

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 9 AUGUST 1979

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 9 AUGUST 1979

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. S. J. Muller, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**SUGGESTION OF DISCOURTESY TO LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION; ERROR IN VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS**

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members, it is suggested that I ignored the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday when he sought to congratulate me following my elevation to this office. If this was the case, it was inadvertent and I regret it.

Another matter has been brought to my attention. It is the clerical error in the proof Votes and Proceedings for Tuesday, 7 August 1979. This proof is always a draft copy, which is checked by the clerks the following morning for accuracy. Any reference to congratulations being offered to me by the Leader of the Opposition was corrected early Wednesday morning in the revised Votes and Proceedings.

COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER OATH

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to issue a Commission under the public seal of the State empowering me to administer the oath or affirmation of allegiance to such members as may hereafter present themselves to be sworn, which I now ask the Clerk to read to the House.

Commission thereupon read by the Clerk.

THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that, following the vacancy occurring through the retirement of Mr. George Wyborn, who occupied the position of The Clerk of the Parliament, that office has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Alan Robert Woodward, lately Clerk-Assistant.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Whereupon Mr. Woodward, having produced his Commission, took the oath of allegiance and the oath of office.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF REDCLIFFE

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received the following letter from the Honourable James Edward Hiram Houghton, member for the electoral district of Redcliffe:—

“59 Dover Rd.,
“Margate,
“7-8-79.

“The Hon. Speaker,
“Parliament House,
“Brisbane.

“Dear Sir,

“I hereby resign as Member for the Electoral District of Redcliffe from today on account of health reasons.

“Yours faithfully,

“J. E. Houghton,
“Member for Redcliffe.”

SEAT DECLARED VACANT

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

“That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Redcliffe hath become and is now vacant by reason of the resignation of the said Honourable James Edward Hiram Houghton.”

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GYMPIE

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received the following letter from the Honourable Allen Maxwell Hodges, member for the electoral district of Gympie:—

“August 8, 1979.

“The Honourable the Speaker,
“Queensland Parliament,
“Brisbane.

“Dear Mr. Speaker,

“I hereby tender my resignation as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland representing the electorate of Gympie as from today.

“Yours sincerely,

“A. M. Hodges,
“Member for Gympie.”

SEAT DECLARED VACANT

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

“That the seat in this House for the electoral district of Gympie hath become and is now vacant by reason of the resignation of the said Honourable Allen Maxwell Hodges.”

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

CHANGES IN MINISTRY

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.8 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that, on 1 August 1979, His Excellency the Governor—

- (a) accepted the resignation tendered by the Honourable Allen Maxwell Hodges as a Member of the Executive Council of Queensland, effective on and after 31 July 1979;
- (b) accepted the resignation tendered by the Honourable Allen Maxwell Hodges as Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism of Queensland, effective on and after 31 July 1979;
- (c) by virtue of the provisions of section 8 of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896-1975, authorised and empowered the Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm, Minister for Mines, Energy and Police, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance, on and from 1 August 1979 and until 24 August 1979.

I lay upon the table of the House copies of the Queensland Government Gazettes (2) of 4 August 1979, containing these notifications.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the Queensland Government Gazettes on the table.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Public Accountants Registration Board of Queensland, for 1978.

Under Secretary for Mines, for 1978.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977 and the State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1978.

Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977 and the State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1979.

Wivenhoe Dam and Hydro-electric Works Act 1979.

Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977 and the Petroleum Act 1923-1976.

Forestry Act 1959-1979.

Orders in Council under—

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1979 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979.

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1979.

Queensland Film Industry Development Act 1977.
 Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1978.
 Harbours Act 1955-1979.
 Grammar Schools Act 1975 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979.
 The Rural Training Schools Act of 1965 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979.
 Griffith University Act 1971-1977 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979.
 City of Brisbane Act 1924-1977.
 Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1976.
 Forestry Act 1959-1979 and the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1976.
 Forestry Act 1959-1979.
 Barrier Fences Act 1954-1978.
 Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act 1944-1978.
 Water Act 1926-1979.
 River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1977.
 Industrial Development Act 1963-1979.
 Valuation of Land Act 1944-1977.

Regulations under—
 Public Service Act 1922-1978.
 Queensland Marine Act 1958-1975.
 Harbours Act 1955-1979.
 Fish Supply Management Act 1972-1976.
 Fire Safety Act 1974-1976.
 The Fire Brigades Act 1964-1977.
 Mining Act 1968-1979.
 Local Government Act 1936-1979.
 Noise Abatement Act 1978.
 Main Roads Act 1920-1979.
 Libraries Act 1943-1979.
 Cremation Act 1913-1978.
 Health Act 1937-1978.
 Valuers Registration Act 1965-1979.

By-laws under—
 Harbours Act 1955-1979.
 By-law No. 12 of the Queensland Institute of Technology.
 By-law No. 4 of the Board of Secondary School Studies.
 Amendment of By-laws Nos. 1, 2 and 9 of the Queensland Agricultural College.
 Amendment to By-law No. 2 of the Oakey Creek Water Board in accordance with the provisions of subsections (vi) and (vii) of Section 26 (1) of Part III of the Schedule of the Water Act 1926-1979.

Statute in pursuance of The University of Queensland Act 1965-1973.
 Rules under the Police Act 1937-1978.
 Notification under the Diseases in Timber Act 1975.

Amendment of The Education Regulations of 1971.

Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 2 August 1979, containing a Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor, notifying and declaring that in respect of a Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly of Queensland intituled "A Bill to amend the Queensland Marine Act 1958-1975 in certain particulars" and assented to by His Excellency on 20 April 1979. Her Majesty has signified Her pleasure that the Act may come into operation.

SESSIONAL ORDERS

RINGING OF BELLS FOR DIVISIONS AND QUORUMS

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

"That during the remainder of this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders, when a division is demanded or a quorum is required to be formed, the division bells shall be rung for a period of four minutes."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

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

"That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding the provision of Standing Order No. 68, questions may be asked by members without notice being given. The period allowed each day for the asking of questions upon notice and without notice and for the answering of questions shall not exceed one hour: Provided that this period shall terminate at 12 o'clock noon on the days allotted for the discussion of matters of public interest."

TIME LIMIT OF SPEECHES

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

"That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the following amendments to the times allowed for certain speeches shall apply:—

(1) Under Standing Order No. 37A (Disallowance of Proclamations, Orders in Council, Regulations or Rules):

Mover of the motion, fifteen minutes; seconder of the motion and any other member, ten minutes; Minister in reply, twenty minutes. Total time allowed, two hours.

(2) Under Standing Order No. 109 (Time Limit of Speeches):

(a) Paragraph 4—In Committee on a Bill, Motion or Estimate—substitute ‘ten minutes’ for ‘fifteen minutes’.

(b) Paragraph 8—In Committee on the introduction of a Bill—substitute ‘twenty minutes’ for ‘twenty-five minutes’.

All other provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 37A and 109 shall continue to apply.”

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.20 a.m.): I desire to speak in relation to the motions that the Premier is moving, which refer to many of the Standing Orders of this Parliament. They are motions that we have had brought forward at the commencement of a session year after year.

I would specifically like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it is incumbent on all of us to ensure that we do something about tidying up the tattered Standing Orders of this Parliament. Questions without notice are the subject of one of the motions before the House—

Mr. Porter interjected.

Mr. CASEY: I think the honourable gentleman should refer to Standing Orders. It is competent for any member to speak on any motion before the House. The Premier has moved several motions, having received the leave of the House to do so. As yet none of them has been voted on by the House, and I am speaking to those motions.

Mr. Porter: None of them has yet been put.

Mr. CASEY: Mr. Speaker, I think you are fully cognisant of the matters I am raising and my right to do so.

The Standing Orders Committee has not met since 1973. On the last occasion it met it made a recommendation to the House that resulted in a motion similar to the one put to the House this morning on the incorporation of questions without notice in the normal business of the House.

On each occasion we meet following the prorogation of the Parliament such motions are brought forward. Surely it is a simple matter to convene a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee and then for that committee to make a recommendation to Parliament by way of a substantive motion, and so clear these matters right off the books once and for all. Questions without notice have now become an established practice. The whole idea of these motions is to enable members to indicate whether these are changes they desire. I think that Parliament has accepted that the incorporation of questions without notice in our procedures was a very necessary change. After five or six years of operation of this practice, it is surely time that we made official provision for questions without notice in our Standing Orders. We

should bring them up to date in that way. While they are so outdated it is necessary at the commencement of each session to have such motions moved.

Back in the early 1970s it was decided that the debate on Matters of Public Interest was a practice that we should examine. That was decided following a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee in those days. That debate has now become standard practice. It is one that we have tidied up a little. Two or three years ago the motion was first moved to provide that question-time should cease at 12 noon on those days when Matters of Public Interest were before the House. That again, is an established and accepted practice. However, year after year we have this motion being moved. The truth of the matter is that this is being done because the Standing Orders Committee has not met for six years. The last occasion it met was in October 1973. In the last 15 years it has met on only six occasions. That is the problem that faces us when such matters come before us.

As to time limits of speeches—sessional orders providing for alterations to time limits have been agreed to for some years. In spite of that, year after year such a sessional order is brought forward at the commencement of the session. We follow this tedious course in an attempt to establish a practice that will be followed during the session—or, should I say, re-establish the practice that was followed in the previous session, the one before that and the one before that. Why are the altered time limits of speeches not included in our Standing Orders permanently? Why are the members of the Standing Orders Committee not called together to resolve that matter once and for all?

In the previous session, experiments were conducted in relation to the ringing of the division bells. As an experiment, when the first division on any day occurred the bells were rung for seven minutes and on any subsequent division they were rung for two minutes. The Premier has now moved a motion that will mean that the bells will be rung for four minutes on all divisions. Before that procedure is accepted as standard practice, the Minister for Works and Housing should look at the problem arising from the operation of the lifts in this building. On Tuesday, at least one of the lifts was out of action all day and it was very difficult for members to move easily from one portion of the building to another in carrying out their duties as members of Parliament. Of course, this is in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and you will have to seek the co-operation of the Minister for Works and Housing to overcome the problem.

In your new role you will have to look at matters such as that and the manner in which, year after year, the same motions are brought forward. This has arisen, of

course, because the members of the Standing Orders Committee have not been called together to present recommendations to the Parliament.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (11.27 a.m.): As the Leader of the Opposition has opened up this subject, I believe that someone on this side of the House should point out publicly what is transpiring in relation to his recent actions. It is obvious to me and, I am sure, to all members on the Government side that as the session goes on we will hear more of this crying from the Leader of the Opposition. He is trying to find any little excuse for picking on you, Mr. Speaker, in your new role, and on the Government's actions.

I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition has become the political sook of this Parliament. For months on end he complained about his accommodation in this building. All he succeeded in doing was harming himself. He complained that his office was inadequate—he was not satisfied with his office in Watkins Place—and that his bedroom was not big enough. He complained that he was not able to rise and congratulate you on your election to the high post of Speaker. That is the action of a political sook, and that is what the Leader of the Opposition is. Why doesn't he stand up like a man, as his predecessor and the hard-headed politicians on the Opposition side did? He has shown that he is like the little boy who says, "If you don't let me bat all the time, I'll take my bat and ball and go home." The Leader of the Opposition is the cry-baby of this Parliament. He is a great political sook, and we are sick to death of his behaviour.

The motion moved by the Premier to limit speeches will guarantee that we are able to put through more business and get on with the business of government. It will streamline our procedures. The Leader of the Opposition should apply himself to that matter instead of getting up and wiping away the tears every time someone on this side of the House moves.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (11.29 a.m.): I had no intention of entering this debate. I do so to point out to the honourable member for Merthyr that it was the Premier who first tried to confuse the House and you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lane: Have you got to protect Mr. Casey? Can't he stick up for himself? We know he is inadequate in his job, but you don't have to protect him all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will cease interjecting.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member would know that a member cannot rise to speak twice in the same debate. That is why the Leader of the Opposition has not defended himself, as he is quite capable of doing.

The position is that the Premier asked leave of the House to move a motion without notice and that leave was given. He moved the motion but it was not put to the vote to have it decided one way or the other. Next he proceeded to give notice of a motion, which will be moved in a fortnight's time. After that he proceeded to move other motions without notice, all of which concerned the operation of this Parliament. As I see it, the Leader of the Opposition let those go believing that a vote would be taken on them, because they concern a debate that will be proceeded with later today. It is also apparent that the matter of questions without notice will be dealt with within the space of a few moments. Therefore, it is necessary that these matters be decided by the House here and now. The Premier proceeded correctly, I believe, in asking leave to move a motion without notice. However, he then proceeded to another matter entirely. I think I am right in assuming that it was a condolence motion. Anyway, he proceeded on a matter other than the issues we are talking about.

I believe the Leader of the Opposition was quite right in asking for your leave, Mr. Speaker. You obviously knew that he was correct in doing so, because you allowed him to proceed and, as well, you allowed me to proceed. I now support the suggestion that a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee is necessary. In 1973, when the Standing Orders Committee recommended that the matters now before the House be proceeded with as sessional orders, that was done on the understanding that it would be a trial to see whether they worked. If they did work, it was understood that the Standing Orders Committee would meet again and would formally put to the Parliament that they be included in Standing Orders.

As the Leader of the Opposition has just said, surely a period of six years is sufficient to show whether or not they work, and I reinforce his request that the Standing Orders Committee meet so that Standing Orders can be put in order. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that would make your task of conducting and controlling this House in the public interest a reality.

Motions (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the constitution of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, the receiving of Resolutions on the same day as they shall have passed in those Committees, and the passing of an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day."

Motion agreed to.

DEATH OF HON. SIR HAROLD RICHTER

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.33 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Honourable Sir Harold Richter, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland and a Minister of the Crown.

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

The recent death of Sir Harold Richter, a very distinguished former Minister and former member of this House, brings down the curtain on the career of a man who was in the public eye for a great length of time—indeed, for most of his active life. He was certainly a close friend and associate of very many of us who are in the Chamber today. I myself had a very high regard for and a close association with the late Sir Harold over many years. He was elected to the House in the general election of 3 August 1957 and on 27 August was sworn in as a member of the Nicklin Government. He had been a member of the now National Party for 15 years before winning the then seat of Somerset. He had been State President of the National Party and previously vice-president for four years.

His active political life attracted him to district politics and for six years he was a successful chairman of the Boonah Shire Council, relinquishing that position in 1952. He was also a member, president, and past president of the Boonah Rotary Club. For 13 years he was president of the Boonah Show Society. Indeed, during his residence at Boonah, he held positions in practically every public organisation, including the Chamber of Agricultural Societies, of which he was an executive member.

On 28 April 1961, Sir Harold won a ballot to fill the Cabinet vacancy caused by the death of the late Mr. L. H. S. Roberts and was sworn in on 4 May 1961. He was an excellent Minister for Public Works and Local Government and held that position until 1963, when he became Minister for Local Government and Conservation.

Owing to ill health, he resigned his portfolio in 1969 and remained a member of the House until he retired in 1972. He was knighted in 1971 for services to the public.

He was born near Boonah and was educated at the Ipswich Grammar School. He lived in Ipswich from 1958 and, with the

help of his two sons, built a very successful agricultural, manufacturing and engineering business.

Sir Harold was a man of the people. He was always approachable and friendly, as all of us remember quite well. He was a man of tradition and a typical Queenslander. He was a great innovator and his engineering works, established at Boonah, saw the development of much agricultural equipment that has been used in pioneering development in South-east Queensland. This business has been carried on by his sons in the great family tradition.

Everyone could depend on his word. He contributed much to this Parliament and the successful development of Queensland during his period of service here and during his lifetime. He was a very great Queenslander and he worked hard for this State and on behalf of the Government. I pay a deep tribute to his years of service to the people.

Sir Harold died at his Coorparoo home on 18 June last, aged 73 years. He is survived by his widow and four children. His death comes as a shock to all who knew and respected him. On behalf of the Government and, I am sure, of all members in this House, I take this opportunity to extend my own personal regrets and the condolences of this House to the family of the late Sir Harold Richter.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.37 a.m.): I join with the Premier in expressing sympathy at the passing of a great Queenslander and a distinguished former Minister and member of this Parliament. It is a sad fact that, at the start of each new session of Parliament, we often find ourselves paying our last respects to former members. Sir Harold Richter passed away after having made a significant contribution to the State that he loved, as the Premier has indicated.

I first met Sir Harold as a young man, and even then was impressed by his obvious sincerity and interest in, and concern for, people. Whilst I was not a member of the Parliament at any time while he was a member, I know that he was respected as both a member and a Minister.

My initial impression was confirmed over the succeeding years, during which time Sir Harold made his mark as a hard-working Minister of the Crown and an effective member for his area. He was a most successful member and Minister, just as he was successful in any of the other endeavours in which he became involved. A measure of that success was the high regard and esteem in which he was held by his colleagues and others who came to know him. During his lifetime he displayed qualities which rightly earned him the affection and admiration of fellow Queenslanders.

Today we pay tribute to him and the service he gave. Today we record our gratitude for the years of service Sir Harold Richter gave in this Parliament and to this State. On my own behalf and that of the Liberal Party, I extend our sympathies to the family of this fine Queenslander. Sir Harold Richter will be sadly missed in this State.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.39 a.m.): I join with the Premier and the Deputy Premier in this motion of condolence. I first met the late Sir Harold Richter, even before I entered local government, when he was Minister for Local Government. I always found him to be very co-operative and helpful and a person who would sit down and listen to a point of view expressed by someone else. It was on my election to local government in the mid-1960s that I found out how well respected he was throughout the length and breadth of the State by people who were connected with the various local authorities.

Sir Harold was a man who served his party well. I understand he was the State president of the Country Party at one stage prior to his entry into Parliament as a member of that party. After having served as a Minister for a number of years, he stood down at a reasonable age to allow others to take over. He was prepared to speak out on matters that were of concern to him, and I can well recall his coming down here to Parliament House after he had retired to listen with keen interest to the debate on the City of Brisbane Act, because he was very alarmed at some of the principles contained in that Act. He served only three short years as a backbencher after having resigned from the Ministry owing to ill-health. I did not have a great deal of personal association with him, but on behalf of Her Majesty's Opposition I join with this motion of regret and sympathy to Sir Harold's relatives.

Mr. GUNN (Somerset) (11.41 a.m.): I would like to associate myself with the condolences already extended to Lady Richter and members of her family. Sir Harold Richter held the seat of Somerset prior to my election in 1972. He was a successful businessman prior to entering politics and had established a reputation for his farm machinery, which was manufactured in Boonah. In fact, Richter machinery is still being manufactured there today, and is well respected not only throughout Australia but in many overseas countries.

Sir Harold was just as methodical as a member of Parliament as he was as a businessman, serving his electorate extremely well. As a Minister of the Crown, Sir Harold excelled himself, but unfortunately, as very often is the case, the burden affected his health and he was forced to retire from politics in 1972.

I wish to pay a special tribute to Sir Harold on behalf of the electors of Somerset. Despite the fact that he was noticeably ill at that time, he came to me and offered his services in my first election campaign. In fact, he assisted at a few of my meetings at the beginning of the campaign. On behalf of the electors of Somerset I extend to Lady Richter and her family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Greenslopes) (11.43 a.m.): In the latter days of Sir Harold's career he took up residence in the graceful suburb of Coorparoo, and it was there, as a constituent as much as a Minister of the Crown, that I came to know him better, and his good wife as well. Upon their retirement they involved themselves in community affairs. Sir Harold's good lady, in particular, became very active in the Red Cross Society. She was always a wonderful stalwart of Sir Harold's. She and he endeared themselves to the many people who came to know them in the Coorparoo district. I think it is appropriate that on behalf of their many good friends in the Coorparoo district I should associate myself with the sentiments of this motion.

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

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (11.45 a.m.): I lay on the table of the House the Fifth Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland and move that it be printed. The report is with the Government Printer and will be available at midday on Tuesday, 21 August.

Whereupon the document was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

I wish to advise the House that the Select Committee on Education has today resolved that copies of certain organisational and public submissions, together with the record of public hearings, should be placed in the John Oxley Library for general access. This will be effected as soon as possible. Original submission material will, of course, be retained in the Parliamentary Archives.

PETITIONS

COMMONWEALTH FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DRAINAGE AND FLOOD-MITIGATION WORKS IN SUGAR DISTRICTS

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) presented a petition from 23 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will move through the Premier to approach the Prime Minister for financial assistance for major works of drainage and flood mitigation in the sugar districts of Ingham, Tully, Innisfail, Cairns and Mossman on

the basis of a Federal grant to match the State Government's contribution of 40 per cent of the cost of the capital works involved.

Petition read and received.

MANUAL ARTS AND HOME ECONOMICS GRANTS

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) presented a petition from 67 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will (1) Take such action as to ensure that the manual arts and home economics grants are paid to Special Schools immediately; and (2) Make provision that these grants are paid in full for the current year.

Petition read and received.

FERTILITY CONTROL CLINIC, BRISBANE

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) presented a petition from 910 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take strong and definite steps to prohibit the operation of a so-called fertility control clinic in Brisbane whereby a doctor flies each week from Melbourne to perform abortions on demand with the assistance of Queensland doctors.

Petition read and received.

FUNDING TO STATE SCHOOLS

Mr. WARBURTON (Sandgate) presented a petition from 20 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will restore the real level of funding to State Schools to at least the level of 1974-75, to provide sufficient funds to ensure adequate class sizes; to allow necessary building and maintenance works in all Queensland schools, and to ensure that provision for capital works be increased to a level not less than allocated in other States.

Petition read and received.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

KNIGHTHOOD OF SIR JUSTIN HICKEY

Mr. CASEY: I ask the Premier: Did the citation relative to the recent knighthood of Sir Justin Hickey on the recommendation of the Queensland Government refer to his generous support for charities and his contribution to the business world and, if so, what has been the extent of his support to Queensland charities and how long has he been directly engaged in business in Queensland?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It surprises me that the honourable gentleman should make some suggestions about appointments made by the Queen. Such appointments are carefully checked to determine what any particular person may or may not have done.

It is not for me to elaborate on anything that any particular person may or may not have done. All I am prepared to say is that this man has been an outstanding Queenslander. He has contributed tremendously to the State in a whole host of ways. He lives in Queensland.

The Leader of the Opposition knows very well that he would never have any hope of qualifying for such honours.

Mr. CASEY: Further to the Premier's comments, I direct another question to him without notice.

In view of the fact that Sir Justin Hickey's family company, Accident Insurance Mutual Ltd., is a registered company in New South Wales, that his registered residential address with the New South Wales Companies Office has been and was at the date of his company's last return 20 Willoughby Road, Castle Cove, Sydney, and that as at 1 January 1979 Sir Justin Hickey was enrolled as a voter in the State electorate of Willoughby in New South Wales and the Federal electorate of North Sydney, can he advise the House of the special qualities possessed by Sir Justin Hickey over and above those of many businessmen who have been continuous residents of Queensland and whose companies are registered in this State and who have contributed completely and utterly to the advancement of the State of Queensland, that prompted his Government to recommend him for a knighthood over and above his fellow Queenslanders?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I said before, he is a Queenslander. He has his address in Queensland. He has a home at St. Lucia; he has a home on the Gold Coast; he is here continually; he was here yesterday; he lives in this State.

