

Ahern
Gygar

PAIRS:

Blake
Underwood

Campbell
Bourke

Resolved in the negative.

The House adjourned at 12.18 a.m. (Wednesday).