It is amazing, and indeed petty, that the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to ask questions on matters of this nature. We know that his party is completely opposed to the bestowing of knighthoods. That has been demonstrated time and time again.

A Government Member: They kicked John Egerton out.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes.

Certainly the Leader of the Opposition has done his party no good by attempting to make an issue out of this matter. One thing is certain: in contributions to the State, Sir Justin Hickey has far exceeded anything the honourable gentleman might ever achieve.

Mr. CASEY: I direct a further question without notice to the Premier. Perhaps he will answer this one. How much has Sir Justin Hickey or his associates or his companies contributed to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It would be very interesting to ask a few questions about the honourable gentleman's own financial transactions and the debts he left around the State before he opted out of his company. It would be much more to the point to know what debts he has throughout the State. People are still asking him to pay what he owes, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

On the basis that the ordinary weekly wage for the Government's 147,000 employees is \$185 a week, I estimate that these two proposals would cost Queensland taxpayers an extra \$5,600,000 a year. Private enterprise would soon be forced to follow suit.

My personal feeling is that this gives a totally new meaning to "feather-bedding"—buying votes at any price.

LABOR POLICY ON PATERNITY AND MATERNITY LEAVE FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. KAUS: I ask the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services: Has he studied the promise in the A.L.P. 1979 Policy Handbook to implement paternity and maternity leave for public servants under a Labor Government, and can he tell us how much this would cost Queensland taxpayers?

Mr. LEE: I have already had discussions with the honourable member. He told me he would be asking this question, and I therefore took the liberty of preparing an answer.

My simple answer is, "Yes". In its 1979 Policy Handbook, released a week or two ago, the A.L.P. declared it would introduce one week's paid paternity leave for any Government employee required to care for a wife and/or children prior to, during or following a confinement.

It also said it would grant maternity leave up to six months in any one year to a Government employee, with positions left open for three months after the confinement, such period of absence to be taken into consideration for the purpose of calculating long service, annual and sick leave entitlements.

The A.L.P.'s 1979 Policy Handbook states that leave conditions for Queensland Government employees will be progressively improved by introducing one week's paternity leave for any employee who is required to care for a wife or a child prior to, during and following confinement and by granting maternity leave up to six months in any one year for an employee. A period of six weeks shall be the period taken into consideration for the purpose of calculating long service leave, annual or sick leave entitlements. Study leave of not less than one week per annum will be granted to employees selected by their union to attend approved study courses. In certain cases leave may be extended and paid up to six weeks per annum. It goes on to say that the A.L.P. will ensure that all Government employees have approved periods of leave of absence, including accident pay, counted for purposes of long service, annual and sick leave, such periods not to extend beyond six months at any one time.

FINANCING OF JULIUS DAM PROJECT

Mr. BERTONI: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of an offer by Mount Isa Mines to provide an additional \$600,000 over the next five years to help the Mt. Isa City Council meet its financial commitments towards the Julius Dam project, on the condition that some contribution be made by the city council and that further assistance be forthcoming from the State Government? As the city council has prepared its budget, except in relation to water rates in the coming year, when can it expect an answer to its submission to the Government on this important issue?

Dr. EDWARDS: I have received submissions through the Premier from the Mt. Isa City Council. As I indicated in the previous session following urgent and continued representations by the honourable member, for a lengthy period the Julius Dam project has been a source of concern to the Government, to the Mt. Isa City Council and to the honourable member for Mt. Isa. Of particular concern are the payments that must be made concerning this important water supply.

If I recall correctly, the Government has made contributions in the vicinity of \$11,000,000, Mount Isa Mines has contributed in the vicinity of \$15,000,000, and it has now made an offer to the council of a further \$600,000 over a period of five years. The council has the responsibility to service a loan of something in the vicinity of only \$4,200,000. In its letter to the Premier it makes no firm commitment as to its own requirements to service this loan. Recently the Queensland Government made a further grant to the Mt. Isa City Council of \$150,000 and on that occasion the council agreed that that would be the last time it would seek assistance from the Government.

I want to place on record before this Parliament and the people of Queensland that prior to the city council election the Mt. Isa branch of the Labor Party campaigned on the basis that it would not increase water rates charged to the people of Mt. Isa even by 1c. Of course, the Labor Party won the election. That means that water rates were not increased and the Labor-dominated council has committed itself to imposing no further increase. This is typical of the irresponsibility shown by the Labor Party in economic matters. The

Mt. Isa people have a responsibility. They honoured that responsibility in the past, but the council refused to face up to its responsibility after the Government and Mount Isa Mines made major financial contributions.

Mr. Yewdale: What about big Mal?

Dr. EDWARDS: It is all very well for the honourable member for Rockhampton North to say, "What about the Federal Government?" The Federal Government has contributed towards this. What did the Mt. Isa council do? It used the money in a different way by making interest payments instead of directing it towards capital repayments. So the honourable member for Rockhampton North must share the blame—

Mr. Yewdale: How many promises has the Prime Minister made?

Dr. EDWARDS: One can barely have sufficient tolerance to bother with interjections from the honourable member for Rockhampton North, who continually whinges and wails. The disease of whingeing and wailing of the Leader of the Opposition is contagious. The member for Rockhampton North has now become the second cry-baby on the other side.

I would like to place on record in this Parliament that the honourable member for Mt. Isa has been very diligent in his representation to assist the people of Mt. Isa. Had it not been for his representation, this very generous offer of Mount Isa Mines would not have been forthcoming. I assure the honourable member that we are preparing a letter at the moment for the Mt. Isa council, which the Premier and I will be forwarding to it, requesting the council to indicate its responsibility in this matter. As soon as we have a definite indication from the Mt. Isa council about its grave responsibility towards payment of the remaining funds, the Government will decide what action it will take to assist the people of Mt. Isa. I deplore the attitude of the Mt. Isa Labor Party. I am sure the response of the people in that area will be an expression of confidence in the member for Mt. Isa at the next election.

LEGALISATION OF NEW FORMS OF GAMBLING

Mr. HOUSTON: I ask the Premier: Is his Government now considering legalising new forms of gambling in this State and, if so, what are they and how will they operate?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition continues to be hopeful. He is an old hand at this type of question. He ought to know that the Government does not speak about policy matters. The policy of the Government on this and all other issues will be announced at the appropriate time. He will have to contain his curiosity until then.

Mr. Houston: Disregarding public opinion and public debate, of course, is a well-known Government activity, but I will try to obtain an answer from the Minister for Works and Housing.

LIFTS IN PARLIAMENTARY ANNEXE

Mr. HOUSTON: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Why are the lifts in this building so inefficient? As they are inefficient, will he tell us what his Government is doing to make them operate more effectively so that they can service this Parliament correctly?

Mr. WHARTON: It is most difficult to hear today. However, over the rabble I did hear the honourable member say something or other—

Mr. HOUSTON: Mr. Speaker, I repeat the question "over the rabble", as the Minister has suggested. I ask the Minister for Works again: Why are the lifts in this building so inefficient? What action has he taken to make sure that their efficiency is improved so that they can adequately service this building for members and the public?

Mr. WHARTON: I thank the honourable member for repeating the question. It is typical of the Opposition—another cry-baby story. They are worrying about a lift to the top, a lift down, or something else. Even the Leader of the Opposition wanted a lift down from his office. He has a driver and an office. He has everything laid on, yet he keeps making requests. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is performing in the same manner. However, let me say this to him: surely he is not so naive as to think that we would install lifts and not attempt to have them fixed. They are mechanical devices and their operation takes more than the flick of a switch. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I understand, is an electrician or something of the kind, but much more than his qualifications is needed to rectify the problem. We have men working on the lifts to see that they are operative. This is a very new building and obviously the new lifts will malfunction and require attention. Their operation is through an electrical current to a computer. Mechanical faults occur, but they are likely to occur in any building.

I assure the honourable member that the matter is in hand. Mechanics have been trying to overcome the problem. It has been fixed. Fortunately, not every day is like yesterday, when hundreds of people were using the lifts. We have endeavoured to make the lifts serviceable for the benefit of the people here, and we will continue to do that. If there are any problems, we will fix them; we will not go to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

NOISE NUISANCE, BRISBANE AIRPORT

Mr. HOUSTON: I ask the Premier: In regard to the building of the new Brisbane airport, what action has been taken or what representation has been made to the Federal authorities by his Government, to ensure that the residents of the Bulimba, Lytton, Wynnum and other electorates concerned are not subjected to the present noise nuisance emanating from the airport?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I can appreciate the honourable member asking a question about noise at the airport, but there has to be an airport somewhere. Top officers of the Queensland and Commonwealth Governments have put a great deal of time and effort into attempts to solve this problem. Many visits have been made to the area and many surveys have been carried out of the area. I have been out there with these people, in helicopters and so on, trying to find the best approach for aircraft so as to disturb the people as little as possible. We must recognise that these officers have had this problem in mind in designing the new runways. We can be very thankful that the runways are to be extended to allow more people to be flown into the State.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr. Whitlam promised it in his day and, like so many of his promises, it did not eventuate. We did not expect his promises to eventuate. We knew they would not. He even offered \$150,000 to save the Bellevue. That did not come about, either, and none of the Labor Party members opposite contributed anything at that stage. That is very typical of them.

CATTLE TICKS, ISISFORD AND BLACKALL SALEYARDS

Mr. TURNER: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Is he aware of the reported discovery of cattle ticks at the Isisford and Blackall saleyards? As this constitutes a serious threat to the cattle industry in Central and Western Queensland, what steps are being and will be taken to control and eliminate this outbreak?

Mr. SULLIVAN: The honourable member did draw to my attention the fact that there had been an outbreak of ticks in the Blackall area. Officers of the Division of Animal Industry were having discussions yesterday with stock inspectors in the area. When cattle were being tested for brucellosis, the ticks were found on a property that is in clean country. From what I know at this stage, the cattle came from tick-infested country. Some cattle from this property have been sold through the Blackall saleyards, and this will necessitate at least a spraying of the saleyards. There may have to be a quarantine period, and this is being

determined by senior officers of the Division of Animal Industry this morning. So some time this afternoon I will be able to tell the honourable member the recommendations that have been made.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SUBSIDIES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Mr. YEWDAL: In asking a question of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer him to the provision of subsidies to local authorities that provide public transport. I instance the Brisbane, Townsville and Rockhampton City Councils. It is my understanding that in the case of Brisbane and Townsville a subsidy of some 50 per cent is paid on revenue produced by these services, but in the case of Rockhampton only 30 per cent is returned to the Rockhampton City Council. Can the Treasurer explain the reason for what appears to be discrimination against that council?

Dr. EDWARDS: I cannot give the honourable member an explanation or even say whether his facts are correct. If his facts are correct I cannot tell him the reason behind the arrangement, but I assure him that I will have an investigation made and write to him as soon as possible.

PRESS RELEASES BY MINISTER FOR INDUSTRY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Mr. YEWDAL: In asking a second question of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I draw his attention as the Leader of the Liberal Party in Parliament to a rather childish method being used by the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services when sending Press releases to members of Parliament. The Minister concerned has apparently instructed his Press secretary to exclude the name of all Opposition members from statements pertaining to their electorates, but in the case of Government electorates the Minister always states that he has advised the local member. Is the Deputy Premier prepared to have a talk to the Minister concerned and have him made conversant with the rules of common courtesy?

Dr. EDWARDS: This is another case of crying by the Opposition. I wonder whether we should bother answering such facetious questions. It is very pleasing for me to hear the Opposition suddenly taking an interest in the Government's activities. I am delighted to hear this expression of interest because it is obvious that at last the Opposition is starting to recognise the Government's performance. If the honourable member for Rockhampton North is so interested in the Government's activities, I will be delighted to make certain—

Mr. Yewdale: Why is it that all your other Ministers bar that one extend the courtesy?

Dr. EDWARDS: Again, if the honourable member will let me speak, he might be able to get the question answered. I would be very happy to send to the honourable member a recent Government publication which outlines its activities in the State so that he, along with every other Queensland, will be informed about the Government's activities in the State.

NORTH QUEENSLAND FUEL SHORTAGES

Mrs. KIPPIN: I ask the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services: Can he outline the endeavours being made by his department to carry out a surveillance of the fuel situation in North Queensland? What action has been taken to help alleviate the shortage of fuel in this area?

Mr. LEE: I share the honourable member's concern about the shortages that have occurred in North Queensland. The Department of Industrial Development is constantly holding discussions with the oil companies in an endeavour to eliminate some of the trouble spots.

When distillate was in very short supply, we did make arrangements with the Navy to get some 3 000 tonnes of it. When the tanker "Leonard" arrived in Cairns the other day with some 3 200 tonnes of distillate, of course the Navy wanted its fuel back. When the honourable member telegraphed me or spoke to me about this matter, I immediately took it up with the Minister for Defence, the Honourable Denis James Killen, and, as a result of negotiations of the Department of Industrial Development with the Navy and the Minister for Defence, we secured 1 800 tonnes of distillate for Cairns. That will alleviate some of the shortage problems. Another tanker is due in Cairns on 27 August, and I think that that will alleviate all the distillate shortage problems in the district.

As regards Avgas and other fuels—this Government has arranged for a 40 000 tonne tanker to travel backwards and forwards to the North, free of cost to anybody, so that the North can get Avgas at all times.

THE QUEENSLAND FLAG

Mr. LESTER: I ask the Premier: In view of the Queensland Government's favourable reaction to my suggestions about the promotion of the Queensland flag as something of which to be proud, and of the general acceptance of the flag by the public, would he be happy to back my call to Queenslanders to avail themselves of the opportunity to use Queensland flag car-stickers, luggage-stickers, etc., and Queensland flag T-shirts, which I have had made? I ask this question in view of the fact that the Commonwealth Games are coming and in particular to remind all of us in Queensland that we are Queenslanders.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I must give the honourable member great credit for promoting Queensland, particularly our flag. He has been well to the fore in this regard. Many years ago when I became Premier, I had a large flag painted on the tail of our aircraft. I was the first person in Australia to do that. Today, flags are painted on the tails of many hundreds of aircraft throughout Australia.

I certainly compliment the honourable member on what he has done in this regard, and suggest that many people should do what he suggests, that is, fly the Queensland flag, have it on display. I point out for his information that I have acquired a large Queensland flag and a flagpole. I am going to fly one at home. If the honourable member comes to my place, he will feel very happy indeed.

RUSSIA'S REFUSAL TO PARTICIPATE IN RESCUE OF VIETNAMESE REFUGEES

Mr. HARTWIG: I draw the Premier's attention to an article in yesterday's "Courier-Mail", written by Australian journalist John Hoffman from Peking, in which he stated that China had damned the Soviet Union because it refused to join the international refugee rescue operation of Vietnamese, which is an act of humanitarianism. The article went on to say that 100,000 had drowned or died at sea and thousands were still struggling in that part of the ocean, and it then said—

"More than a million people have been driven out of Vietnam at the orders of the Hanoi authorities . . ."

I now ask: Has he heard of the Australian Labor Party condemning Communist Russia for its attitude?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No; to the contrary. A.L.P. members have complimented the Hanoi Government again and again and supported it right through the war period. They sat in the streets, demonstrated against our side of society, and supported Hanoi. They have continued to support the Communists completely and utterly and never once have they come out condemning Hanoi, nor, indeed, has the Soviet Union.

Mr. Casey: Do you support the Peking line?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable gentleman says that he is supporting the Peking line.

Mr. Casey: I asked whether you support it.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I did not know that he had switched from the Soviet line to the Peking line, and I am very interested to hear him say that he is now behind the Peking side of that philosophy.

GOVERNMENT JURISDICTION OVER QUEENSLAND
WATERS

Mr. JONES: I ask the Premier: What was the outcome of the deliberations at the Premiers' Conference and of the Commonwealth-State agreement at Emerald regarding the jurisdiction and geographical areas defined within the Great Barrier Reef and other matters concerning the waters off the Queensland coast?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The answer to that question would be a long one. If the honourable member had watched television or listened to the radio, he would know that the Prime Minister and I signed an agreement and undertaking in relation to the protection of the Great Barrier Reef and in relation to the parts that the respective Governments are to play. I think that the honourable member is aware of that and at least knows that the State Government is very much to the fore.

Mr. Jones: Is the detail of it to be brought back to this House?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The detail has been published and printed. I do not know whether the honourable member wants it published in "Hansard" or where he wants it published. For goodness' sake, read the newspapers; you will see all about it in the newspapers.

OVERFISHING OF TRINITY BAY

Mr. JONES: I ask the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police, who is acting as the Minister for Marine Services and Tourism: Has his attention been drawn to the charges of overfishing within Trinity Bay, particularly in the Cairns inlet area? If so, will he advise whether any inquiries have been made in this regard that may or may not substantiate the concern for the marine life there? If not, will he have immediate investigations undertaken with a view to protection of that fishery?

Mr. CAMM: I have already had discussions, and officers are looking at the whole question of fishing along the Queensland coast—not only in relation to overfishing in the Trinity Bay area but also in relation to amateur and professional fishing in Queensland coastal waters.

A.L.P. POLICY ON WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. LANE: I ask the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services: Does he support the A.L.P.'s 1979 policy declaration for worker participation in Queensland firms and Queensland industry? Can he tell us how much it would cost to put into effect the decision of the A.L.P. at its Rockhampton conference in February this year that in Government it would actively

encourage the development of industries owned and/or controlled by workers on a co-operative basis?

Mr. LEE: I support it only inasmuch as it has resulted in some South Australian firms moving here lock, stock and barrel, and an increasing number of others are making inquiries from my department with a view to moving here to get away from the dead hand of worker participation. We could expect a similar reaction from Queensland firms if they, too, were forced into a programme of workers' councils, as planned by the A.L.P. here according to its 1979 handbook.

I should point out that there is nothing in our Constitution to prevent an A.L.P. Government in Queensland from nationalising industry. That is something that we on this side of the House strongly oppose because it erodes private ownership and allows workers who have put no money into an enterprise to participate in policy decision-making in which they may have no expertise. We prefer worker consultation, not worker participation.

I do not know how much it would cost for the A.L.P. to institute workers' councils in Queensland, but I believe that the cost in lost jobs and lost contracts alone would run into millions of dollars a year.

A.L.P. POLICY ON LONG SERVICE, ANNUAL
AND SICK LEAVE FOR GOVERNMENT
EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANE: I ask the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services: Can he tell the House how much extra it would cost Queensland taxpayers if the A.L.P. ever became able to put into effect the policy decision arrived at at its 1979 Federal Conference in Rockhampton to ensure all Government employees had approved periods of leave of absence, including accident pay, counted for the purpose of long service, annual and sick leave, etc., provided such periods did not extend beyond six months at any one time?

Mr. LEE: I estimate that, with 225,000 males and 121,000 females under State awards, including semi-Government employees, the extra cost to taxpayers would be \$12,500,000 a year.

DEMONSTRATION INVOLVING VIETNAMESE
REFUGEES AND BRISBANE WHARF
LABOURERS

Mr. VAUGHAN: I ask the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police: Is it a fact that police who were on duty at the Vietnamese demonstration last Monday night were directed not to prevent the Vietnamese from proceeding with their demonstration? If not, why did the police not intervene when

it was seen that the Vietnamese demonstrators were carrying kung fu sticks and other weapons and that serious violence would result? Has an investigation been ordered into the lack of action by the police officer in charge when he was requested to intervene? If no such investigation has been ordered, and in view of the concern that is felt by Queenslanders about the violence that erupted, will he order an immediate investigation into the incident?

Mr. CAMM: I can understand of course why the member for Nudgee is taking the side of two Communist union officials from Vietnam.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise to a point of order. That statement is offensive to me and grossly untrue and I ask that the Minister withdraw it.

Mr. CAMM: I will accept the fact that the honourable member does not agree to the visit to Queensland of two Vietnamese union officials.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise to a point of order. I asked that the Minister withdraw his former statement and I now ask that he withdraw his second statement. That is not a correct interpretation of my comments.

Mr. CAMM: I will withdraw both statements. For goodness' sake, why doesn't the honourable member make up his mind and show us how he feels?

In answer to the question—a disturbance or a confrontation did occur at the wharf labourers' club; two groups of people, one on one side of the road and one on the other side of the road, were hurling abuse at each other. I dare say the honourable member was in this Chamber when police were standing on the veranda of the Parliament House building and listening to abuse from a group of people and unionists who marched down George Street and stood on the other side of the street. If we had requested the police to arrest those people, we would have been accused of interfering with the liberties and rights of the individual.

Those two groups were occupying the footpaths in that area. They were not disrupting traffic. Violence eventually erupted when they both moved on to the street. Police intervened and arrested people from both sides. I understand that a beer can was thrown and a girl from the side where the Vietnamese were standing had her head cut. The beer can came from the other side. The police do not know who threw it. That was one of the things that sparked the confrontation.

Is the honourable member asking me as Minister for Police to tell the Commissioner for Police that, whenever people are on the footpath expressing objections, the police should move in and arrest them? From

my inquiries, I believe that the police acted with considerable restraint. They could have moved in earlier, but they waited until confrontation erupted into violence. They then moved in and arrested people from both sides.

ADDITIVES TO SAUSAGE MEAT AND MINCE

Mr. AKERS: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Has his department any control over the quantity or proportion of meat extender and water used by retail butchers in the manufacture of mince and sausages? Is it true that an extender with a soya bean base has to be combined with water in the proportion of 3 kg of water to 1 kg of solid? In view of the seriousness of accusations being made publicly, will the Minister undertake to have this matter investigated?

Mr. SULLIVAN: We do have a responsibility on the standard of sausage meat and mince. It is highly technical. I am not personally aware of the standard. If the question is placed on notice, I will have the matter investigated and then reply.

Mr. AKERS: I do so accordingly.

OPERATIONS IN PUBLIC HOSPITALS

Mr. HANSEN: I ask the Minister for Health: Are Queensland hospitals required to keep records of operations carried out in them? In particular, are records kept of the names of doctors carrying out the operations and the anaesthetists involved?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member is correct. Records are kept of operations performed in public hospitals, as well as details about them.

FLIGHT BY PREMIER AND OTHERS TO MELBOURNE

Mr. HANSEN: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer him to the "summit" meeting attended by him, Sir Robert Sparkes and others in Melbourne on Monday 30 July—the Monday after the Tasmanian elections. I now ask: Did those people travel in the Queensland Government's plane, who travelled with him to Melbourne and what was the cost?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I know that the honourable member will be severely disappointed, but I am sorry that I can't help about that. I do not think it is necessary to tell him who travelled with me, but for his edification I will tell him that I travelled in a private aircraft with other people.

PROPOSED OPPOSITION CHANGES TO
ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT

Mr. INNES: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Has he seen the Press reports by the Leader of the Opposition and the notice inserted in the Queensland Government Gazette by the honourable member for Rockhampton proposing changes to the Electoral Districts Act 1971-1977? Does he know whether the changes proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Rockhampton are in accordance with the publicly reported official A.L.P. policy on this matter?

Dr. EDWARDS: I have seen the reports in the Press and also the notice in the Gazette and I must say that I, along with many other Queenslanders and indeed many people within the Labor Party, am amazed that the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Rockhampton can claim to be following, let alone implementing, Australian Labor Party policy.

I was always of the opinion—and I think many people in the A.L.P. and in the unions were of the view—that the Australian Labor Party's policy and platform were determined at State conferences and that once they were adopted by the conference they were part of the A.L.P.'s platform and policy and were then binding on the A.L.P. parliamentary wing and caucus and also on the A.L.P. Leader of the Opposition. Apparently he is trying to give himself a good image in the community—to show that he is not part of that rabble and not part of the Left-wing organisation. He is trying to dissociate himself from these elements so that he can appear to be the good guy so far as the Labor part of the community is concerned.

Mr. Casey interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, could I seek your indulgence to ask the Leader of the Opposition to leave the Chamber if he intends to continue to murmur? With all due respect to him, I am sick and tired of his continual whingeing and attempts to destroy the dignity of this House. I offer him my handkerchief if he would like it, because all he has done since becoming Leader of the Opposition is whinge and cry.

I have it on good authority that the Leader of the Opposition's proposal is in direct contradiction of A.L.P. policy. In fact, I believe that he has been challenged by certain members in the Labor Party

because it does not reflect the wishes of the A.L.P. I understand that he has been charged and will be charged, and that the proposal is in breach of party policy. I believe that this is simply a political ploy to try to gain political mileage. It is indeed in conflict with Labor Party policy. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Rockhampton to make certain that they identify themselves as being separate from Labor Party policy so that the people of Queensland will know at last where they stand. All I see is a whingeing, whining, crying person who smiles when it suits him and is in conflict with his own party when that suits him.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr. INNES: I ask the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police: Can he assure the House that, firstly, retrospective increases in the cost of electricity used before the date of commencement of new electricity charges will not occur in the future when electricity charges are increased, and, secondly, that the system of averaged pro rata charging for power used before and after the date of the commencement of new electricity charges will be used for all future increases? In addition, can the Minister take steps to ensure, firstly, that in future notice will be given publicly, by means other than the Government Gazette, of any proposed increase, and, secondly, that computer programmes for pro rata charging will be developed forthwith by boards or the commission and will be available in the unfortunate and, one hopes, unlikely event of future increases in electricity charges?

Mr. CAMM: I think the honourable member is well aware that I did confirm these points with him when he visited me recently as part of a deputation. It is a fact that the policy that has been adopted by the distributing boards in Queensland in so far as an application for increases in electricity charges is concerned does contain a measure of retrospectivity. This was brought about quite a number of years ago on the recommendation of the major distributor of electricity in Queensland at that time, the Brisbane City Council, which requested that it be allowed to adopt this method. It suggested this because if in the future the charges were to be levied from a particular date, they would be far higher than they would be if there was some measure of retrospectivity involved.

At that time there were two systems open to the distributing boards. One was to fix a date and state that all electricity used after that date would be charged for at a certain rate. The second was to state that when all accounts were sent out on a certain date all electricity used from that account onwards would be charged for at a specified rate. As I indicated, the recommendation of some of the major boards, including the Brisbane City Council, was that the second option should be adopted. I saw the difficulty associated with this.

There is unfairness in both systems. However, it is a fact that all electricity meters cannot be read on the one day, so it is very difficult to assess when the increased electricity charges should apply. The difficulty was not so pronounced previously because increases were not of any great magnitude, but today, with inflation and costs rising as they are, the increases have become rather significant.

When we saw the problems associated with it, we introduced in the Electricity Act in 1976 a third alternative, that is, pro rata billing for the consumption of electricity. But this involves tremendous accounting problems and can be handled only by a board that has sufficient computer space to deal with it. At the present time, I think there is only one distributing board in Queensland which could handle a pro rata system of assessing electricity charges. One distributing board does not have a computer. Following the representations made at the meeting I had with the honourable member, I instructed the commissioner to advise the various distributing boards to work towards the introduction of sufficient computer space to enable a pro rata system of billing to be introduced following any future increase in electricity charges in Queensland.

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

GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that His Excellency the Governor, on Wednesday, 8 August, delivered to Parliament a Speech of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. I presume honourable members will take the Speech as read?

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

[*Sitting suspended from 12.56 to 2.15 p.m.*]

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (2.15 p.m.), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!", said: I move—

"That the following Address be presented to the Governor in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this, the second session of the Forty-second Parliament of Queensland—

'May it please Your Excellency:—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislature of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

'The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.'

I am very conscious and proud of the great honour conferred on me today in being requested to move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech of the second session of the Forty-second Parliament of the State of Queensland.

At the outset, let me congratulate His Excellency Sir James Ramsay on his statesmanlike address, one which not only portrayed very clearly the achievements of our coalition Government but also demonstrated many major projects that the Queensland coalition Government is committed to carry out for the benefit of Queenslanders generally. We are fortunate indeed that His Excellency and Lady Ramsay have travelled Queensland so extensively and shown tremendous interest in and concern for the people of this State. One of their first visits after taking office was to the Yeppoon/Capricorn Coast and to Great Keppel Island, and it was very much appreciated.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the office of Speaker of this House. I say to honourable members that I have been a close friend of Mr. Muller

for some time and I am sure that he will fill his high office with dignity and adjudicate without bias or favour.

In moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply of the second session of the Forty-second Parliament, I most humbly reaffirm the loyalty of all my constituents in the electorate of Callide to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Having entered Parliament in May 1972 as a representative of the Government, I take this opportunity to personally thank the thousands of people throughout my electorate who have continued to give me support, loyalty, and the privilege of serving them in this Assembly. I would like to thank particularly all members of my National Party organisation, including the Callide electorate chairman, Dennis Hinton, for their continued support and encouragement. The National Party is very strong and very active in Callide, where altogether there are 12 individual branches, and the people in those branches have been very loyal.

The electorate of Callide, like so many other electorates throughout this great State, can best be described as one in which we have witnessed tremendous growth and development. I can honestly say that my electorate is now going through one of the most exciting periods of development that has ever been witnessed in Central Queensland. We are about to see the commencement of the Queensland International Tourist Resort at Yeppoon, a tourist complex unique in its design and fascinating in its magnitude. The Iwasaki development is designed to become something greater than Disneyland or Disneyworld, and over the next few years the eyes of the tourist world will be focused on Yeppoon.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, unlike the two A.L.P. members representing Rockhampton seats, ignored the invitation to attend the opening of the Iwasaki project. Earlier this week he rose in this Chamber and spoke about unemployment in this country. A man is prepared to come here and employ thousands of people in this State, but the A.L.P. ignores his invitation. That indicates the attitude of the A.L.P. to the unemployment of the people of this land.

The rich Callide Valley, which surrounds the town of Biloela, shows evidence of prosperity and growth. The Capricorn Coast

and its offshore Keppel Islands have become a holiday mecca for tourists from all over Australia. Byfield, with its beautiful tropical fruits and softwood reforestation of some magnitude, is also a very important area. Rosslyn Bay Boat Harbour is becoming overcrowded and soon we shall need a much larger harbour. Our fishing and trawling industry has become a multi-million-dollar business, as has the pineapple industry.

What a wonderful, decentralised and vast State Queensland really is! I am not going to be accused of talking only about my own electorate. Let us talk about the State. We have a coastline of 5 200 km and land boundaries of 1 625 km with New South Wales, 630 km with South Australia and 1 045 km with the Northern Territory. We have a total area of 1 728 000 km², representing 22½ per cent of the total area of Australia. I remind honourable members that 54 per cent of this great State lies to the north of the Tropic of Capricorn, with a population of 2,200,000, including 24,414 Aborigines and 7,508 Torres Strait Islanders.

No doubt we are endowed with one of the greatest tourist potentials of any State, not only in Australia but anywhere in the world. Brisbane has a population of some 800,000. If we look further afield, we see that the Gold Coast has over 100,000; Townsville 91,000; Toowoomba 70,000; Rockhampton 54,000; Cairns 50,000; Mackay 44,000; Mt. Isa 26,000; Bundaberg 32,000; Maryborough 22,000; Gladstone 21,000. There are 10 cities with populations of over 20,000 outside the metropolis. No other State has such a record. Queensland is the most decentralised State in the Commonwealth.

At this stage I wish to pay a special tribute to a man who has done so much to make Queensland the greatest State in Australia today. I refer to the Premier, who has served this State so well as Premier over the last 11 years. As well as being the longest-serving Premier, he is truly a great Queenslander and leader. I also pay tribute to Mrs. Florence Bjelke-Petersen for the tremendous work she has done and the assistance she has given not only to the Premier but to all members of Parliament. I sincerely hope that the Premier will be spared to continue to give the State of Queensland the free enterprise and anti-socialist system of government by which the majority of Queenslanders have benefited so greatly.

I also pay tribute to the Deputy Premier, Dr. Llew Edwards, who has worked so hard with the Premier to give this Government solidarity and positive policies. I thank each and every Cabinet Minister for his assistance to me since I entered the Chamber eight years ago. As a coalition team, we have achieved so much for Queensland. We must let no man—or, for that matter, no woman—put this Government asunder.

I congratulate Max Hodges and Tom Newbery for stepping down from Cabinet to give some of us back-benchers a chance to serve the State in Cabinet. After all, I suppose it is the ambition of every back-bencher to serve in the Cabinet. The action of those two men has given us a ray of hope of making Cabinet. We acknowledge what those two men have given to Queensland while serving in the Ministry. I personally wish them both a happy retirement.

I pay tribute to the Clerk of the Parliament and his staff for the many courtesies extended to me. I also thank the librarians, who are so helpful, and the dining room staff under Miss Glennie, who also have done a marvellous job. I also thank the Hansard reporters under Baxter McCarthy's control, who are always very courteous. I also pay great tribute to my wife, Estelle, who is sitting in the gallery today, for her tolerance and assistance to me while carrying out my duties as a member of the Government. All wives of members play a very important role.

My wife and I extend our sincere sympathy to our friend the member for Redlands, Mr. Goleby, on the recent tragic loss of his dear wife.

The establishment of electorate offices was a great boon to members and the provision of secretaries has assisted members as it has their constituents to keep in contact with them.

During the past 12 months the most exciting thing in the rural sector has been the tremendous increase in cattle prices. I never thought that I would see bullocks sold for as much as \$800 a head, as they were over recent months. I have been associated with the beef industry all my life and in 1975 I sold bullocks with a cold weight of 700 lb. for \$84. One can only assume that between 1974 and 1978 millions of dollars were ripped off the beef producers by exporters who

manipulated the markets and supply, to the detriment of the cattle industry generally. Indeed it will take many years, perhaps generations, for some to recover. We are fortunate that grain prices have remained high and that the farmers have been blessed with good seasonal conditions.

I draw attention to the fact that yesterday members of the Cattlemen's Union attacked the National Party. They must have very short memories. What Whitlam did to the cattlemen was absolutely terrible; he ruined them. Yet today cattle prices are the highest ever received. I cannot understand how members of the Cattlemen's Union could condemn the National Party.

The cotton industry in Biloela is booming. This year's production is estimated at 17,000 bales and the return to the grower will be approximately \$200 a bale. Last year the industry was worth \$3,500,000 and the future looks even brighter.

Let me deal with the prices paid for grain in Central Queensland. The price paid for sorghum is \$69.60 per tonne, less freight to Gladstone; for sunflower, \$200 a tonne; for safflower, \$180 a tonne, for linseed, \$195 to \$200 a tonne; and for soya bean, \$220 a tonne. The "Queensland Grain Grower" of Wednesday, 27 June, contained a report to the effect that Australian standard white wheat had reached a record level of \$166 per tonne f.o.b. and that barley was quoted at \$125 a tonne. However rosy that may seem, farmers are continually being hampered by steep price increases for fuel, fertiliser and spare parts. They also have to contend with high freight rates, high taxation, high wages for employees and other high costs associated with general farm work.

I was pleased to hear the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Anthony, state only two days ago that the Federal Government would take immediate steps to ensure that supplies of distillate and petrol would be guaranteed to farmers to allow them to continue to grow and harvest their crops. Compare today's petrol price of \$1.39 a gallon, or 31.2c a litre, with 65c a gallon five years ago. It is rumoured that the price of petrol could reach \$2 a gallon by next Christmas.

Governments throughout the world are looking for alternative sources of energy. Nuclear power is the energy source of the future. Most Western industrialised nations will depend upon it to project them into the

21st Century. Queensland has the third-highest grade of uranium in the world and because of its large reserves it is well situated to take advantage of future energy developments.

Both Mt. Isa and Townsville are being looked at as sites for a uranium enrichment plant in Queensland. Today energy is necessary to fuel our technological society and to turn the engines of commerce. Politics and excessive prices are disrupting supplies of oil to the industrial West. The obvious solution is the development of nuclear power combined with the utilisation of our massive reserves of coal. It will soon be economically feasible to convert coal into liquid fuel and our Government is working on this at present.

Right now, nuclear power is one of the safest forms of energy available. A recent statement by Dr. Beckman showed that not one person had been killed by the peaceful use of nuclear power.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: What about the woman in America recently?

Mr. HARTWIG: What about the motor car? That is what the honourable member should be worrying about. Already this year, 340 people have been killed on Queensland roads.

Each year the generation of electricity by fossil fuels kills approximately 20,000 Americans through electrocution, air pollution, transportation and industrial diseases. The recent shut-down of an American nuclear plant resulted in no-one injured, no-one dead, no-one diseased. In fact, it was a nuclear success story. Development of uranium-mining must continue, and nuclear power for peaceful purposes must be an integral part of the future industrial development of the Western World.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Wolston should be in his correct seat if he wishes to interject.

Mr. HARTWIG: The socialists of this country, aided and abetted by the A.L.P., have been trying to sack our Premier over a number of years. However, without a shadow of a doubt, Joh Bjelke-Petersen will go down as the greatest Premier any State of this country has known. Just look at our impressive list of developmental projects:

Rundle shale-oil, the aluminium smelter at Boyne Island, Gladstone, Tarong Power Station, Burdekin Dam, Wivenhoe Dam, Norwich Park, Blair Athol, Oaky Creek, Gregory coal deposit, Cania Dam and all of our other water conservation projects. In fact, developmental expenditure, both private and public, will exceed \$15 billion this year.

Let us all remember that Queensland under its free-enterprise Government leads Australia in exporting cattle, sugar, coal, copper, aluminium and so on. In fact, we in Queensland have virtually everything necessary for our future security in energy, food and minerals. Because of this Government's policy of dynamic and secure development, investors both in Australia and overseas consider that Queensland is the safest place in Australia for investment. This Government stands for free enterprise. We believe that individual people and companies are selective when they invest in Queensland, and we give them maximum support and encouragement.

Where does the Labor Party stand in all this? We all remember the stagnation that occurred when Labor governed Queensland for 20-odd years, when we were known as the hick State of the Commonwealth. Queensland is unquestionably the lowest-taxed State in Australia. Taxation reforms initiated by this National-Liberal Government in Queensland have given the lead to the rest of Australia. The abolition of gift, probate and succession duties is the best known example. Road maintenance contributions were removed from 1 July this year. Queensland's motor vehicle registration charges are amongst the lowest in the Commonwealth.

Let me illustrate other facts and figures which serve to highlight the free-enterprise success story in Queensland today. The first is the foreshadowed complete removal of pay-roll tax. This will relieve tax on employment by private enterprise. Let Labor match that if it can. In this State—and let us compare this with the results in Labor-controlled States—we produce twice as much as we buy. The latest figures show a surplus of exports over imports of nearly \$2 billion annually.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Why don't you talk about the unemployment you have brought about?

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member voted against Iwasaki, a man who wants

to employ people. He shouldn't talk about unemployment. He ought to be ashamed of himself.

This State produced more than 23 per cent of the nation's export earnings. Five of Australia's six major growth centres are in Queensland.

An Opposition Member: You're wrong.

Mr. HARTWIG: That just goes to show the honourable member's mentality. Official figures show a population increase of nearly 2 per cent in this State, compared with a national average of just over 1 per cent. It is little wonder that people are pouring in from other States, bringing with them money and their families. Free enterprise belongs to Queensland.

I am adamant that continued excessive taxation imposed by Canberra is one of the main reasons for our economic ills and continued unemployment in this country today. Incessant demands by some unions for higher wages, which are continually being granted, resulted in the Federal Treasury being the main beneficiary. A general rise of 10 per cent in wages across the nation means an increase of 20 per cent in the revenue received by the Federal Treasury. At one time I believed Australians wanted success only from hard work and achievement. Our forefathers and pioneers did not seek hand-outs. We were a country of rugged individuals and were fiercely independent. At one time we were, but alas, today there is in this country a continual call by organisations, individuals and industry for Government financial assistance. Many people expect the Government to be a universal provider and if hand-outs are not forthcoming we are told that Government popularity is on the wane.

Unemployment benefits last year exceeded \$900,000,000. Not one cent of it was productive in any manner. In this year of 1979, at a time when we have more scientists, economists and academics, we seem to have sunk into the depths of the welfare State and we will have a tremendous job extricating ourselves from it.

It is the responsibility of Governments and private enterprise to create employment and a way of life for our people. Governments must rethink and restructure our whole taxation system. No worker, no businessman and no farmer should have to pay more

than 20c in the dollar in taxation. If people who work are not allowed to keep a reasonable amount of their income or reward for their labour, incentive is killed and the ambition of the individual is killed. The present excessive taxation policies that have been employed by Canberra Governments over recent years have been disastrous.

The simple fact is that people who work aim to make a profit. If that profit is taken away from them by taxation, we will never see the end of massive unemployment. Reduction of taxation and promotion of our free enterprise system, which have been strongly advocated by our Premier, must be our main priority.

The Labor Opposition, of course, is torn by recurring and continual internal strife and the destructive policies of the Communists, who play a significant part in this. Remember what happened in the streets the other day when Queensland was invaded by a couple of Commos from Vietnam. We have suffered from industrial lawlessness and blackmail over the past few months.

All the time that this was going on, the chief concern of the Leader of the Opposition was, "Where is my bedroom? Where is my office?" He was interested in his own personal comfort. That made the headlines in a Sunday paper when this nation was being held by the throat and we could not ring our neighbours. All that the Leader of the Opposition was interested in was, "Where is my bedroom going to be?" I would like to send him a dummy. He sat here like Senator Georges and Mr. Urine—I mean Uren—and the socialist trendies—

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the comment made about Mr. Uren, whom the honourable member referred to as Mr. Urine, be withdrawn. As a member of the A.L.P., I find that offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The correction was made by the honourable member.

Mr. HARTWIG: It was a typographical error, Mr. Speaker.

The Left-wing elements, such as Senator Georges and Mr. Uren, have been a great embarrassment to the A.L.P., which would like to divorce itself from them and get as far away from them as possible. But we have to watch these traitor-like industrial

strikes. They are like running cancerous sores. Those taking part turn off the power, close down the wharves and leave Telecom with no communication. There are strikes by the dozen. Everywhere we look and every day we pick up a paper we see them making headline news. I know that Communists manage many unions in Australia today. As everybody knows, most of the unionists in my electorate vote for me. There is no risk in the world that the union bosses belong to the Communist Party, which is determined to bring this great nation to its knees.

Premier Joh, the Cabinet and this coalition Government have news for the Mundeys, the Carmichaels, the Whitbys, the Kanes and their friends. The Queensland Government will not stand by idly like the Fraser Government and watch the majority of decent people being embarrassed, inconvenienced and forced to suffer financial loss from none other than Australia's Communist elements.

We have even had the sickening spectacle of Senator Georges and Tom Uren being arrested time and time again for breaking the law, with their fellow Senators Geitzel (Labor, New South Wales) and Ruth Coleman (Labor, Western Australia) being arrested with them. Let me remind Queenslanders that Australian taxpayers are paying the wages of these cranks and lawbreakers. They are paying their first-class air fares to Brisbane from as far away as Perth, Canberra, Melbourne and Sydney. I notice that Opposition members are now very quiet. These people openly defy the laws of this State. They are a disgrace to their fellowman. Georges and Uren have become almost an unbearable embarrassment to Ed Casey, Bill Hayden and the rest of the Labor Party. They are like leeches as far as the A.L.P. is concerned, unable to be removed, so that it is tainted by these fools who are openly hostile to our traditional democratic way of life.

This morning somebody asked a question about the Government's record in the area of national parks. In the establishment of national parks and in the area of wildlife management, the Government's record has been outstanding. Extreme conservationists label us as exploiters of the land at all costs, but the record shows the contrary. Since the National-Liberal Party Government established the National Parks and Wildlife Service in 1975, the area of national parkland in Queensland has been trebled. The funding provided for national

parks and wildlife management has also trebled. There are now nearly 400 national parks in Queensland, 170 of which are islands, covering almost 2 per cent of the State. I pay tribute to Mr. Newbery, the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation, who has been in charge of most of that development.

I would like to congratulate the Government on the balanced approach being taken to national park management. This is evidence of the Government's policy of creating national parkland. Where good grazing country is included in the park, and where it can be shown that cattle will not interfere with visitors or damage the park, these areas are leased for grazing. This ensures that there is productivity from areas awaiting future development as parks. It also ensures that local authorities are not deprived of rates.

An interesting development in wildlife management is deer-farming. The Government has now licensed nearly 40 farmers to farm red deer in the Brisbane and Mary Valleys. Although this infant industry was promoted during the recent period of rock-bottom prices in the beef industry, it will almost certainly become an established industry, producing live deer for the Australian market and velvet for export.

Much has been said recently about sex education being included in the curriculum of public schools in Queensland. I agree that we must look at this problem seriously, but too often I feel that we think of this education as a means of preventing child-birth and disease and encouraging abortion and the use of various contraceptives. That may be all very well, but I want to see our young girls of today become our mothers of tomorrow. I want them to be taught all the good things about motherhood so that they are encouraged to bear babies and rear decent young Australians.

While some half-baked professor is lecturing educated society to reduce our population to zero growth, the backward countries of Asia are teeming with millions of people and we now witness the situation of being silently invaded by thousands of Asians from our north. Why, it is almost the unique event today to see a pregnant woman. In 1972 the number of live births was 20.11 per 1,000 of average population. In 1977, that figure had fallen to 16.08, and in 1978 it had fallen to the lowest figure in Australian history

of 14.8 per 1,000 of average population. So while we exercise this attitude of almost zero population growth, the teeming millions to the north are coming to our vast continent; and short of war, we cannot stop them.

Why are these people leaving Vietnam? We are told they are paying gold to get away. Anybody who has travelled to those countries knows that these people are poorer than church mice. They are fleeing from the Communist rule in Vietnam, as I said this morning, and thousands are drowning on the high seas. They are trying to escape from those Communists, whom Opposition members support. They met some of them in Brisbane the other day.

It is time we had a long, hard look at our railway system. For the four years from June 1974 to June 1978, this State lost the staggering amount of \$389,861,705 on the railways of Queensland. Despite an improvement in earnings of over \$10,000,000 in 1977-78, our overall deficit was 33.46 per cent higher than for the previous year. The return from the carriage of coal, coke and other minerals increased by \$12,080,000 to \$144,000,000, representing 52.93 per cent of all revenue. Passenger traffic declined by 5.87 per cent in 1977-78 and contributed only 4.62 per cent of total earnings of the railways last year. In the same year, wages increased by \$22,675,000, and today wages for the railway system amount to \$242,000,000 a year. It is my opinion that no State can continue to lose this amount annually. The suburban railways should be taken over by private enterprise.

If we had spent that \$400,000,000 on the road system in Queensland, we would not be having the dreadful road carnage that we have on our roads today. During the last seven years, since June 1972, 3,888 Queenslanders have died in road traffic accidents and another 65,000 people have been seriously injured. On these revealing figures, motoring today should be regarded as a dangerous hazard.

Much has been spoken in recent months of the racing industry in Queensland. I refer particularly to the White Paper submitted by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, who is in charge of racing. I am adamant that we must appoint a Minister for Racing in the Cabinet. Racing today is a major industry and it cannot be treated lightly.

A few weeks ago I called a meeting in Rockhampton. It was well attended by representatives from 14 different race clubs.

I will be watching very closely any proposed changes to the racing system that are brought before this Parliament. Small country race clubs in provincial cities such as Rockhampton, Gold Coast, Toowoomba, Townsville and Mackay play an important role in the racing industry. Country race meetings and owners and trainers play an important part also. Bookmakers play a vital role in horse racing, trotting and greyhound racing meetings throughout Queensland. Prize-money must be increased for all races in the metropolitan area. People must be attracted back to the racecourses. We must provide better facilities for patrons. Major clubs, such as the Queensland Turf Club and the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club, could well look at allowing car parking inside the race tracks, as is done at all the major race tracks in Sydney.

Naturally, I, along with our Premier, Deputy Premier and all members of this Government, must be concerned at the proposal by both of our organisations for separate Senate tickets and three-cornered contests. Perhaps, unfortunately, we could call them three-cornered electoral conflicts. To me, and I am sure to thousands of Queenslanders, it is regrettable that the National and Liberal Parties did not amalgamate. I only ask for sanity from within our organisations. Three-cornered contests should be used only to defeat the Communists, not our own Government. Our sincere and purposeful aim must be to consolidate the maximum anti-socialist vote—to put individualism aside and do what is best for Queensland. We should impart confidence and reject socialist philosophies.

In summing up, I should like to make some comment on various controversial issues. Whilst they are my own personal opinions, I believe that in many instances some of these suggestions could be considered. Firstly, I believe that the Agricultural Bank should be expanded to become a bank of issue so that loans could be made available to our young people wishing to build homes on their own properties. It should also advance money for a much wider field of activities than is presently the case.

Secondly, I believe that we must look at two things related to railways. One is the cause of the millions of dollars lost annually by the Railway Department. I believe that the Railway Department has to go out and look for business. We could look at handing the railways over to private enterprise.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: Ask Alderman Sleeman how many millions of dollars is being lost on the Brisbane City Council buses. It is about \$4,000,000 a year.

I should like to see week-end penalty rates deleted in bona fide tourist employment areas.

I believe that there should be a reintroduction of national training for both males and females. In case of war, it is necessary that they be taught the meaning of discipline.

Instead of appointing Agents-General, I believe that roving Agents-General should be appointed, that is, astute men with business acumen who would seek markets for our products overseas and report back to the Government and marketing organisations.

Mr. Prest: Who would it be—Tom Newbery, Darcy Dugan, or who?

Mr. HARTWIG: Somebody mentioned Tom Newbery. In my opinion, Tom Newbery is one of the top men that we could think of appointing as Agent-General anywhere in the world.

Cabinet strength should be increased, with a splitting of portfolios. There could be a Minister for Racing; we could split agriculture from stock, mines from energy. Our future depends on young people, and I believe that we could well have a ministry for youth and sport. It should not be forgotten that in a few years the Commonwealth Games are to be held in Queensland, and I would expect that the Minister for Sport would be in charge of that very important event.

Water resources are of tremendous importance, and I believe that the portfolio of Water Resources should be split from Lands. Works could well be divorced from Housing.

It is said that it would cost so much more for Ministers salaries. I would prefer to see this State governed by the people who are elected than by boards and statutory organisations that are set up, with our democratic rights being eroded. I do not think that anyone will disagree with that. If I go to a Minister, I can expect a "yes" or "no". If I go to a board, the answer is nearly always "no". I am sure that most honourable members would agree with what I am saying. I believe that we should have government for the people by the people. The people elect the Parliament;

boards and authorities are not answerable to the people. The establishment of so many boards and authorities is eroding our democratic rights.

I should like to see more main roads and highway construction work let on a contract basis. I repeat that day-labour jobs are becoming too expensive and in many instances costing well over the estimate. It has become a joke. Once I was the greatest advocate for day-labour construction of highways, but I am convinced that we must now look at the private-enterprise system of construction on big jobs.

Country people on remote properties should automatically qualify for Government subsidy on power and telephone communication connection, and people who wish to do so should be allowed to construct their own telephone and power lines under supervision. I know of instances in which people have been refused permission to construct telephone and power lines. What rot!

As I said earlier, I believe that there ought to be a flat rate income tax deduction of 20c in the dollar, and there should be Commonwealth subsidies on fuel for bona fide primary producers. Let the Federal Government give back to primary producers some of the \$1,000 million that it has collected annually from fuel excise duties.

The Government should consider building multi-storey pensioner units or units for aged people.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: That shows you are a fool.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member calls me a fool. A pensioner in my home town of Yeppoon is receiving \$116 a fortnight in aged pension and she is paying \$50 a week rent for a home. I ask the honourable member how old people can exist in circumstances such as that.

We should consider capital punishment for premeditated crime such as rape and murder. I believe that punishment is the greatest deterrent to crime.

In my opinion, we should look at the introduction of racing on Sundays in some parts of Queensland. After all, I cannot see any difference between drinking in hotels and holding chook raffles, attending a football match and buying doubles tickets, and attending a nice open-air country race meeting with a family-picnic atmosphere on a Sunday afternoon.

Television of State Parliament for certain times each day would ensure that the A.L.P. would never be elected to Government in this State. It would lead to better attendance in the Chamber and a much higher standard of debate. Eighteen-year-olds have been given the right to vote. Those youngsters should know more about Parliament and how we conduct it. If we have a good thing, let's sell it.

I would ask the Minister in charge of fisheries to consider an alteration to the statutory fishermen's organisation to allow 26 commercial fishermen's associations to have one representative each, or 26 members in the master fishermen's organisation in this State.

This year in my electorate of Callide I am hoping for a new railway station at Biloela and a new court-house at Yeppoon. I am still trying to get a pre-school centre at Emu Park, new class-rooms at the Thangool State School and more Housing Commission homes at Biloela. The main road between Wowan and Dululu is in a hell of a state, and it really needs reconstruction.

A new highway is required between Thangool and Biloela, as is a new sealed road from Yeppoon to Byfield. There is need for another release on the Yeppoon-Rockhampton road. We urgently need flood-gates on the Callide Dam. We need a full-time medical superintendent at Yeppoon Hospital, a community health centre for Emu Park, and the completion of the Biloela Hospital, including the new male ward.

I am disappointed at the attendance in the Chamber during my wonderful speech. I believe that this has been a great honour for me. I have waited eight long years to move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Once again I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his fine Opening Speech yesterday. On behalf of all honourable members on the Government side—I do not know about honourable members opposite—I acknowledge the great Opening Speech made by His Excellency, and I wish him and Lady Ramsay many happy years in their future role in this State.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (2.57 p.m.): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply at the commencement of this the second session of the Forty-second Parliament. The motion was

ably moved by my colleague the honourable member for Callide, Mr. Lindsay Hartwig. I am sure he left a message with the House—a message that should be considered during the next Parliament.

At the outset I thank His Excellency the Governor, Sir James Ramsay, for his Opening Speech and for his untiring interest in and dedication to the people of this great State of ours as Her Majesty's representative. I would also like to express my gratitude to his good wife, Lady Ramsay.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Do you know her?

Mr. MILLER: Yes. I have had the pleasure of meeting her many times. Everybody who has had the opportunity to meet Lady Ramsay would agree that she is an asset to His Excellency. She has certainly won the hearts of all of those who have had the pleasure of meeting her.

I take this opportunity on behalf of the electors of Ithaca, and perhaps the whole of Queensland, to assure His Excellency of our support and loyalty to Her Most Gracious Sovereign Queen Elizabeth II.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you on your elevation to the office of Speaker of this House. You are following in the footsteps of many able men. I am sure that you will be a credit to this House.

I should like to say a few words about the previous Speaker, Mr. Jim Houghton. He was a man for whom I had a very great respect. Of all the Speakers whom I have had the privilege to serve under, Mr. Jim Houghton was the one who was most interested in Parliament and the representatives of the people. His whole concern as Speaker of this House was to ensure that members of Parliament had the opportunity to express their points of view. He made sure that the assets of this Parliament were available to each member of Parliament. I would like to think that, if ever we get round to naming rooms in this Parliamentary Annexe, the library would be referred to as the Jim Houghton Room. If anyone did anything for members of Parliament, it was Jim Houghton. The library in this annexe will always be here as an asset to this Parliament, and if it were named the Jim Houghton Room it would remind everybody that Jim Houghton was the Speaker who made the decisions about what was going to happen in the Queensland Parliament. I sincerely thank Jim Houghton and the members of his Buildings Committee for the privileges that we enjoy today.

Mr. Scott: Is this a little homily to the present Speaker?

Mr. MILLER: The member who interjected has not been here very long. He does not realise the hardships that members of Parliament, prior to his presence in Parliament, had to put up with. That is a pity, because as someone progresses through life he appreciates the niceties that are shown him.

I appreciate the actions of a lot of members of the Opposition because I believe they came up through the work-force. They appreciate what has gone before them. They appreciate the way in which they are able in this House to achieve something for their peers. I do not appreciate the actions of anyone who does not appreciate the hardships that have gone before. Just as people in our community have had hardships before, so, too, have members of Parliament had hardships before. Many members of the A.L.P. have endured hardship in this House so that we can stand here today and talk about anything we want to talk about in the way in which we want to talk about it. An interjection such as the one we just heard from the honourable member for Cook is not appreciated at all. I appreciate very much what the previous Speaker did for every member of this Parliament.

In his Opening Speech His Excellency outlined many of the significant aspects of the Government's programme for the period ahead. One of the aspects that he emphasised was the electrification of the suburban rail services in Brisbane.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: As a man of long political standing, you would recall that the Labor Government had electrification well in hand in 1957.

Mr. MILLER: I thank the honourable member for Archerfield for his interjection. I make no apology for the fact that this Government waited until this point in time to electrify Brisbane's railway system. There are a lot more people in this State than those who live in Brisbane and there is a lot more industry in this State than that in Brisbane. In 1957, we as a Government had to make a decision in line with our Budget as to what we would do with that Budget. I make no apology to the honourable member for Archerfield or to any other person for the fact that the Government of the day decided to put the money into education.

It made education in this State the No. 1 priority. Then it decided it would embark on dieselisation, not just in Brisbane but throughout the whole State. I would hate to think what the unemployment level would be if the Government had not made that decision in 1957.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You are only trying to justify the inexcusable.

Mr. MILLER: I will ignore that inane interjection. We are all aware of what has taken place in Central Queensland. We are all aware of the number of people who have been employed in the mining industry through the new open-cut mines that have been developed. We are all aware of the number of people employed in the building industry consequent upon the establishment of those open-cut mines. And what was the factor that enabled those mines to be opened up? The one important factor was that haulage over long distances from the mines to the coast could be economically handled by diesel-electric locomotives only. That is the very reason why companies agreed to go into Central Queensland and develop mining fields there.

I as a member of Parliament respect the decision made by those members in 1957 that, instead of electrifying the railway system of suburban Brisbane, they would pour money into education to overcome the problem that had resulted from previous Labor neglect and also supply the whole State of Queensland with diesel-electric locomotives so that industry could develop throughout the whole State. That is the principal reason why Queensland is the most decentralised State in the whole of Australia. So I pay credit to those who made the decision back in 1957.

Mr. Davis: Have you got any trains in your electorate?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, I have.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Whereabouts?

Mr. MILLER: I have trains running through the Auchenflower section of my electorate.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I thought that was in the electorate of your colleague Mr. Porter.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member for Archerfield is not abreast of what is happening in the State. He lived in Torwood for many, many years and attended the

same school as I attended. I should have thought that he would be aware that Auchenflower was in the electorate of Ithaca.

I now turn to the Brisbane and Area Water Board. The Opposition made great play of the fact that we as a Government decided to set up a board to administer the Wivenhoe Dam.

Mr. Davis: And I've exposed you in my electorate; I can tell you that.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member for Brisbane Central says that he has exposed me in his electorate. I certainly hope he has. Can I say that I have exposed the Labor Brisbane City Council in my electorate? All of the things that have been said by aldermen in recent times have displayed the hypocrisy of the Brisbane City Council in the establishment of the Brisbane and Area Water Board. We as a Government decided that it was right that, instead of leaving it in the hands of one council to supply water to 11 other councils, we should create a board consisting of all 12 councils. That is the fairest way of ensuring that what happens in each shire or city is done in accordance with what is agreed by its council.

Of course, the Labor Party, in trying to stir up trouble within the community, attempted to make out that the Brisbane City Council should have had control of a dam situated not in the Brisbane city area but in the Esk Shire. Could we as a Government accept that the Brisbane City Council should control the dam in the Esk Shire and then sell water to that shire for reticulation? That is what the Labor aldermen of the Brisbane City Council and the Labor Opposition in this House have suggested. I suggest that the whole thing was a farce. If the Labor Party believes in honesty and fair play—and I have always thought that the Opposition believed in fair play—it would agree that a board with representatives from each council, with no Government representation whatsoever, is the only fair way. It is quite obvious that I would never be able to persuade the members of the Opposition in this House to espouse fair play.

I now refer to the Brisbane River bridge or tunnel, whichever is decided upon in the near future. It is long overdue. We should have had a bridge or tunnel there many years ago. I can remember Mr. Sam Ramsden, who was the member for Merthyr in

those days, taking a very keen interest in a tunnel beneath the Brisbane River to overcome the problems of industry and the problems of heavy transport in having to wend its way through the main streets of Brisbane from the southside to the northside of Brisbane, or vice versa. Unfortunately, in those days, we as a Government ignored Mr. Ramsden's suggestion. How much cheaper it would have been had we decided to accept the recommendation of Mr. Ramsden, who, having studied the project and having talked to contractors, including those who were prepared to undertake this project on the basis of owning it for a number of years—

Mr. Scott: Wouldn't the same argument apply to the electrification of the railways?

Mr. MILLER: No, not at all.

Mr. Scott: You didn't give much support to that a few moments ago in your speech.

Mr. MILLER: Not at all. Could I say in answer to the honourable member for Cook that we need to have priorities. We have shown where our priorities lie. Although the electrification of the suburban railway system is very important indeed, it had a lower priority in my opinion than the tunnel beneath the river. If we are interested in employment, we must be concerned about the cost of employment. We have to be concerned about the cost to industry. To me, that was far more important than the electrification of the railways so that somebody could go to town in a more silent train than a diesel-electric. The diesel-electric train did exactly the same job as the electric train would have.

Mr. Scott: The only thing wrong with your story is that it will cost \$140,000,000 more now.

Mr. MILLER: Of course. It is a matter of priorities. I have outlined our priorities. The Opposition has laid down its priorities. As I have said, in the first place my priorities lay originally in education and, secondly, in diesel-electric trains for the whole of Queensland so that industry could expand.

I want to refer now to colleges of advanced education. I learned, from the Governor's Opening Speech yesterday, that we are to have two new technical colleges and a further expansion of the pre-vocational trade-based programmes. I wholeheartedly support the suggestion of an expansion in this area. We need new technical colleges. We need an expansion of the pre-vocational course.

I wonder how many members of this House realise what the pre-vocational course is all about. What is it doing? What problems does it overcome? The whole point of the matter is that the pre-vocational course is designed to assist young people, on leaving school, to make a decision about their future lives. They have the opportunity of going to a technical college and studying for 12 months in three modules. In the first module, they are shown the ways and habits of each trade. In the second module, they are taken out into the work-force to see at first hand how industry operates. The third module is the equivalent of the 14 weeks of intensive training in the normal apprenticeship course in the trade they have chosen after completing the first two modules. So to me a pre-vocational course is very important indeed.

It is interesting to note that three years ago when this course was first introduced there were 224 young people enrolled. This year the figure has increased to 840. So I congratulate the Department of Labour Relations on what it is doing. It is allowing young people to make decisions about their future lives, and they are making the choice the right way. They are able to make these decisions after seeing at first hand exactly what takes place in an industry.

I now want to refer to the free-hospital system, which was mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. I wonder where Opposition members stand on Queensland's free-hospital system.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Introduced by a Labor Government.

Mr. MILLER: It was introduced by a Labor Government, but that is not the answer to the question I asked. I want to know where Opposition members stand on this issue. When he presented a petition this morning, the honourable member for Sandgate said that he wanted Queensland to spend on education not less than the amount allocated in other States. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we can spend only the amount of money we have available to us. Do we give away the free hospital system and pour that money into education, or do we make a decision to retain the free hospital system as it presently exists? Queensland is the only State in Australia with such a system. Do we expand it, or do we put all the money into education, as has been requested by the honourable member for Sandgate?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Why don't you answer your own question?

Mr. MILLER: I will answer the question. I say we should continue on the course we have adopted over the last 20-odd years. We will make education the highest priority in our Budget, but our second-highest priority is free hospitals. I for one will never agree to do away with the free hospital system in order to pour money into education merely to ensure that a few

more teachers, who did not have to take the course if they did not want to, are employed. To me, the free hospital system of this State must not only continue but expand. But we as members of this House have to realise that if we are going to continue with the free hospital system we will have to spend more and more money on it.

Mr. D'Arcy: You and your Government are aborting the free hospital system.

Mr. MILLER: The free hospital system has been allocated the second-highest priority in our Budget. I am wondering what the States of South Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales are going to do now that the Commonwealth Government has decided to do away with Medibank generally. They have to make a decision on whether they will follow Queensland and set up a free hospital system similar to ours or charge the poor and people in the middle income bracket for hospital treatment. To me, our system in Queensland is most important. I wish to know just where the Opposition stands on this matter. Does it believe in the free hospital system?

Mr. Casey: We introduced it. It is our system.

Mr. MILLER: Honourable members opposite did not introduce it at all. It was introduced by former members of the A.L.P., who had views different from those of the A.L.P. members presently in this House.

Opposition members are saying that we should be spending more money on education, but where do we get the extra money? Where do we get the money that they are demanding we should spend? We could get the money from only one other part of the Budget. The second-largest part of the Budget is allocated to free hospitals, and I will oppose any call by the Opposition to do away with the free hospital system in this State.

It was most disappointing that the Commonwealth Government decided to reduce expenditure in the fields of education, health, hospitals and agriculture. To me, that decision was not made in the best interests of the community or of any State in this nation.

Nobody would disagree with the development programmes outlined by His Excellency. Perhaps we would have liked to see greater programmes in the areas in which we, as individuals, are interested, but governments are no different from the ordinary householder who has to cut his coat according to his cloth.

An Opposition Member: I would not like to dine in Mr. Fraser's house, then.

Mr. MILLER: I am not interested in dining in Mr. Fraser's house. I am interested in the amount of money that we in Queensland receive and in ensuring that our Budget

is used to benefit the people of Queensland in our areas of concern. It is interesting to note that the areas in which the Commonwealth Government is reducing the amount of finance that it provides to the States are those in which we are getting calls for the provision of extra funds—education, health, hospitals and police. We want more money to spend in those areas, but they are the ones in which the Commonwealth Government has decided to make cuts in expenditure.

When one considers the amount of the Federal deficit, \$3,453,000,000, which is \$640,000,000 more than was expected, one can perhaps see why one would be concerned if one were the Prime Minister or a member of the Federal Parliament. But I am not a member of the Federal Parliament, I am a member of the Queensland Parliament, and the decisions that we have made here have not contributed to the deficit of the Commonwealth Government. The deficit has resulted from the Government's own decisions.

Mr. Casey: Are you going to run for Jim Killen's seat?

Mr. MILLER: I have already said that I am not interested in becoming a member of the Federal Parliament. I am interested in the people of Queensland and in doing something for them. I am a little amazed that the Leader of the Opposition should make such an inane interjection at this point of time. I believe that he is a man who takes life very seriously, yet he makes an inane interjection like that.

Dr. Edwards: He even went to Canberra to release one of his policies.

Mr. MILLER: Did he really? Nothing about him would surprise me after today.

As I was saying, the problem confronting the Commonwealth Government is not of our making. It is of the Commonwealth Government's own making, and the remedy is in its own hands. I can see two ways in which it could reduce expenditure without affecting the States in any way, that is, in the area in which duplication of departments takes place and in the field of unemployment benefits. I am concerned about the amount of money that is being poured into the payment of unemployment benefits with no beneficial aid to the person who is unemployed and no benefit to the people of Queensland or any other person in Australia.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: What are you suggesting as an alternative?

Mr. MILLER: If I have sufficient time and there are fewer interjections, I hope to come to that.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: It is a very important issue.

Mr. MILLER: It is a very important issue.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Well, don't muck around on frivolous stuff. Get to the point.

Mr. MILLER: First, I wish to refer to duplication of Government departments, because I believe that such duplication should be done away with immediately.

Federal Governments have had certain responsibilities since the Commonwealth of Australia came into being in 1901; the States of Australia have had certain responsibilities since they came into being. However, over the years we have seen the Commonwealth Government slowly but surely infiltrating the areas of responsibility of State Governments. I remind honourable members that in 1901 there were eight Federal Ministers, that at the end of the Second World War there were 14 Federal Ministers—six more in just over 40 years—and that from then till now there has been an increase to 28 Federal Ministers, most of whom operate in areas that overlap and interfere with the administration of State Governments.

Mr. Mackenroth: We are not doing a bad job here when we have put a bloke in charge of pencil sharpeners. We have 18 here, haven't we? We have to find jobs for them.

Mr. MILLER: I hope that interjection is recorded in "Hansard".

Mr. Mackenroth: So do I.

Mr. MILLER: I accept the honourable member's interjection, and I want it recorded in "Hansard" because I think it is the most inane interjection that I have heard.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker: the mad expansion that took place during the Whitlam era is still with us. Governments of all political colours have been responsible for the expansion of ministries, but the Whitlam era put the icing on the cake. The Whitlam Government made sure that all the little departments that were set up by previous Governments, irrespective of their political colour, grew to the monstrosities that we have today.

In my opinion, the first thing that we must do is convince the Federal Government to do away with the duplication of departments. Every cent that is spent on duplication of departments is one cent less that the States of Australia receive to carry out necessary functions such as the provision of education, health services, hospitals and police—the very things that we are being asked by our constituents to provide. What member of this Assembly has not had a constituent come to him and say, "I want more money spent on education. I want more money spent on health services. I want to ensure that the free hospital system continues. There are not enough police on our streets. We want more police on the streets.?" We have all had such requests. But for every cent that is spent on a Federal department, the States are going to lose a cent.

Therefore, I say to the Leader of this Government and to the Deputy Leader of this Government, "Next time you talk to the Federal Government, tell it that we want more money for the States and we want less money spent on Federal departments." Today, people outside this Chamber want more value for money.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: You were getting more money from Whitlam, and you are the ones who have to cop the blame for it.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member for Wolston is quite correct in what he said. It is true that Queensland received more money under the Whitlam Government. He broke Australia. The R.E.D. scheme of the Whitlam Government had to be brought to a close because there was not enough money to keep it going. It was a good scheme, and the principle was a good one, but there was not enough money to keep it going. Mr. Cameron was told by the Federal Government of the day that there was not enough money to keep the scheme going. There was nothing wrong with the scheme had there been enough money to ensure its success. But the Federal Government didn't have enough money, and that is why I say to the honourable member for Wolston, "Of course Mr. Whitlam and his Government poured money into Australia." I am not denying that. They poured money in so quickly that we ran out of it. We couldn't earn it as quickly as they were spending it. That is where the problem arose.

Mr. Mackenroth: You told us you were going to cure the unemployment situation.

Mr. MILLER: Perhaps I should turn to unemployment because I want to speak about that problem today. After reading statistics covering the period between 1970 and 1978, I realise that we are facing a very serious situation in Australia. At the end of May this year 424,578 persons were unemployed in Australia. If Professor Bill Ford of the University of New South Wales is correct, that figure is going to continue to increase in the 1980s. Professor Ford is recognised Australia-wide as an expert. He believes that, while we have nearly 500,000 unemployed at the present time, it is quite conceivable that in 1980 we will have close to 1,000,000 unemployed persons. That frightening prospect demands a rethinking by Commonwealth and State Governments. We cannot afford to have 1,000,000 unemployed persons in Australia.

As I said earlier, each cent that is put into a Federal scheme is one cent less that the States have to spend. The amount of money spent on unemployment in 1978 represents an increase of 8,855 per cent since 1970. That unbelievable increase has taken place in a short period of eight years in Australia. In 1970 there were 109,383 persons unemployed in Australia. That drained from the Commonwealth Budget a mere \$8,868,000. By 1978 the number of

unemployed had increased to 879,637, an increase of 704 per cent. But what did it cost the Commonwealth Government? Unemployment in 1978 cost \$794,144,000, an increase of 8,855 per cent. If Professor Ford is correct and unemployment is going to increase in the 1980s, that figure will pale into insignificance.

Professor Ford has also said that one in every three teenagers outside the education system will be looked upon by society as unemployed. That frightening statement demands action of this State Government and of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Kruger: Where are you going to start?

Mr. MILLER: I would start by encouraging industry to employ labour again and I would give this encouragement by reducing taxation on industry. I would say to every industry that is prepared to take on young people and to every industry that is prepared to take on unemployed older people, "For every man you put on you will pay a lower percentage of tax." To me, such a scheme is of utmost importance. We cannot afford to pay out \$794,144,000.

Let me give an indication of the unemployment situation in Brisbane. Last year, the Brisbane City Council had 47 vacancies for apprentices. A total of 5,000 young people applied for those 47 positions. That gives an indication of the level of unemployment. What is happening to those people who were not accepted by the Brisbane City Council? They are probably sitting at home twiddling their thumbs. Employment is hard to get.

I suggest that all young people who are interested in taking up trades should be given an opportunity to attend a technical college. I do not want to see the situation in which a young person has to go to an employer to be indentured into a trade. I want all those young people who were refused employment by the Brisbane City Council to be able to start a course similar to the pre-vocational course that operates at the present time for school-leavers. I want every young person who wishes to be a tradesman to go to a college and to start learning his trade.

Mr. Vaughan: There's no room.

Mr. MILLER: We are building two new technical colleges. I cannot accept that our technical colleges are full day and night. I am certain that these young people would be very happy indeed to be in the same position as young people in Singapore and other Asian countries.

(Time expired.)

Debate, on motion of Mr. Casey, adjourned.

SUPPLY

VOTE OF CREDIT—\$1,223,000,000

Mr. SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services for the year ending 30 June 1980—

“From the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland (exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account), the further sum of \$530,000,000;

From the Trust and Special Funds, the further sum of \$605,000,000; and

From the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account, the further sum of \$88,000,000.”

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (3.40 p.m.): I move—

“That there be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1979-80, a further sum not exceeding \$1,223 million towards defraying the expenses of the various departments and services of the State.”

In the last Appropriation Act, passed by the House in November of last year, supply for 1979-80 to the extent of \$662,000,000 was granted—\$300,000,000 for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$320,000,000 for the Trust and Special Funds and \$42,000,000 for the Loan Fund. The purpose of the Bill now before the Committee is to provide a further sum of \$1,223 million, of which \$530,000,000 is required for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$605,000,000 for the Trust and Special Funds and \$88,000,000 for the Loan Fund.

The total supply which will now be available for 1979-80 pending the approval of the Budget for that year is \$1,885 million—\$830,000,000 for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$925,000,000 for the Trust and Special Funds and \$130,000,000 for the Loan Fund. In total, this represents an increase of \$167,000,000 on the 1978-79 figure. This increase is necessary to cover the cost of salary, wage and other cost increases in the intervening period, and reflects also an increase in the proportion of total expenditures that is taking place in some areas in the early part of the financial year.

I propose to take this opportunity to make some brief comments on certain facets of the State's economy and other related matters that are topical at the present time. There can be no doubt in the mind of any person here today or elsewhere about the potential of this great State of Queensland—a potential that is steadily but surely being brought to fruition by a combination of many factors, not the least of which is the

policy of the State Government of encouragement and assistance in the development of our vast wealth of resources.

These resources are almost unlimited—minerals, agriculture, beef, sheep, tourism, secondary industry of all sorts, commerce, financial institutions and probably above all a predominance of people with a “get up and go” approach to life, people who recognise what the State offers to those who can demonstrate that they have drive and enthusiasm, that they have confidence in Queensland and its future and that they are willing to provide a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

This is, I believe, the broad picture of the State of Queensland as a person with a reasonable knowledge of what is going on around him would see it. It is certainly the picture that the rest of the world sees, as I have found out to my great satisfaction in dealings with people from financial and industrial institutions from overseas, and I will be talking a little more about this later.

The Government of Queensland must continue to play its part in providing an economic environment that is conducive to continued growth and development. It is determined to do so in the most effective ways that are at its disposal.

It is regrettable but unavoidable that the State's powers in relation to economic control are limited and that the policies of the Federal Government, which has the prime responsibility in this area, are to a large extent inhibiting the improvements and growth that would occur if natural trends were allowed to take their course. This is not to say that I am in total disagreement with the economic policies of the Commonwealth Government.

While I am on record as disagreeing with specific aspects of some policies, I am convinced that overall the Federal Government has proved to be effective in achieving what it has set out to achieve as its prime objective—the control of inflation and the inflationary trend that was left by the Whitlam Government after three years of devastation in economic planning and progress. In 1975, when the Government changed, the inflation rate was 18.5 per cent, and honourable members opposite know it well.

I recognise, of course, that costs are again increasing at a rate that most people would see as undesirably high. I continue to be concerned, as we all are, about the level of unemployment that persists, despite the best efforts that have been made by the State Government to convince the Commonwealth that its policies in this area are wrong and that it should combat it in its own way by providing stimuli through injections of capital funds, tax concessions and so forth. Nevertheless, I am convinced that there is increasingly a feeling of optimism and confidence in the business sector generally and that, while the road is still a

little bumpy, the very near future will see the nation and Queensland in particular in high gear with a clear road to full recovery and prosperity in the days that lie ahead.

All the signs are good. Virtually all areas of primary production are showing a substantially improved situation over that experienced in 1977-78. The value of livestock sales, for example, was up 131 per cent in 1978-79 over its level in 1977-78, while the value of wheat sold was up 258 per cent over the same period.

While gains in other areas have not been as spectacular, substantial improvements are evident. Retail sales are increasing, mineral-processing continues to expand with the encouragement that has been given to the mining sector of this State by our Government policies and programmes and motor vehicle registrations show growth.

I might also mention that, this year, the economy of the State and its revenues will reflect the new export coal developments at Norwich Park and Gregory, which have been encouraged by this Government and with which we are very proud to be associated. In the coming years a number of other large-scale mining developments that this Government is fostering and encouraging will come into operation.

The Government's policies and its positive approach to matters relating to State development are conducive to a continuation of economic growth. Its financial policies must be complementary in nature to its attitude to development in the private sector, and in this regard I believe that the Government's approach must continue to encompass two major thrusts.

The State Government must maintain its policy of restraint in growth of services and the Public Service generally. That is contrary to the policy of the Opposition. In its policy it was publicly stated that it will expand the Public Service widely. This is one of the basic reasons why inflationary trends and costs of community services rose greatly during the 1972-75 period.

By careful husbandry of the State's finances—and only in this way—will the Government be able to continue to provide the levels of service to which Queenslanders are entitled while, at the same time, minimising the extent to which increased costs are passed on to the public.

As part of its continuing effort to restrain costs, a comprehensive review of Public Service staffing requirements has been undertaken over the past 12 months with a view to an overall reduction in staff numbers, and it has been possible to reduce staff in a number of areas to enable some expansion of service in priority areas. Further savings have been possible as a result of departmental reviews of their services to re-establish priorities. These reviews will continue.

Great care has been exercised in the evaluation of proposed new services and only those of a most essential and pressing nature have been approved. I would point out that this is one of the broad policies on which this year's State Budget is being prepared.

Increasing salary and wage costs and increases in the basic items necessary for the provision of services, allied with slashed Commonwealth funding in a number of areas, have meant that the State Government has no alternative to reviewing its fees and charges to ensure that their real value is maintained. Accordingly, I have instructed my officers, in conjunction with departmental officers, to undertake a review of all fees and charges with a view to ensuring that their value is maintained in relation to changes in monetary values since they were last revised.

While I would have preferred to preserve the status quo, the alternatives of reducing services or increasing taxation, whether of existing State taxes or by the introduction of new taxes, such as an income tax surcharge, are unacceptable to this Government. An announcement has already been made in regard to the proposed increase in rail fares and freights and these small increases will take effect shortly.

As the review of other fees and charges is progressively completed, action will be taken to implement any proposed increases, if that is necessary, as soon as possible. That is not to say that the Government will not be looking hard to see where there are pressing needs for taxation concessions. However, it would be irresponsible for us as a Government to provide tax concessions without also looking at alternative revenue sources or rationalisation of services to ensure that the cost to the Government does not result in any reduction in the level of essential services. We are firmly committed to a policy of providing tax concessions and to maintaining Queensland's taxes at the lowest level possible, consistent with a reasonable and responsible approach to the overall funding requirements of the State's essential services.

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: The honourable member for Sandgate does not know the difference between a tax and a charge. As far as I am concerned, he has a lot to learn.

I believe the Government must be realistic in its approach to taxation. We have removed four major taxes during the last few years. I will continue to strive, as successive Treasurers before me have done, to provide concessions where they are warranted and when budgetary circumstances permit. The extent to which this can be achieved must be governed by practicalities such as the Government's ability to accommodate the loss either by reduced expenditures or substitutional revenues.

For example, I and, indeed, the Government as a whole would wholeheartedly embrace any realistic and practical means by which pay-roll tax could be phased out and eventually eliminated. The benefits to industry, to the economy and to employment would be very worth while. However, at this stage, unless some form of substitutional funding could be found, the cost to the State Budget would be disastrous. At the same time, the Commonwealth Government would receive a windfall in the form of reduced social service payments and increased income tax, both personal and company, very little of which would flow automatically to the States. Within this combination of effects there must be potential for adjustments that would permit the action that is obviously most desirable to be taken without severe detriment to the State Budget, and it is a matter that we propose to pursue.

The second major thrust of the Government's economic policy in recent years has been a consistent effort to divert as much finance as possible to special employment-intensive capital projects. In 1978-79, it was possible, through tight control of expenditure programmes, to divert \$61,600,000 for this purpose. Since 1976-77, some \$188,000,000 has been utilised in this way.

The Queensland Government is firmly of the belief that continued improvement in the private sector economy can be enhanced and nurtured by maintenance of a continued high level of capital works in the public sector. Not only does this mean the provision of necessary schools, hospitals, roads, houses, irrigation works and other facilities, but it also provides, through both its initial impact and the consequent multiplier effects through the private sector, a relatively non-inflationary boost to the economy and a consequential significant increase in employment prospects.

It is a matter of considerable regret to me that the Commonwealth has not accepted this point. Its continued policy of restriction of capital funds for the States resulted in severe cuts in 1979-80 programmes at the June Loan Council meeting. The State Government's own programme was reduced by 20 per cent in real terms from a level which had already lost its real value because of successive years of non-increase in the programme while costs continued to escalate. We had hoped that the Commonwealth Government would realise the benefits that would rapidly flow from an expanded capital works programme and change their policies accordingly.

However, far from recognising this fact, the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to slash the Government's capital works programme—to the point where major projects of vital importance to the State will have to be shelved unless alternative funding arrangements can be made. This must have a profound effect on employment in our State. While I am fully cognisant of the

very difficult problems of economic management which confront the Federal Government, this particular aspect of its economic management programme, in my view, flies in the face of what is needed now to help recovery.

I would like to turn briefly to one aspect of the State Government's commitment to capital development which, I am pleased to say, has been supported by the Commonwealth Government. As honourable members would be aware, Loan Council in 1978 approved guide-lines to enable States to borrow funds for infrastructure requirements associated with major development projects which cannot be accommodated within normal loan programmes. The Queensland Government has been granted approval to borrow \$75,000,000 for coal-loading facilities at Hay Point, \$130,000,000 for various electricity programmes, including Gladstone Power Station, Wivenhoe Dam and the Tarong Power Station, and \$68,000,000 towards completion of the electrification of Brisbane's railway system. These projects are all of immense importance to the future of this State.

I would like to emphasise what these offshore raisings mean to the Queensland economy and work-force. This year we will be pouring additional capital funds of \$169,000,000 into the economy, and the crucial fact is that this is additional work, additional purchases, additional employment and, with the multiplier applied, substantially additional spin-off work and services in the private sector.

As I mentioned earlier, I have been most gratified by the enthusiasm with which overseas financial institutions have sought to become involved in the financing of projects in this State. Since offshore funding became a reality a year or so ago, bankers of substance from the financial centres of the world have been keen to do business with the Queensland Government. There is a constant flow of correspondence, proposals, and personal representations to me and my department.

I have recently returned from Japan where I visited a selected number of major banks concerning the present \$44,000,000 proposal I have before the market, and I can say quite genuinely that I was overwhelmed by the earnestness of these people to lend to Queensland and to do so at very competitive and attractive interest rates and conditions. Earlier this year the Under Treasurer and I received the same reactions in New York and London when we finalised the earlier loan of \$45,000,000 on very good terms.

Proposals for the present loan are also being canvassed in New York with a number of major bankers of international standing and all show a very satisfying keenness to offer funds to the State on probably the best terms on offer to anyone around the world. This, I am sure honourable members

will appreciate, is the crucial factor in the whole exercise—the securing of the best terms possible for the money we borrow.

Overseas funding is full of traps and pitfalls. From the statements that I hear coming from the member for Sandgate, those pitfalls are not understood by the Opposition. The currency risks, in particular, are very real. I have invited members of the Opposition to come and talk to me so that I can explain to them quite simply the details of the risks involved in currency dealings. I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition on that matter today.

Mr. Casey interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: Even if I explained the situation to him, he would not understand it. That shows how much he knows about the whole matter.

Mr. Wilson interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: If the honourable member listens to the facts, he might learn something. Obviously, he does not understand the matter.

Mr. Vaughan: How many more trips is it going to take to get the money?

Dr. EDWARDS: If we can save 0.01 per cent on a \$44,000,000 loan, I believe that it is well worth 100 trips. If the member for Sandgate considers that a trip around the world in six days is any junket, I will invite him to come with me the next time. I have been able to achieve much more than he would be able to achieve if he were in Government—and thank goodness he is not in Government. In fact, by the way in which he performs, he never will be in Government.

I say quite clearly that I can justify any travel that I have done on behalf of the Government. I have asked the members of the Opposition to come and see me about this matter.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Some Opposition members will be going on a trip shortly.

Dr. EDWARDS: I make it quite clear that the Government's programme in this field has earned the respect of every Government throughout the world and, indeed, of every State Government in Australia. The Labor Government of New South Wales has placed on record that it appreciates what has been done by the Queensland Government in the negotiations of loans that are regarded by financial circles as the most attractive loans offered to any Government throughout the world. If that does not speak for itself, the Opposition does not understand the facts.

Let me repeat, Mr. Hewitt, that overseas funding is full of traps and pitfalls. In particular, the currency risks are very real. Interest conditions, security, types of multi-currency and term options and possible

hedging arrangements have to be negotiated to the State's advantage. We have been well served in this to date by personal contact with the world markets by both my predecessor and now by myself and by my Under Treasurer. This has proved invaluable in the loans that have been negotiated, and this close personal surveillance of the overseas loan arrangements at State Treasurer and Under Treasurer level will continue—I repeat "will continue"—and will, of course, require regular, though perhaps very quick, overseas visits to the world financial centres.

This general world-wide attitude indicates clearly that Australia's credit is held very highly and demonstrates the stature in which Queensland, in particular, is seen by very discerning people in the international financial sphere. It is, I suggest, a direct result of having a stable and responsible Government and a sound economic and financial base.

As honourable members can see, this Government is firmly committed to continuing the development of Queensland. Through judicious management, restraint, the diversion of funds to employment-creating capital works and careful husbandry of funds I believe that the Government is succeeding in creating an economic environment that will encourage the growth and development so vital to the future of Queensland and all Queenslanders.

I commend the motion to honourable members.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (4.2 p.m.): In September 1975, the Premier, on behalf of the National and Liberal Parties in Queensland, embraced the Fraser-Anthony Government's federalism in its economic entirety. There were no reservations, no qualifications, no hesitations.

It is in the context of the discredited federalism, with its already demonstrated inconsistencies, inequalities and failure, that we must consider the Appropriation Bill now before Parliament. This will be the basis on which by-elections in Redcliffe and Gympie will be fought. No matter what the State Government says now, this is the economic policy of the Bjelke-Petersen-Edwards conservatives in Queensland just as much as it is the policy of the Fraser-Anthony Liberals and Nationals in Canberra.

This so-called federalism was supported by the Queensland National-Liberal Government in 1975, with the taxpayers' money used dishonestly in advertisements throughout the State to promote it. It was the Queensland Government's policy again in 1977, and it remains the Queensland Government's policy for the elections due next year.

The Premier, his deputy and the National-Liberal Parties are partners with the Fraser-Anthony Federal Government in their broken promises to all sections of the community. They are partners in the cruel betrayal of the pensioners; partners in the dishonouring of tax indexation; partners in the dismantling of Medibank. The shame of Commonwealth

payments to the States, slashed to ribbons in real money terms with worse yet to come, sits squarely on their shoulders.

As this State is hustled closer towards the ultimate aim of Fraser federalism (double income taxes), it is these preliminary results of economic mismanagement that must be brought to the notice of the suffering Queensland community. Inflation is up and rising, not down and falling as promised not only by Messrs. Fraser and Anthony but also by the Bjelke-Petersen-Edwards Government. Unemployment is up and again soon rising, not down and falling as promised. The same story applies to interest charges, income tax, rates, indirect taxes, medical costs and petrol prices, to name but a few examples of Liberal and National Party economic treachery in Canberra and Queensland.

In this debate today on the Appropriation Bill, I propose to concentrate on three aspects of Queensland's financial administration. The first is Fraser-Anthony federalism and the tragic way in which it is damaging Queensland, the most decentralised State, much more than any other part of Australia. The second is roads, with my fears now confirmed of the tragic incompetence at State ministerial level to present properly detailed submissions to Canberra for adequate assistance. The third is the delusion spread by the National and Liberal Parties in Queensland that this is a low-tax, tax-reducing State Government, which I plan to expose.

For the first time since World War II in Australia the concept of full employment has been completely abandoned. It has been abandoned not only by the Fraser-Anthony Government in Canberra but by the Bjelke-Petersen-Edwards Government in Queensland. Young Queenslanders, better educated than ever before, are forced to compromise their careers as casualties of the job starvation that accompanies the so-called new federalism.

Amid this politically enforced hardship, we see Cabinet Ministers (Federal and Queensland), the real architects of the recession, journeying extravagantly to the four corners of the earth while many hard-working families and others on the poverty line cannot afford even a holiday. Queenslanders are sick and tired of the excuses in 1979 from the National and Liberal Parties that guaranteed results as far back as 1975. We are sick and tired of hearing the Deputy Premier, the Premier and various Cabinet Ministers, plus their Muppets on the back benches, repeating that all that is wrong in Australia today was caused by the Whitlam Government.

Whitlam and his Government have been gone from the arena for almost four years, and during that four years this Government and its Federal counterpart have had every opportunity to put Australia into the situation that the people of this country desire. They have failed to do so. That is not just my expression of opinion. As the Deputy Premier and Treasurer would well know, the

public opinion poll released yesterday indicated that support for the Liberal and National Parties throughout Australia was at an all-time low. Queenslanders are sick and tired of these excuses. This State Government is a practising partner in the economic excesses and abuses of Fraser-Anthony federalism, and no matter how it twists, squirms or misrepresents today, it cannot escape its guilt.

There is not suddenly on the eve of the 1980s one economic policy in Canberra for the Fraser-Anthony Government and another in Queensland as this Government tries desperately to pretend. In September 1975 the Premier ignored the warnings of Labor and pledged Queensland to the then undefined federalism, and the irresponsible Liberal Party backed him to the hilt. Do not think for a moment that Malcolm Fraser and Doug Anthony are penitent for the suffering they are causing, or the promises they have broken and continue to break. Far from it. If they have their way after 30 June next year, after the generous 5-year financial guarantees of the previous Labor Government expire, the States can expect even tougher treatment.

Those are the true facts of Commonwealth-State relationships. Over the past seven years the best deal the States have ever received was the deal given to them by the Whitlam Labor Government in 1975. It was a deal that set this State back on its feet financially. It was a deal that Malcolm Fraser agreed to continue for five years, but he is going to scrub it as at 30 June next year. He has clearly expressed that intention.

During the recent Tasmanian election campaign, the Liberal Party Prime Minister wrote to the Tasmanian Premier and, I understand, to all other Premiers as well (including Mr. Bjelke-Petersen), claiming that the Australian Government has been far too generous to the States. Because of the long-term significance of that letter and its importance in relation to economic planning and appropriation, I now ask that the Premier or Treasurer table a copy of it for study during this debate. If the Federal Liberal-National Party Government is to slice its funding to the States even more savagely than it has in the past few years, Queenslanders are entitled to know by how much it will be sliced.

When Fraser-Anthony federalism was originally introduced in February 1976, it centred around three main areas—tax sharing with the States; loan funds from the Loan Council; and specific purpose grants. At the time of its inception, there was a new 5-year Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement arranged by the Labor Government in June 1975, with positive guarantees of funds to the States between 1975-76 and 1979-80. But for that legacy from Labor, now nearing expiry, the financial plight of the State Governments would be much greater than it is today.

Commonwealth financial revenue from tax sharing will then join money the States receive from the Loan Council and specific purpose grants as targets for the Federal Treasury scissors. The protective guarantees left over from Labor in 1975 will no longer exist to curb the worst extremes of Liberal and National Party federalism.

I believe that the Fraser Federal-State financial policies, with the dangers that lie ahead after 30 June next year, must be urgently reviewed and reassessed in open session at a special Premiers' Conference and that Queensland, as the worst-affected State, should initiate it. Surely this State is not to be silently handicapped into the 1980s by the blind economic obedience of the Liberal and National Parties to policies that have already disastrously illustrated their failure in the 1970s. Already, in the specific purpose payments area, money for sewerage is slashed to zero; tuberculosis control is abolished; flood mitigation is almost worthless, and finance for housing under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is savagely cut. Shortly I will refer to perhaps the worst problem of all—that of road funding.

At the Premiers' Conference last June, the Prime Minister offered to make Commonwealth officers available to the States to decide what assistance, if any, can be given inside the bounds that the Federal Government itself agrees are within its financial capacity. I want to know what his Liberal and National Party partners in Queensland have done since to ensure that he keeps at least one of the promises he spreads around so recklessly.

Again at that June meeting, the Prime Minister suggested he was prepared to consider a new Premiers' Conference later this year to reconsider and renegotiate Commonwealth-State finances. What has Queensland, as the most disadvantaged State under Fraser-Anthony federalism, done to initiate such a conference? I call on the Premier and his deputy to support my demand for this special Premiers' Conference and also seek the backing of other Premiers and State Treasurers.

Unless there is at least an extension of the Labor Government's 1975 guarantee on State finances or a serious adjustment of present Federal attitudes, the Fraser-Anthony tax-sharing arrangements under this new federalism will soon end in tatters and financial dislocation surely will follow. It will be too late for complaints if these Federal-State discussions are delayed until the States are in a no-win situation and forced to accept whatever crumbs Malcolm Fraser throws them as token compensation.

From federalism, I turn to a subject of great concern to Queensland, as the most decentralised State. I refer to road development, where in the past year there has been a dishonest attempt by the Federal Liberal-National Party Government to pre-

sent normal allocations for a section of the Bruce Highway as some kind of new, special allocation for Queensland.

I refer, too, to the more recent efforts of the Queensland Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, who claimed that the Queensland Government would go it alone. The completion of the section of the Bruce Highway to which he referred was promised as far back as the early 1970s. It is still uncompleted, and it will not be completed within the three-year programme that he talks about. When it is completed, a 60-km stretch will have to be reconstructed to widen the existing 12-ft pavement and to bring the road up to a satisfactory standard. These matters are well known to Federal Ministers—of the same political colour and ilk—as well as to State Ministers.

In 1977, after an inspection tour of the North, the National Party's Federal Transport Minister (Mr. Nixon) said the State Government was not doing enough in road development in the area. He himself criticised the State Government. Now there is alarming evidence of the fact, as I have long suspected, that its submissions at State ministerial level for Federal assistance are incompetently and incompletely prepared and presented. For 22 years the National and Liberal Parties have permitted a situation of almost predictable closures of our No. 1 national highway between Brisbane and Cairns, and for 19 of those years there has also been a Liberal-National Party Government in Canberra.

In the past six years, major closures of the highway have occupied a total of 108 days—an average of 18 days a year—with 35 days involved already in the present year. It looks like being a record. There is no worse publicity for North Queensland's tourism industry than the reports that occur annually with monotonous regularity of washouts, with motorists stranded along the Bruce Highway, particularly between Mackay and Rockhampton.

I have wondered for some time why other States less dependent on road transport seem to succeed in obtaining more generous allocations than Queensland. In the 1979 report of the Bureau of Transport Economics entitled "An Assessment of the Australian Road System" there is a copy of a letter written to State Ministers for Transport concerning road and transport development needs, projection and strategy—the overall planning for our road system in Australia for the years ahead. The return submitted from the Victorian State Government printed in the bureau's report occupies 19 pages, while the answer from Queensland takes up a disgraceful seven paragraphs—less than a page! Two of these paragraphs are taken up by the introduction and concluding remarks and the balance indicates the Queensland Government's quandary as to whether it should support road or rail transport. There is not a word about those

very vital things—not a word about the needs; not a word about the projection of our road system; not a word about the strategy that would be undertaken by that Government.

The Transport Minister and his globe-trotting Main Roads colleague, who sees himself as the Premier's heir apparent, should hang their heads in shame. They have let Queensland down through their indifference and incompetence. Next month the Main Roads Minister, who obviously knows so little about local road strategy, is heading overseas to the Austrian alps and America for five weeks to attend a conference lasting five days. I believe this example in roads is not an isolated case in which Queensland is suffering at Federal level from ministerial neglect and from the way in which Queensland is not submitting proper cases to Canberra on these matters.

For almost 12 months Queensland has been awaiting a reshuffle of a Cabinet which the Premier has already conceded in a number of cases is either too old or too inefficient. It is a Cabinet that continues to include two Ministers who even the Treasurer, as Liberal Leader, tried unsuccessfully to sack in November last year because he felt they were not up to the task. Because he was unable to sack them, he has continued to keep them in Cabinet for a further seven months. The Premier would not let him sack them.

Dr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I find that statement inaccurate and offensive. As usual, the Leader of the Opposition is taking advantage of this debate to make such statements. I therefore feel that he should withdraw those statements, which are absolutely incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those comments.

Mr. CASEY: If the Deputy Premier—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There will be no qualification. The honourable member will withdraw.

Mr. CASEY: If the Deputy Premier finds those words offensive, I withdraw them. I am not quite sure which ones they are, because most certainly he did try unsuccessfully to sack two Cabinet Ministers last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is making an assumption. The Treasurer has already entered a denial. The Leader of the Opposition will accept that denial and withdraw without qualification.

Mr. CASEY: They are still there, so he must have been unsuccessful.

Dr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I seek your indulgence, Mr. Hewitt. The Leader of the Opposition has continued

to make that statement. He has done so on two occasions and has still not withdrawn it. It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. CASEY: I withdraw whatever he is offended about.

Dr. EDWARDS: With respect, Mr. Hewitt, he has not withdrawn that statement, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to state that he withdraws the comment.

Mr. CASEY: I did state I would withdraw what was offensive to the Treasurer. I am sorry that he is so easily offended, and finds it so hard to change his Cabinet.

The highways of Queensland will not be paved or made flood-proof by the propaganda of State Cabinet Ministers who can only contribute a miserable seven paragraphs on our future transport projections. There is no consolation for Queenslanders when this State misses out on money it deserves because their own State Cabinet Ministers are so obviously inefficient and deficient. I hope that the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services does not take exception to those words.

My third topic today concerns the deceitful budgeting strategy designed to create the false impression that this State Government is a low-tax, tax-abolishing Government. The sectional tax cuts approved by the National—Liberal Government, often to their favourites interstate (such as in road transport), have been subsidised in all cases by heavier State tax burdens on the general Queensland community. The State Government Gazettes are littered with increases in State charges that are deceitfully omitted by the National and Liberal Parties from their annual Budget document.

We have seen rail freights increased by a combined 97 per cent since the Government promised to peg them as an election promise in 1974. The last two of these increases occurred in the course of the year without any reference to them in the Budgets that preceded them.

This type of economic trickery is occurring all the time. I challenge the Treasurer in this debate to detail one by one every increase in State taxes and charges that has occurred since the Budget last September, and the extent of each. It is obvious from the way the economic estimates are balanced that these increases in many instances are planned at the time the Budget is presented but are sneakily hidden away from the Queensland people.

There are pages and pages of increases that are silently imposed on the Queensland people via the secrecy of Cabinet by this Government that dishonestly pretends it is a tax reducer. Pay-roll tax, which has been condemned by the former Liberal Treasurer and now Health Minister, has been doubled from 2.5 per cent to 5 per

cent in less than eight years by this Government that condemns it as it collects it. Far from dropping or reducing taxes as it claims, the State National and Liberal Parties are increasing their charges with a regularity that beats even their promise-breaking Federal partners in Canberra.

Labor believes that, as we consider this Appropriation Bill with the uncertainties of the new federalism already clouding our entry into the 1980s, it is important that the true economic facts are relayed to the Queensland people. The pot-holes of the North and West are not filled by misrepresentation and ministerial inefficiency. The tax burden of the average Queensland family will not be lessened by this State Government that disguises its real budgeting activities to cheat the people it is elected to represent.

There is, I believe, cold comfort for Queensland in a federalism already scarred with failure; a federalism that, as it moves closer towards a second income tax, is shared enthusiastically by the State National and Liberal Parties as well as the Federal ones. For Queensland, gripped with the fuel policy initiated by the National Party and endorsed by the Liberal Party, there can be no hope whatsoever for the future from a cabinet that can only contribute a paltry seven paragraphs on Queensland's road transport requirements.

Labor believes that this State, as the worst affected by Liberal and National Party federalism, must be the one to start the moves to amend it. Those changes, already overdue, must not be delayed any longer until the most drastic extremes are upon us after 30 June next year.

For too long this State National-Liberal Government has concealed its own shameful lack of economic performance behind criticisms of Canberra—behind, in many cases, policies that it has proposed, recommended and promoted. It is a Government that has dropped the ideal of full employment and allowed technology to chase experienced men and women and young Queenslanders out of the work-force without any investigation into its orderly introduction.

Economically, this State National-Liberal Government is an active collaborator with the Fraser-Anthony Government in the sell-out of Queensland. It is an active collaborator in the promotion of a false federalism that damages Queensland more than any other State. It is an active collaborator with its colleagues in Canberra in the furtherance of policies that, in the case of fuel, are strangling the remaining prosperity from already struggling provincial and country centres. It is a high-taxing Government that promotes a dishonest low-tax profile; a Government that limps along handicapped by jet-setting Cabinet Ministers who are too old, out of date or straight-out incompetent.

This is an Appropriation Bill and, as such, the Opposition supports it as a formal machinery measure. But at the same time we condemn the economic inabilities and discrimination of the National-Liberal State Government that presents it—the State Government that has deliberately delivered this State into the clutches of a style of artificial federalism from which it is already suffering so severely.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (4.23 p.m.): I am amazed to find no provision in this Appropriation Bill for an increase in staff to fight the ever-increasing white-collar crime in Queensland. We are all aware that white-collar crime is next only to the massage parlour industry in having the fastest growth rate in this State. The staff of the Fraud Squad should be increased substantially with well-trained and qualified staff to deal with this menace.

Because of the obvious indifference of the Bjelke-Petersen Government to the burgeoning white-collar crime in the community, there is a widely held view that the Premier is a political partner in white-collar crime and corruption and is using the prestige of his position to promote and entertain undesirable no-hopers who should never have been allowed into Queensland.

In London, this State is represented by the former National Party Minister for Lands, Sir Wallace Rae, who has been named by inference unfavourably in a police Fraud Squad report on the Russell Island land robberies. Members of this Parliament and Cabinet, and former members of the Cabinet, are not immune from any charges that could be laid by the police Fraud Squad for fraud or embezzlement.

Mr. Porter: What are you alleging?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: If the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs will be patient, I will come to it.

Listed in the same report is the former Liberal member for Kurilpa, Mr. Clive Hughes. It contains allegations that he used his parliamentary privileges to separate innocent Asians from their bank balances. At a time when the staff of Her Majesty's Opposition is booted undemocratically out of this Parliament House, the dregs of the Pacific are being invited into it by the Premier. It is no wonder that the people of Queensland have lost all respect for the Government and, regrettably, through it, our whole parliamentary system.

Mr. Porter: They have no respect for you.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: There is certainly no respect for the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs.

In 1975, the Premier's favourite was the bankrupt confidence man Wylie Fancher, whom he appointed as his financial adviser. At our expense he dispatched Mr. Fancher around the world to blacken the name of

the Whitlam Government on grounds found a few months later by the Federal Liberal Attorney-General as being absolutely worthless.

Mr. Prest: They reckon his name is on the Agent-General's list.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: No; I do not think the Government has slipped that far. It has certainly slipped, but not that far. This is the same Wiley Fancher who now cannot pay his telephone bill, let alone the money he owes to many Queenslanders. In my opinion, and I think it is the opinion of most Queenslanders, he should be deported unceremoniously to the Deep South of America whence he came.

Another favourite of the Premier is the notorious crook, Harry Londy, who was applauded by the Premier for the land fraud because of which he is now bankrupt and should be gaoled. I have here a Press statement made on 28 September 1976 in which the Premier hailed a \$35,000,000 housing project that was promoted by this white-collar crook, Harry Londy. At a later date I made a speech in this Chamber and exposed Harry Londy, and as a result the proposed development at Redland Bay never took place. I am also told on good authority that, when this Harry Londy used to fly a plane up from Sydney with unsuspecting southerners to view the so-called land at Redland Bay, alcoholic beverages flowed quite copiously and by the time the plane got over Redland Bay the poor old suckers did not know whether they were flying over Redland Bay or Kingaroy. As I say, the Premier congratulated this corporate criminal Harry Londy—blessed at the time with a most unsavoury record—on his faith in Queensland.

On 11 March 1979 in "The Sunday Mail" there appeared an article headed, "Police probe on forgery in land letter". The article states—

"The fraud squad is investigating the forgery of a letter on the notepaper of a well-known Brisbane legal firm, apparently by a Sydney-based property developer.

"The letter, purporting to come from the office of O'Shea, Corser and Wadley, and dealing with a South Queensland land deal, was sent to a Sydney doctor and his wife.

"The deception was discovered when the doctor contacted the legal firm, which had no knowledge of the letter.

"Partners in O'Shea, Corser and Wadley called in the police."

I make no secret of the fact, and I am going to state it here today, that the person who forged that letter was none other than Harry Londy. Nothing has been done about it. It is also widely recognised throughout Australia that Queensland has become the haven and the Mecca for white-collar crooks in the Commonwealth.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Shocking!

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is shocking. The Premier is on record at that stage as saying that white-collar crime did not exist in Queensland. Of course, it was quite obvious at that time that the Premier was wearing his rose-tinted glasses. Harry Londy is a criminal of the worst type, and the sooner he is put in gaol the better off the people of Queensland and Australia will be.

From Londy we now pass to the Cook Islands witch-doctor, Milan Brych, promoted in Brisbane by the Premier just before he deserted dying Queenslanders after relieving them of their life savings. Even the present leader of the Liberal Party, who at that time was the Minister for Health, was prompted to come into this Parliament and denounce this unregistered quack. The Premier has gone strangely quiet on the subject of Brych's return to Queensland to set up a clinic.

Next came Brych's partner in fraud, Sir Albert Henry—another worthy knight of the realm—who was dismissed from office as Prime Minister of the Cook Islands by his own country's Supreme Court. Only three weeks before the court declared Henry to be one of the worst crooks in the Pacific he was wined and dined in Queensland by the Premier, and even joined him in a Press conference.

Mr. Hewitt, it goes on and on. There is the Premier's 500,000-plus shares in Oilmin No Liability, previously Exoil, a company that would love nothing better than to drill the Great Barrier Reef. We learn from the Sunday newspapers that the Premier's wife has shares in Comalco, which gets cheap power from this Government. Only last year we saw the Premier holidaying, I might add at the taxpayers' expense, with the mixed-bathing millionaire Mr. Iwasaki, just before steam-rolling legislation through this House to give this old Japanese war-lord ownership of part of our precious beach-front, equal in distance to the area from Broadbeach to the Tweed.

Soon after, and this is a strange coincidence, out of all the primary producers in Australia, Iwasaki's associate, Aoki, picked the Premier's son John as his partner in a farming venture and in the process presented him with a 20 per cent profit on his investment. It is any wonder that the reputation of this Government reeks with dishonour and corruption.

Mr. Davis: It's a shame!

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is a shame. It is also true.

Then there is the Premier's plane—actually the Government's plane—which costs over \$2,000 a week to operate yet spends all but nine hours each week squatting unproductively on the tarmac at Eagle Farm while the pilot, earning more than \$21,000 a year, occupies most of her time farming in the Brisbane Valley.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Government members on my left are saying, "Come on". I am telling them through you, Mr. Hewitt, that what I am saying is spot on. Let the Premier stand up in this Chamber tomorrow and deny it.

The Premier's former Press Secretary has just been elevated, without appeal, to a senior Public Service position—and I am referring to Mr. Alan Callaghan. The assistant secretary in his ministerial office, Gary Gilbert, went straight there from the last redistribution commission. That looks very suspicious and certainly reeks of jobs for favours rendered.

Just imagine for a second how many extra crooks like Fancher, Londy and Brych were able to deceive because of the false respectability given to them by the Premier! In my opinion, he was a collaborator in their evil conspiracies.

No decent Government would tolerate the ministerial likes of the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, anointed as he is by roubles rather than scruples.

Mr. Jones: Is it true that the Honourable Minister for Main Roads is off to Vienna to study autobahns?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is true. With the Minister's limited knowledge of roads, it would be more appropriate if he went to Venice. The mind boggles. Just imagine the Minister for Local Government being ferried down one of the canals in a gondola! Just imagine, also, the honourable member for Salisbury, with her dulcet tones, serenading him in the back of the gondola!

In all seriousness, what other State Government would harbour a political diplomat—and I am referring to Sir Wallace Rae—who has so dishonourably attracted the attention of its own police Fraud Squad?

Then there is the Liberal leader, and the Minister for Survey and Valuation, who are here in Parliament only because of special backdating Bills to save them from their sins? In the case of the Minister for Survey and Valuation, it was to save him from his greed.

The present Minister for Health was rewarded with a knighthood after getting the boot for incompetence. Of course, another undeserved knighthood was handed out to Sir Bob Sparkes. I have said before publicly that if these two gentlemen had had any sense of decency they would have handed back their knighthoods.

This Parliament must protect itself against those who seek to drag its reputation into dishonour through their dirty unethical conduct. We must start with the members of the Cabinet. They should be setting an example for the other members in this Chamber. In Mareeba, in the early part of this year, the Government rented office space, at public expense, for the National Party member for Barron River from Tom Magro, who is named in police records of interview

as being a principal in drug deals involving over \$1,000,000. An inquest in the same town, with the smell of drugs around it, concerning the death of a police officer has been kept secret from the people with the approval of the Justice Minister. That is just another example of this Government's looking after its mates.

Another example of white-collar crime that I wish to bring to the notice of honourable members is particularly reprehensible. It trades on the desire of people to own their own home, in particular those on low incomes with very little means. The methods used are that houses are advertised for sale for as little as \$100 deposit. When a couple goes along to the salesman he takes a list of their liabilities. Finance companies then advise their agents of their particular requirements as to the applicants' assets, liabilities, income, etc. However, when replies from applicants do not conform with the set figures, the formula figure is used in place of the truthful figure supplied by the applicant. That practice has become quite prevalent.

Few applicants would be able to verify the correctness of the information on the form. They would sign in the belief that their information had been written down correctly. However, in such circumstances it could be claimed that the applicants had conspired to defraud the finance company. Further, because of the false figures allegedly supplied by the real estate agent to the finance company, the applicants would be unable to meet their commitments, thus losing their deposit and home.

Another variation on this theme is for the real estate agent to consolidate the applicant's liabilities into one finance company loan. I see that the Treasurer is listening intently. I can hear his head rattling. An application is then made to a building society for a loan on the basis that the applicant has only one debt, for example, paying off a car. The same fate awaits him—loss of house and deposit.

Fortunately, most of the building societies are awake to this ploy. A couple of building societies in the State leave a lot to be desired. One is the Security Permanent Building Society, and I will be having something to say about it later in the session. Most of the honourable building societies have refused to have anything to do with certain real estate firms.

In my own electorate, I recently had brought to my attention the case of a couple losing their money and their house because of overcommitments. They subsequently found out that their home had been on the market four times because of that overcommitment. In that instance the agent was Myer Realty, which is a division of Peter Kurts (Developments) Pty. Ltd.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: He is a tasty person.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I had occasion in this Chamber some years ago to name Peter Kurts for his unethical conduct in buying and selling homes. I must have worried him, because in the Brisbane "Telegraph" next day he inserted a large, expensive advertisement on page 3 refuting what I said in the Parliament, and in "The Courier-Mail" on the following day he inserted another expensive advertisement denying what I had said. I am saying that the activities of Peter Kurts leave much to be desired. I am only sorry that the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General is not in the Chamber to hear what I am saying. If he were, no doubt he would take action. I hope that he reads the pull of my speech.

Mr. Bourke: I hope it reads better than it sounds.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It certainly sounds better than the speeches of the whispering paperweight from Lockyer.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Where is Lockyer?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: As a matter of fact, I do not think even the honourable member himself knows. He does not represent it very well.

Also tied in are Queen Street Realty Pty. Ltd. and Vaucuse Investments and, as I said earlier, I shall be having more to say on the matter as the session proceeds.

In the few minutes left to me, Mr. Hewitt, I should like to deal with the position of the Agent-General in London. I think that most people in the community would agree that the position of Agent-General in London has now outlived its usefulness. In fact, I remember an occasion in this Chamber on which the honourable member for Salisbury, I think it was, asked the Premier a question as to whether it was economically feasible to maintain the office of Agent-General in London. So the question has been raised even among members of the Liberal Party. Not that members of the Liberal Party are overbright, but I will give them credit for being brighter than members of their coalition partner, the National Party. The leader of the Liberal Party reminds me of the mouse that roared, and he reacts every time the Premier pulls the puppet strings.

As I said, the position of Agent-General in London is now obsolete and should be abolished. It is now only a sinecure for ageing political hacks. The person now being touted for the position is Mr. Newbery, who I think is still Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Prest: He will get a send-off by Ministers.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: He should be given a lot more send-offs, too, but they should not be kindly ones. All he is is an ageing political hack. He has reached the age of 65 years, and it is a blatant trade-off. He

is making a big ploy of the fact that he is going to get out of Cabinet and make way for a younger man. Let him do the right thing and get out of Cabinet altogether and make way for a younger person to accept the position of Agent-General in London.

Last week I read in the newspaper a statement attributed to the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation. Although the Minister looks quite good as he sits over there—he has a pleasant appearance and he dresses well—as soon as he opens his mouth he dispels that impression. As soon as he opens his mouth, he puts his foot in it. From the ridiculous statement made last week by the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation, it is quite obvious to me that he has not heard the old adage that a closed mouth catches no flies.

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: There he is, the Minister in charge of pencil sharpeners, Mr. Lee! If ever there was a lightweight in this Chamber, he is one. He was driven out of the Works and Housing portfolio.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am going to have all Ministers referred to by their correct title. The honourable member will correct the Minister's title before he proceeds.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: In deference to you, Mr. Hewitt, I will. The present Minister for Industry and Administrative Services was driven out of the Works and Housing portfolio because of his bungling incompetence. Most honourable members who were in the Chamber prior to 1977 will remember the bungling answers that he gave when questions were asked by the Opposition in relation to building societies.

Dr. EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Hewitt, may I seek your advice on a matter? We are supposed to be debating the Appropriation Bill. It seems very strange to me that you have been so tolerant in listening to a large outpouring of comments, and I am seeking your advice as to whether the comments of the honourable member for Archerfield are appropriate to this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The forms of the House have always provided that an Appropriation debate and a Budget debate allow reference to anything on which expenditure in the State touches. My personal opinion is that there should be a defining of the parameters; but until those parameters are so defined, I must act on precedent.

Mr. MILLER: I rise to a point of order. May I suggest—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! An honourable member takes a point of order; he does not suggest.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Hewitt—claims have been made by the honourable member for Archerfield, and I think those claims should be investigated. I would hope the Government would set up some sort of a committee to investigate those claims.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has made his point.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I take the point of the honourable member for Ithaca. I do hope that a committee is set up. Had a committee been formed some years ago, some of the white-collar crooks who have operated so blatantly, untrammelled and unfettered in this community would not have been able to do so, and a lot of Queenslanders who have been left lamenting would have been much better off.

It is true, Mr. Hewitt, what you say about the debate on the Budget and Appropriation Bills. The debate can range fairly widely. It is also true that the department under the control of the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services would require part of the appropriation we are talking about today. Therefore I feel that I am quite within the provisions of Standing Orders in making these comments. It is quite obvious that the present Minister for Industry and Administrative Services was kicked out of the Housing portfolio because of his gross incompetency. He showed no ability whatsoever.

Mr. Moore: You sound deflated.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I am just trying to be kind to the Minister. I certainly get no pleasure out of standing up here and making such comments about a Minister of the Crown, but as a responsible member of Her Majesty's Legislative Assembly I feel it is my duty to draw the Minister's shortcomings to the attention of the public of Queensland. When I look over there at the geriatric Cabinet—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That comment is offensive. The honourable member will withdraw it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: When I look around—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will withdraw it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I withdraw it. When I look at the Government front bench and see the aged members of Cabinet, I think they do very little for parliamentary procedure in this State. The Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs is in the twilight of his political career.

Mr. Prest: Twilight? He is 5 to 12.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Probably he is 5 to 12. Certainly he is in the twilight of his career, and I think it is only a matter of time before he gets out. But just look around that side. I know that the leader

of the Liberal Party is very unhappy about the talent he has beside him, but the remedy is in his hands. Without a good Press secretary, the Minister for Industry and Administrative Services cannot utter two sentences consecutively. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer should put the cleaner through his Cabinet representation. Now is his opportunity to put some young men with talent in Cabinet, and I hope he does that.

Mrs. KYBURZ (Salisbury) (4.43 p.m.): I believe that it is appropriate during the debate on an Appropriation Bill for some members of the Government not only to be congratulatory about the Bill but also to reflect upon some of the expenditure that has taken place. I rue the fact that the honourable member for Archerfield, sweet and benign as he is, made some comments which I considered to be of personal antipathy to some members. I see no reason for that sort of thing to take place in this Chamber now or at any time. While he may cast reflections upon the personality of some people, the fact is that we still tolerate him, and some of us even occasionally find him bearable.

The Leader of the Opposition took time to run down the policies and expenditure of the Federal Government, and then tried to lump this Government with that Government politically in an attempt to remove the odium that his party in the Federal sphere has cast upon the A.L.P. in Queensland. It would not be ill-meaning of me at this time to reflect upon some of the policies of the current Federal Government. Many of us have said that we do not agree in toto with some of the Federal Government's policies. At the Premiers' Conference each State goes cap in hand to the Federal Treasurer, but always comes away with what it considers to be not an equitable share of the Federal cake. Whether or not that is a fact, one is left to judge. Difficult decisions are made in the Federal sphere, and further difficult decisions are to be made in the future.

Some people consider that a State such as Tasmania, with its small Budget, is inappropriate in the current economic scene. Indeed, for Tasmania even to be a State is a matter of wonderment to me. I am disillusioned by the fact that the present Federal Government allowed the Northern Territory, with a population of only 35,000, to become a State in its own right. It seems more like a large cattle property run by quite an expensive legislative procedure.

The fact is that the Federal Government is in many ways quite gutless. It does not have the courage to make cuts where cuts should be made. Indeed, some of the cuts that have been made have occurred in inappropriate places.

I listened carefully to the previous speakers. I believe that they were critical without putting forward suggestions as to where cuts should have been made. I know that at this

time a lot of people are pushing the pensioners' barrow and are urging half-yearly indexation, which I believe will be in the Federal Budget. However, I believe that the present Federal Government has carried on some of the policies of the previous Federal Government and maintained what it considers to be middle-of-the-road stability. It is indeed pandering to the middle-class bourgeois Australian, who is very well off in our economy.

Whether or not the Federal Government realises that there are people in dire straits, I do not know. I do know that the family man and woman on an income of between \$170 and \$230 a week, and with two or three children, are struggling. They are struggling to maintain the payments on their home, to pay their insurance premiums and to buy their food. Their everyday living is a struggle. Whether or not they can be blamed for finding themselves in that position is not for me to decide; the fact remains that a number of people feel very unhappy because they are not able to bring up their children in the way that they wish.

Of late, my main concern has centred on the amount that they will have to pay for medical benefits cover. Although I have at times criticised our Health Budget, I must say that Queensland has husbanded its health resources very carefully. Because it is going to cost the average family man dearly to go to the doctor, I believe that the free hospital service will be a very important service in the future. Some of our health facilities leave a lot to be desired. Some doctors—I use the word “some”—do not provide an after-hours service, and this causes people a great deal of concern.

Because we have in some ways been burdened with a gutless Federal Government, it seems appropriate at times to say, “You have not been able to make those cuts that you ought to have made, you have not been able to weed out the tall poppies in your own Public Service, so why are you constantly criticising the States?”

The Prime Minister, strong as he may be, seems to be something of a kung fu expert in that he is constantly waving sticks. However, he does not seem to know what to do with them. Listening to a speech by Malcolm Fraser is a very interesting exercise in polemics. His speeches contain a lot of verbs but they contain too few adjectives and very few nouns. Indeed, nothing is said.

The fact is that Queensland, in its budgeting, has husbanded its resources very well, particularly in health, education and works. Quite often a lot of criticism is levelled at the Works portfolio. I must say that the Works Budget has not been cut. In fact, it has been constantly increased and I believe that in the forthcoming Budget we will see the injection of public funds into the Works portfolio.

My main concern in relation to the Works and Housing portfolio revolved around some of the policies of the Housing Commission. In some ways it has moved away from its original concept of being a provider of welfare housing. Perhaps there is some empire-building in the Housing Commission. Whether or not the commissioner realises the *raison d'être* of the Housing Commission, I do not know. The fact is that there are people in dire straits and in need of welfare housing. The honourable member for Archerfield said that people are losing their own homes. He also mentioned some real estate agents. There is no doubt that what he had to say is entirely and absolutely the truth and that in middle suburbia people are having trouble keeping up with their repayments. Some institutions are constantly putting up their interest rates. People are going into debt well over their heads, perhaps thinking that there will be two incomes for a considerable number of years whereas in fact, for one reason or other, those two incomes do not eventuate.

It is a regrettable fact that people are losing their houses because of lying real estate agents. People come to us and say, “But they said that we could continue making these repayments or cut them down in future years.” People are just so gullible that they will believe real estate agents, who are not in the main trained to give financial advice. I am well aware that some might be; but the fact that most are not irks me.

Whether or not we ought to have a financial adviser somewhere in the Government is a point that I have raised previously. It is one that concerns me. Many, many people do not have access to a person such as the manager of a bank. They borrow through other financial institutions and have nowhere to turn when they need financial advice. That advice is multi-disciplinary. It is embarrassing to find that sometimes people are not held back from going to sources such as real estate agents. If we had someone in the position of financial adviser—we could call him whatever we wish—people who are in financial difficulty would have access to advice on a totally non-partisan basis. I believe that to be an extremely important service that the Government could consider.

I turn now to the appropriation for continuing education policies of this State. The Education budget of this State is increasing at such a rate that we really do have to consider what the avenues for improvement in policies should be and, indeed, whether the current politicisation of education institutions in this State is good or bad. I personally am very concerned that many members of p. & c. associations are pushing political lines at their meetings and are constantly talking politics not only in the classroom but also at what I would consider to be social gatherings. They are constantly

pushing their own politics at p. & c. meetings when those associations were not instituted for that purpose. Whether or not that politicisation is good or bad will be for the present and future generations to determine; but I believe that many people have lost sight of the fact that millions and millions of dollars allocated to education are spent with the good of the education of the whole of the young people of this State in mind.

One of the current bones of contention that have been raised by many of my colleagues concerns speech therapists. I often hear people, perhaps meaning well, say that their school ought to have a social worker or a speech therapist attached to it. Perhaps they do not realise that speech therapists are attached to special institutions, where their services are needed far more than at the average suburban high school. If parents had themselves been good communicators and had even attempted to communicate with their children instead of plopping them in front of television sets when they were younger, they would not need the service of a speech therapist.

I firmly believe that this Government has failed—and the Education Minister is probably to blame—by not saying to the wider population, “The Government’s policy is that speech therapists should go first to children and adults in need; that is, those people who are intellectually and physically handicapped.” I believe that in the past those people have been getting a somewhat raw deal, most particularly because they have been shunted into the background as much as possible.

The fact that people in that category, particularly those with mental handicaps, are an embarrassment to the community has not escaped my notice. Whenever I mention to people that intellectually handicapped children deserve speech therapists first, the immediate reaction is, “Why bother wasting a speech therapist on a dumb kid?” That is an extremely sad indictment of the attitudes of some people towards these children. We ought to be saying loudly and quickly that the Government’s policy is to employ speech therapists where they are needed most.

The same applies to social workers. Social workers should not be attached to schools. They work best within the health context and not within the education context. The fact is that there is such an overlapping of disciplines now that it is very hard to work out whether the interdisciplinary social worker is indeed needed in the health centres that we now have.

One of the policies of the Housing Commission that is causing concern is the lack of social mix in the areas that have been set aside for Housing Commission purposes. My concern is that there are no social peer groups in those areas.

Whilst at times I have been a strong advocate of women trying to do their own thing at all times, I believe equally that children are best brought up in a household where there are two models—a mother model and a father model or a grandmother model and a grandfather model.

I rue the fact that in areas such as Eagleby, which is on the left-hand side of the highway travelling towards Beenleigh, there are streets upon streets of women who are trying to raise their families and are doing the best job possible while, in approximately five streets, there are only two males. Those males are trying to provide the football clubs, scouting organisations, and similar activities that the ordinary community enjoys. That policy is not in the best interests of those children. Those women should not be stuck down there. For all the services they have, they might as well be in Birdsville. The majority of them have no way of affording to get into the city. They have no avenue of social intercourse. They have no avenue of intellectual stimulation, except each other and Haydn Sargent, and that is a pretty poor choice.

It is that policy of the Housing Commission which ought to be criticised again and again. At every opportunity in this Chamber I intend to criticise that policy of the Housing Commission, which lumps together either socially or economically deprived people.

During the election of the Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition made one statement that I feel I should correct now. He criticised the lack of opportunity that a member of Parliament had to debate such trivial matters as those I am raising now. At times I have agreed with him when a particular issue has blown up that we have not had the opportunity. This sort of debate allows members to raise any matter that is, as you have stated, Mr. Hewitt, related to the Budget of this State. It covers a very wide range of matters for us to debate. I very much doubt that our opportunities will be curtailed in the future.

On very few occasions in this place have I been asked, told, cajoled or threatened not to make a speech. Of all people, the Liberal Whip, for all of his alleged snappiness, has been totally and openly in agreement with, and, indeed, enthusiastic about, our making a speech at every opportunity. I must congratulate him for that. So the Leader of the Opposition is entirely wrong. The Liberal Whip constantly says, “If you want to speak, speak.” He is always giving advice to us about what sort of speeches we can make and how often we can speak. I have never been told by the Liberal Whip not to make a speech. The Leader of the Opposition should consider changing parties; not that he ever would.

When we consider the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), we realise that the Government’s money flow is winding down and that a Budget is coming up quite soon. I hope that in considering the framing of the

Budget the Treasurer will give consideration to those housing, education and works policies that I have mentioned.

The fact is that in my electorate a new hospital is nearing completion. It is equally a fact that that hospital was relatively unnecessary when we consider that there are hospitals in close proximity and that the Greenslopes Repatriation Hospital is running short of patients and is now opening its doors as a general hospital. I ask that consideration be given to using part of the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital as a rehabilitation hospital because I am extremely concerned that not only physically handicapped people but also stroke patients are not being adequately treated. I believe that these sorts of patients are being shunted off into remote parts of our big hospitals when they should be given specialised treatment.

I believe that the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital concept, which is more of a community hospital than a general hospital, would be an ideal situation for a rehabilitation ward or wards. I will be raising this issue as often as I can because it is one about which I feel very strongly. There are middle-aged stroke patients in the community—to someone my age I suppose “middle-aged” is 50-plus—whose working life is certainly not over. They need retraining, and they need it in a community situation, and I believe they would receive better rehabilitation treatment in this new hospital.

I must say that the money being expended on the grounds of the Griffith University for the accommodation of Commonwealth Games athletes is probably a laudatory move except that there are still continuing discussions about a medical school facility at the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital. I think it is time that the Australian Medical Association made a clear policy statement on whether or not there ought to be a medical school at this hospital and the Griffith University, because I do not believe that expenditure on such a facility is at all warranted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (5.3 p.m.): We have just heard a diatribe from the Deputy Premier and Treasurer about the financial record of the State Government that was a load of tripe. This evening I wish to deal with an instance in the Ipswich area where the financial policy of the State Government is having disastrous consequences on a certain section of the community. I have here figures supplied by the Commonwealth Employment Service in Ipswich, which show that during the life of this Parliament the number of unemployed in the Ipswich district has sky-rocketed by nearly 30 per cent from 2,705 in June 1977 to 3,364 at the end of June this year. They are figures for a typically quiet time of the year for employment.

This week one of the largest secondary industries in any of Queensland's country towns is lying dormant, and that is the

Lockyer Valley Fresh Food Co-operative Association Limited in Laidley. As of last Friday it has been forced to stand down its employees owing to its inability to secure a suitable operating overdraft. That co-operative has a work-force of up to 90 people and approximately \$12,000 a week is paid in wages, which automatically flows into the economy of Laidley and the surrounding area. Of course, Laidley is part of the Ipswich area. After carrying out a feasibility study on the operations of the co-operative, the Department of Primary Industries has recommended to the Treasury that it grant a guarantee of \$1,000,000 to the co-operative. The Lockyer Valley Fresh Food Co-operative is unique in that a facility valued at \$1,500,000 has been built up by 30 members. The co-operative now finds that only Government support can solve its financial problems.

Mrs. Kyburz: Why?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If the honourable member listens, I will tell her.

This guarantee, which the co-operative needs, has been refused by the Treasurer under Treasury advice, contrary to the advice of the Department of Primary Industries. I submit that the Treasurer should recommend the guarantee—which to date he has refused to do—and the co-operative will be able to meet the terms of the guarantee over the period of the guarantee.

Briefly, for the information of those people who do not know about the Lockyer Valley Fresh Foods Co-operative, originally it was a partnership of six primary producers engaged in the processing of catering supplies and fresh vegetables, namely, fresh-cut potato chips, coleslaw, lettuce and freshly packed sweet corn. Approval to register Lockyer Valley Fresh Foods as a co-operative was given on 21 April 1975. The operation continued as a partnership until 30 June 1975. It began trading officially as a co-operative on 1 July 1975.

The potential for the production of frozen vegetables was the impetus for the building of a factory on land in Laidley. Using its own local recruits, Lockyer Valley Fresh Foods Co-operative proceeded from the bare ground up to erecting and equipping a steel-framed building of some 1 800 sq m of floor area. The reason for the non-use of the Department of Industrial Development's facilities was that its terms were far too costly, and members found that they could set themselves up with their required facilities much more cheaply.

At present, the co-operative is geared to processing a range of frozen vegetables such as sweet corn, diced carrots, baby carrots, cauliflowers, mixed vegetables, beans and peas, in addition to the original chilled fresh vegetables for the Brisbane, Ipswich, interstate and overseas catering trades. The company has been able to sell everything that it has produced. In addition, it has had to buy in reserve raw materials to supplement its production. It has had to do this in the face

of the price that it needed for its product, a limited range, price competition, no advertising, monopolistic wholesale distribution, the restrictive policies of major chain stores and initial poor packaging problems, which have now been solved.

In the initial period of its operation in 1975, when the operation was relatively small, finance was not a problem. However, the Treasury has used the debt structure of around about that time as a secondary reason for refusing to grant the guarantee. Here I should like to refer to a letter which the Lockyer Valley Fresh Foods Co-operative wrote to the Treasury on 18 May 1979. In providing information to the Treasury to support its request for the guarantee, the co-operative stated—

“My Association feels certain reasons pointed out by you which influenced your decision would need much more consideration.

“The Association’s losses have been grossly exaggerated by accounting inefficiencies.

(1) Namely work done by our own engineering staff over the four year period was not capitalised to the extent it should have been.

(2) It must be accepted that it has taken three years to build the complex to a stage where it can operate mechanically efficient. Any processing done during that period of development was never expected to be profitable as it was all on a stop-go test run basis.

“We are now fully efficient and all production budgets are being exceeded comfortably. This initial period of development also effected the marketing potential because as you know we had to break into a market that was traditionally national companies with a Multi national domination and we have proved that Australian people will patronize small enterprises operated by Australians who are game to have a go to develop Queensland, in particular for the primary benefit of Primary Production and Secondly the ordinary consumer without foreign domination.

“We are also very confident of our sales expansion in the future. The evidence of sales supplied to you is only a small portion of the trade which has been offered to us when we can produce the quantities required.

“You may notice that we have not as yet had to sell to the super chains to dispose of our entire production.”

I mentioned the debt that the co-operative accumulated in the early days through experimentation and setting up. Since that time the marketing of its increased production and of its much wider variety of products has started to cut into the sales, naturally enough, of the monopolistic vegetable processors that are operating in Queensland. The power and influence of the giant national and international companies such as General Jones Pty. Ltd., Edgells and Wattie Pict

Ltd. was brought to bear on the financial world. The co-operative, over the last two years in particular, has found financiers using any and every tiny little excuse as a reason why the co-operative should not be supported.

The Lockyer Valley Fresh Foods Co-operative has a sales figure touching \$3,000,000. Is it any wonder that the large companies are feeling the presence of that co-operative and, as a consequence, want it forced out of the market-place? The immediate reason for the Lockyer Valley Fresh Foods Co-operative’s shortage of money is the \$400,000 expended in May and June of this year to process 1 500 tonnes of beans. The co-operative, in temporarily standing down its production, is interrupting the processing of 1 000 tonnes of carrots, which will, in turn, cause a shortage of stock for future sales.

The production plan for 1978-79 is 7 000 tonnes of vegetables grown locally in the Lockyer Valley and the Fassifern Valley. However, there is a serious threat to this production and, consequently, to jobs and to the financial and social gains by the farmers and the Laidley community. Unfortunately, farmer members are unable to lodge security to meet bank demands. The only hope now is, as recommended by the Department of Primary Industries, for the State Government to provide a guarantee that will see the co-operative expand into one of Queensland’s major industries.

When the co-operative initially sought a State Government guarantee last year through the Department of Primary Industries, the department laid down certain provisions and required some changes. The co-operative properly carried out those requirements. In fact, the Treasurer, when noting these changes, complimented the co-operative for its bold moves, which he felt were beneficial to it.

The issue is this: to grant or not to grant the guarantee, and at stake is the future of the jobs of 90 people, a multi-million-dollar processing, marketing and distribution industry for the Lockyer and Fassifern Valleys’ farming communities, the increased returns and occupational freedoms enjoyed by farmers supplying the raw produce to their own processing, marketing and distributing body, and healthy competition in the industry in the market-place, which causes better and cheaper products to be available to consumers.

The Department of Primary Industries, with all its practical and theoretical experience, has recommended the guarantee that the Treasurer and Treasury’s advisers find unacceptable. The Treasurer and his advisers are not experienced in this area of business, as are the Department of Primary Industries and the Minister for Primary Industries. I believe that the Treasurer is simply accepting the advice of his advisers, who are living in an ivory tower. It is time that they got out of their flash cars, jet planes

and cushy chairs and began to realise the problems that people are experiencing this year, and will experience in years to come, because of the lack of initiative, the failure to have a go, by the Queensland Government.

This is a pioneer industry, and pioneer industries always have problems and need to be supported. The men who set up this industry have vision. They have had the Treasury's back turned on them, and this industry is very important to the area and to the whole south-east corner of Queensland. In every primary industry that one can think of—for example, the grain and dairying industries—in which co-operatives were formed to assist industries in the past, the Government has always had to assist in some way or other. In fact, in almost all areas of primary production statutory bodies have been set up and financed by the Government.

Here we have pioneers, men with vision, men who have set up a viable industry that has great potential and capacity for expansion to the benefit of the primary producers, the workers involved, the local community and the State as a whole. Because it is a primary industry and because they made mistakes in the beginning when they had to experiment in a brand new industry in this State, they accumulated debts, and the State should be prepared to accept that. Of course, the Minister states in his correspondence that he will not accept reasons, even though they may be good reasons, for the initial debts. He only looks at the debts as such. What a cold and callous point of view.

Why should vegetable farmers remain the slaves of the international and national combines, providing cheap vegetables so that they can line their coffers with large profits? Why can't the farmers be given a hand to manage their own industry from the farm to the shoppers' grocery bag so that both the farmers and the workers involved in the industry can obtain maximum benefit from their labour and investment?

The Treasury's refusal to grant the guarantee is crushing a viable Queensland industry that has great potential, whose demise would be to the eternal benefit of non-Queensland monopolies. Guarantees for co-operatives have been granted before by this Government. I refer to a letter to me from the Treasurer dated 9 March 1979 in which he stated—

“Over the years very many guarantees of co-operative association borrowings have been recommended by the Treasury. Recently guarantees have been given in respect of the Buderim Ginger Growers Co-operative Association Limited and the Lower Burdekin Rice Producers Co-operative Association Limited. Other outstanding guarantees include those in respect of the South Burnett Meat Works Co-operative Association Limited and the Atherton Tableland Potato Growers Co-operative Association Limited.”

It is interesting to note in what electorates or near what electorates those co-operatives are operating. Most of them are held by Cabinet Ministers and the others are areas where the Government will be in trouble at the next State election. Of course, Laidley is a very strong National Party area. The farmers and workers there have always been very loyal to the Government while we have had Governments in Queensland. Of course, familiarity breeds contempt, and that is the way this Treasurer is treating the people of Laidley, and others in the Fassifern and Lockyer Valley areas.

The Treasurer states that the main problem, as he and his advisers see it, is that the co-operative is involved in a very competitive industry, namely, processing fresh and frozen vegetables, and that the co-operative has no proven record of being able to maintain sales over a five-year period at the new high level necessary to redeem the suggested \$1,000,000 guarantee. No company and no industry has sales orders or sales secured in any way over a five-year period—

Mr. MILLER: I rise to a point of order. I am not sure of the new procedure under the new Speaker. This member has been reading his speech for the last 10 minutes. I ask for your ruling. What is the procedure at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The fact is that speeches should not be read. I have been noticing the honourable member's conduct. Members should be dependent upon notes only, and speeches should not be read. I ask the honourable member to observe that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt. Actually I have copious notes. I wrote copious notes so that I would not give the Treasurer too hard a bucket. I feel very strongly about this, as do the people of the Laidley area. He is too ignorant to take the advice of the people there; he is too used to his big black car and his soft chair. But he will not be here after next year, so we will not have to worry about him then. He should get his stethoscope out and try to get back some of the patients out there who have turned away from him.

If this industry is such a dangerous proposition for the Government to enter into, why is the New South Wales Government trying to get it to move its operations south? Why is Primaries Mactaggarts trying to buy it out. The members of the board of Primaries Mactaggarts are very hard-headed gentlemen. They do not take over an operation that is likely to go bust. They are trying to move in. Of course, the deal was not accepted by the producers out there. They realised they would be just selling out to another large company and would once again become the slaves of another big combine. Why have overseas companies and other companies in Australia tried to move into the area if it is such a bad deal?

It has had feelers from some big manufacturing companies that want to buy it out and close it down, thereby removing competition from the market-place. It is a very competitive producers' co-operative.

Owing to the limited amount of working finance available to it—and not because of lack of sales—the co-operative has been restricted in the quantity of farm produce that it is able to turn out. As I pointed out earlier, it has increased its sales to other States, including even Western Australia. Furthermore, it has made sales to overseas clients and it could easily fill large orders placed by Asian countries. Unfortunately, it does not have the carry-on finance to be able to take in the produce and process it.

The co-operative already has the facilities to expand its output to meet the terms of the guarantee. The only problem is the lack of carry-on finance. As I stated earlier, the finance industry is not prepared to come to its aid, so it is up to the Government to lend its support.

Mr. MILLER: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has drawn the matter to my attention already and I am now monitoring the situation. I again remind the honourable member for Ipswich West that he should not read his speeches.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The honourable member for Ithaca read his 40-minute speech word for word. I am using copious notes, Mr. Hewitt.

The co-operative has potential buyers banging at its doors. Its products are of very high quality, and orders from these buyers will meet the terms of the guarantee. As I have stated, the lack of working finance is the only thing that is restricting its expansion.

In the few moments left to me I want to deal with an industry that has not been viable since its commencement. I refer to the Greenvale nickel project. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been poured into it by this State Government and the Federal Government by way of subsidies and so on.

Dr. Edwards: Hundreds of millions?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Hundreds of thousands and millions.

It compares with the small industry to which I have referred, one that could do a great deal, a pioneer industry in this State. It is one in which the employees will obtain great benefits. It is employing 90 persons and it needs State Government finance. It is very easy for the Treasurer to scoff and scorn.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (5.23 p.m.): I take this opportunity to talk about land sales overseas and a gentleman by the name of Alfred Grant.

Mr. Austin: I thought you were going to talk about tyres.

Mr. BURNS: I shall leave the baldy tyres to the man with the baldy head.

Alfred Grant was a company sponsored by the Queensland Government to sell land in London in 1969 and 1970. It used a letter from Sir Francis Nicklin, a former Premier of Queensland, and the Alfred Grant representatives in London were prepared to say that it was given to them by Queensland House and that they were authorised to use it as a recommendation.

Alfred Grant sold land to at least 700 people, many of whom have complained since that date that in most cases they did not receive title to their land. Because of that and because of the provisions contained in our Auctioneers and Agents Act they would normally have been entitled to the repayment of their money. The money should have been held in trust until such time as the title was handed over.

One wonders why the Government has done nothing about this matter. I have received a number of letters from people in both England and Australia in relation to it, and for the benefit of honourable members I will try to recapitulate on some of its history.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Alfred Grant group of companies, of which Tweed Valley Pastoral Company was a member, embarked on a programme of selling land in the Cooroy area in Queensland, and at a location known as Bundilla Lakes, to people in London. To do this they set up a company known as Capricornia Finance and Marketing Corporation Limited in Jersey, which is one of the Channel Islands and a tax-free haven. In addition to that, they also set up another company in London called Australian Land Sales. The directors of Capricornia Marketing, as I understand it from the investigations I have carried out, were Alfred Grant's wife and daughters. However, according to an article in "The Australian Financial Review" of 20 March 1973, a Mr. Hosegood of the Grant company in London said that they were Grant's three daughters. Because of the way it operates in Jersey—in the Channel Islands—which is a tax-free haven, one is not allowed to check out the records.

I am in contact with a Labor M.P. in London who has made some checks for me. He assures me that the Alfred Grant company, or the Grant family, controls Capricornia Finance and Marketing right through. One would wonder why Alfred Grant, if he were dealing honestly with the people of Britain, would need to set up a company in the Channel Islands, with all of the tax-free lurks associated with it at that time.

When a person went to purchase some of this land in London, an agreement was entered into between Capricornia and the vendor company out here, which was Tweed Valley Pastoral Company, one of the Grant companies, whereby Capricornia and the various subagents were to obtain commission amounting to approximately 45 per cent of the contract price—45 per cent sales commission! Grant was paying his own company over in England, with either his daughters or wife as nominee directors, 45 per cent sales commission on the sale of land in this State. When the money was collected, they got another 5 per cent sales fee. Anyone who knows anything about real estate and real estate sales would know that no-one pays 50 per cent commission. One would want to know why Alfred Grant and company headed off to England to set up this company and pay it half in commission.

Most of the land involved in these sales—if not all—was at the time of the sale in unregistered subdivisions. That practice was then legal in this State. Since then it has been prohibited under legislation. The agreement between Capricornia, the vendor company and the subagent companies continued successfully right through the early 1970s. When purchasers made their final instalment, title was supposed to be passed to them. They were given a five-year term—60 monthly payments. The purchasers were not allowed to vary the terms. They were not allowed to pay it off earlier. They had to complete the payment in 60 months. At the end of the 60 months they were to receive their title. If title was not available, the purchaser was required to wait.

In 1973 the Alfred Grant group of companies (included in which was this Tweed Valley Pastoral Company) controlled by Alfred Grant Holdings became a public company. The accountants for the issue required an indemnity from the private company (Alfred Grant Pastoral Properties Pty. Ltd.) that all overseas debtors be satisfied. In return for giving this indemnity, Alfred Grant Pastoral Properties required that all money paid by the purchasers should become the property of that company until such time as settlement was effected. That agreement purports to state that all money held in relation to sales made overseas is the property of Alfred Grant Pastoral Properties. There is some opinion that that agreement would not stand up in a court of law.

Tweed Valley Pastoral Company was one of the group of companies that on 24 March 1976, together with all other Alfred Grant companies, was placed into liquidation. At the time of the appointment of the receivers, 700 purchasers had either partly or fully completed their contractual commitments but had not received title for the purchased land from the vendor company. However, in many cases title was not available because the land had not been developed

or the subdivision even registered. As with many others, the position of the people who wrote to me was that the land was under a first mortgage to another finance company. So when Alfred Grant went into liquidation, the finance company stepped in, took the land away, developed it and sold it to someone else.

As I understand it, these people under the Auctioneers and Agents Act should have had all of the money that they paid to the agent put in trust until such time as they got a deed. However, they were in the position where they could not get their money back and could not get title to the land. When some of these stories were published in the Press, Alfred Grant replied in "The Courier-Mail" on Saturday, 14 July, to say that he was being defamed by these stories. He said that all moneys which came into Queensland representing payments by purchasers of such land were placed into trust accounts.

I shall cite the case of Mrs. Clancy of Culverley Road, Catford, London, who paid \$11,031.13 to Capricornia Finance and Marketing, which kept more than \$4,800.

Dr. Edwards: Did she see the land?

Mr. BURNS: No. She has been out here since and I will read a letter from her in a moment. I accept the interjection, but really one of the problems is that while people might be foolish enough to buy land they have not seen, they are entitled to our protection. If the land turned out to be good, we would not be arguing about it. The laws of the land should not be designed so that a person can be told, "If you sell someone a block of land that he does not see, you can rob him." I do not think that is right and I do not think that the Treasurer thinks that it is right. Because someone is a fool and buys a block of land without seeing it does not mean that we should allow con men or crooks to set up companies. I am not saying that Alfred Grant is a con man or crook. But there are a lot of questions he must answer. I am concerned about the people involved and about the lack of activity in this matter, just as there was with Russell Island.

Mrs. Clancy paid \$11,031.13 to Capricornia. A reconciliation of this amount has been effected by an accountant but Capricornia and the various receivers have not agreed to the reconciliation, which acknowledges that the sum of \$5,696.08 is held here for Mrs. Clancy—in other words, half of it was sent over—and that Capricornia took \$4,837.50 commission and another \$497.55 as collection fees for selling this \$11,000 block of land. So Capricornia did not do too badly. Remember that the allegation is that Capricornia is an Alfred Grant company which is run by his wife and his daughters and set up in a tax-free haven to sell land to people in London. Alfred Grant and Co. paid that company 50 per cent.

I have some understanding of that law. When I came out of the Air Force I sold land for a short while. I worked for B. J. Canniffe & Co. and for another real estate agent. Our responsibility was to pay all of the money received into a trust account. When the title deed to the land was handed over—that is, when the purchaser got title to the property—we got our commission and the vendor got his money.

That is not the way in which this transaction seems to have been handled. All that Capricornia has done is hold half the money and send the remainder here. If our Auctioneers and Agents Act provides that the real estate agent can take the money first and hand money to the vendor, I would be surprised. I am sure it did not happen that way some years ago and I would be interested to hear if the procedure has been allowed to change.

The situation now is that some of the money has been forwarded here. The liquidators in Australia are now arguing about who controls the money. As I said, all money should be held in a trust account until title is passed over. I am told that legal opinion differs and that this is why people cannot get any satisfaction regarding the ownership of money held by the receivers of the company. It appears that only lengthy court proceedings can solve the problem.

None of the parties, who have spent \$11,000 and have only a chance of getting \$5,000 back at the most—after the receiver takes his share, they probably will not even get that much—are interested in spending any money on the deal. So none of the little people who have been ripped off can afford to do anything about it.

Alfred Grant assures the people, through the columns of "The Courier-Mail" of 14 July, that all of the money, not half as the receiver suggests, has been placed in trust. He said—

"All of those moneys were recorded in the books and records of the companies and furthermore a painstakingly prepared reconciliation accounting for all moneys and all moneys paid by purchasers has been in the hands of the Receivers and the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs for months."

I am told that the receivers are reporting some progress in their investigation. But I'm told that Mrs. Clancy and the others will finally have to go to court to settle the claim.

There is some doubt about where the money is held. What they say is that \$375,000, which is approximately £250,000, was sent over here and put into the company's trust account in August 1974. But there is no record of any advice being received regarding the disbursement of this account. Mr. Grant said that a painstakingly prepared reconciliation was made. How can he say that in "The Courier-Mail" on 14 July when the receivers themselves have said that there was no record of any advice being received regarding the disbursement of this sum?

The money was in fact credited mainly to the accounts of numerous persons who had completed payment for the land which had been registered, and the balance to persons who had completed payment for unregistered land. None was credited to the account of poor Mrs. Clancy, who had paid \$11,000. A total of over \$5,000 went to the Grant company salesman in England and none came here.

I could read letter after letter from people in England and in Australia. Mr. and Mrs. Kiley wrote to me and sent me a complete set of the documents which I have sent on to our Fraud Squad. I understand that the police have said they can do nothing about it. I also understand that Corporate Affairs say they can do nothing about it. It seems to me that there is something wrong with our laws if that is the case. I say that because I cannot believe we cannot act when honest, trusting people are being ripped off by the real estate developer or the salesmen who work for him.

As I understand the operation of Parliament, it is our responsibility to see that the laws of the land protect the innocent from those who set out to rip them off. Mr. and Mrs. Kiley bought blocks and finally paid the lot off in 1974. Under the contract they were told that after five years they could get their title. Many people have not received a title yet. Mr. Kiley really followed it up. He came to Australia to live. He went up to the North Coast and then wrote a series of letters from 1969 right through till 1974. But in 1974 he was told that he could not be given title at that stage because the development of Bundilla Stage 2 had not been completed. The developers wrote to him and said—

"It is unfortunate that your lot is one lot away from present development. One benefit will be that your lot is close to

registered land and that as construction of new homes begins the value of your lot will appreciate greatly . . .”

People in Manly West, Springwood, Coff's Harbour and the North Coast are asking this Government to see that the laws of the land which I understand were in force at that time are enforced.

I think it is time we had a close look at the people involved, not only in the land sales area but also in the finance companies that back them up. When a major developer such as this goes broke and a large number of people are affected, I believe that we should not only handle the receivership and liquidation of the companies but also send in investigators to start asking a series of questions. I would like Mr. Alfred Grant to tell me why the company was set up on the Jersey Islands in his family name. I would like him to tell this Parliament and the people of Australia why he was paying 45 per cent commission plus a 5 per cent collection fee when at that time real estate agents' commission was about 5 per cent on the first \$500 and 2½ per cent on the balance.

I would like Alfred Grant to advise why the records which he said on 14 July this year were so painstakingly kept were not available to the liquidators so that people can get their money back. I would like someone in Corporate Affairs to tell me why all the money that should have been held in trust, which I believe should have been the total sum of money paid on each block of land, has not been kept in trust. If it was kept in trust on the basis that it did not go to anybody else until such time as the title deed was given to the people concerned, I would like to know why those people cannot get all of their money back. That seems to me to be reasonable under the law, because the law expressly provides that it shall be held in trust until title is issued.

This is a very minor point for me to make in a debate on the Appropriation Bill, but I believe I should take this opportunity to raise it. If I cannot get answers, I am going to have to raise it again.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (5.40 p.m.), in reply: I would like to thank honourable members for their contributions, although I must say the debate this afternoon has been very disappointing. I share your view, Mr. Hewitt, that it is about time that the

Parliament looked at the wide range of subjects that can be discussed in a Budget debate and perhaps returned to the principle of discussing only the appropriation in a debate on an Appropriation Bill. I am sure this would raise the standard of debate.

I was extremely disappointed with the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. He is obviously a man on the roll, as it were. He does not know where he is heading or what he is doing.

An Opposition Member: Here's a good economist coming in.

Dr. EDWARDS: The honourable member says a lot of rubbish, too. He knows his standing in the Parliament. The Leader of the Opposition could well watch out for him and the member for Sandgate. We are all well aware of their plans for the future. It is no wonder that the honourable member interjects when I refer to the Leader of the Opposition.

The comments by the Leader of the Opposition on the economic situation were disastrous. He does not understand economics at all. He made foolish statements about the Loan Council. He does not understand anything about it. It is to be regretted that the member who is the Leader of the Opposition should make such statements. He does not understand the basis of this matter.

The Leader of the Opposition says that the highest increase in unemployment is in this State. Yet today's "Telegraph" reports that the fall in unemployment in this State is continuing. We know that in Queensland the unemployment figures have been falling over the last few months. If I recall correctly, Queensland has had the smallest increase in the Consumer Price Index in the last two quarters.

The Leader of the Opposition obviously believes that recovery from economic stagnation and destruction could be achieved in only a few days. Despite what Opposition members continue to say, the effect of the Whitlam era will be felt in this country for a generation, and I make no apology for making that statement. The Whitlam Government destroyed the rural economy and the manufacturing industries. Its tariff policies destroyed manufacturing industry in my own city of Ipswich. The member for Ipswich West made some comment allegedly about Ipswich. He does not know where his electorate finishes, and

I will have more to say about that in a moment. During the Whitlam era, five fabric producers in my own city of Ipswich were forced out of business. Mr. Hayden organised a very large protest march for the workers whose jobs had been destroyed by his own policies. The member for Ipswich West knows that full well. Yesterday, the member for Wolston called upon Morris Woollen Mills (Ipswich) Pty. Ltd. to spend many millions of dollars on a programme which, if implemented, will put many people out of work. One wonders what are the priorities of Opposition members.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: They are the wreckers of the economy.

Dr. EDWARDS: Yes. This nation will suffer for years from the effects of the economic mismanagement of the Whitlam Government. It is still feeling the effects of that Government's programmes.

Mr. Underwood: Why don't you get the police out to arrest them for breaking the pollution laws that you made?

Dr. EDWARDS: The honourable member is just a schoolboy, and when he grows up we will listen to him.

Mr. Underwood: You had better go on another overseas trip.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Ipswich West will cease making constant interjections.

Dr. EDWARDS: The Leader of the Opposition talked about the deceitful tax imposed in this State. He talked a lot of rubbish, the like of which I have never heard before. I shall give some figures that I believe will prove that this Government has been totally responsible in imposing taxes.

The statement by the Leader of the Opposition that we are the high-tax State is absolutely untrue. I shall give figures showing the total tax per capita. They are not the State's figures; they are the Commonwealth Statistician's figures. They show the total tax per capita as follows: Queensland, \$312.37; New South Wales, that doyen of the Labor Party, \$430.56; Victoria, \$435.45; South Australia, another Labor State, \$345.90; Western Australia, \$350.90; and Tasmania, \$316.36. The overall average tax per capita for the whole of Australia was \$395.30. In Queensland it was \$312.37.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about our having the highest pay-roll tax in Australia. These are the figures for pay-roll tax per head of population: New South Wales, \$114; Victoria, \$105.33; Queensland, \$81.66; South Australia, \$94.03; Western Australia, \$98.59; and Tasmania \$85.61. Yet the Leader of the Opposition has the audacity to say that Queensland has the highest pay-roll tax in Australia! In fact, we have the lowest. The sooner the Leader of the Opposition gets his facts correct, the greater respect he will receive from his own colleagues.

I table this document that has been produced by the Commonwealth Statistician, because it shows that Queensland is the lowest taxed State in Australia.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

As I indicated, this Government has removed more taxes than any other State Government.

In New South Wales, the Labor Party is in trouble because Mr. Wran made a promise at the last election in relation to the removal of death duties. He has had to postpone that for another year because of the financial mess that he has made in New South Wales. That is typical of the economic mismanagement for which the Labor Party is well known.

Members on this side of the Chamber believe in economic responsibility, and we make no apology for the state of the Queensland economy. Premiers in other States are envious of Queensland's financial position. Representatives of companies throughout Australia, and, indeed, throughout the world, are flocking to this State because they realise and recognise that Queensland is a State of great potential. The honourable member for Nudgee may laugh, but we know that people from South Australia are coming here and knocking on the Premier's door and my door every day of the week, asking about establishing industries in this State. Let me say quite clearly that the Premier of South Australia said to us—

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: When the truth comes out, Mr. Hewitt, it is amazing how honourable members opposite are stung into action. A South Australian Minister said to us, "I wish you would not try to entice our people to your State any longer. Because of the drift to Queensland, we will have no work left in our State." That was said to

us at a ministerial conference, because of the large number of industries wishing to come to Queensland.

The number of industries wishing to come here is the highest of any State in Australia, and if it is good enough for that to occur, it is good enough for the people of Queensland to recognise the value of their Government. We are proud of it, and we will continue to act responsibly in dealing with the economy.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about a second tax that the Government will apply. Never in the history of this Government's activities has it said that it would introduce a second income tax. The Government has opposed that from the beginning, and because of the economic strategies that it has applied it has been able to avoid the imposition of such a tax. In the Labor States of New South Wales, Tasmania and South Australia, taxes have been imposed upon public patients who use the free hospital system. The Governments of those States charge public patients when they go to public hospitals. That is typical of the actions of the Labor Party, whose representatives are on the Opposition benches in this Chamber. This State is proud of its free hospital system, and the Government will continue to advance it as quickly as possible.

Let me take the matter a little further. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the inaccurate and defective submissions that were made to the Federal Government relative to the State's roads system. The Minister for Local Government and Main Roads has repeatedly made lengthy submissions to both Labor and Liberal Federal Governments and constantly advocated that there should be increased grants to this State in recognition of the recommendations of the Australian Bureau of Roads. For the Leader of the Opposition to say that such submissions have not been made again indicates the inaccuracy of his statements.

In my opinion, the Leader of the Opposition stands condemned in this Chamber today because he has failed to contribute anything to the debate. I offer him my greatest sympathy for the days that lie ahead, because the Redcliffe and Gympie by-elections will show that he is on the skids, which I believe is where he should be.

Let me say a little—very little—about the comments of the honourable member for Archerfield. The audacity of the Leader of the Opposition to nominate for the position

of Speaker of the House the member for Archerfield, who, in my opinion, spent his time degrading the standards of this Assembly! I am ashamed that he would stand up here and make comments that had no basis of fact. I believe that Parliament must look at itself when members spend their time on an Appropriation Bill denigrating people who cannot answer for themselves. Many years ago Sir Winston Churchill said—and I believe that this applies to the honourable member for Archerfield—"He has a unique ability to compress the largest amount of verbiage into the smallest amount of thought." That is all I need to say.

Mr. Burns: Are you reading from notes? I was going to take a point of order.

Dr. EDWARDS: The honourable gentlemen can take a point of order if he wishes.

I think the least said about the contribution of the honourable member for Archerfield the better.

The honourable member for Salisbury made a very wise contribution concerning the benefits to the State's economy of the State Government's policies. Her statements upon the community needs—

Mr. Underwood interjected.

Dr. EDWARDS: The honourable member can rumble again. He doesn't look after all the people in his electorate. I am sick and tired of seeing constituents from his electorate in my office because they cannot get any satisfaction from him.

Mr. Underwood: I am continually getting people who have come away empty-handed from your office.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Ipswich West under the provisions of Standing Order 123A.

Dr. EDWARDS: At least the honourable member for Salisbury recognises the problems of a community where there are single parents. The community needs were well expressed by her.

Because of the lack of respect he has in the Ipswich area, I think the least said about the honourable member for Ipswich West the better. He said he was presenting something to the Committee about Ipswich. Of course the story he presented was about Laidley, which is not even in his electorate. I am sure that that speaks for itself. I regret that the honourable member is sadly

lacking in his understanding of what a Government guarantee is all about. It is pitiful that he saw fit to raise that matter in the Chamber.

The situation regarding the Lockyer cooperative to which he referred is quite clear. That particular company, which is a cooperative as he indicated, made an application for a Government guarantee. A Government guarantee is decided on standards laid down by legislation. Of course it is easy for a company to raise money when it gets a Government guarantee. If it fails to fulfil its obligations, the Government has to pick up the tab. That would mean the expenditure of public money. We in this Government are totally responsible. The Act lays down the responsible way in which the Government has to act, and it is a pity that the honourable member did not read the Act. He made all kinds of suggestions about the viability of the company. If it is so viable, why are financial institutions not prepared to give it finance?

Mr. Burns: Why is it in trouble?

Dr. EDWARDS: That is the company's problem, not mine. The reason it is in trouble is that it expanded far too quickly and did not carry out its operations on the right basis. We cannot give a Government guarantee unless the requirements of the Act are fulfilled. This Government will not make political or other decisions in the light of converse recommendations—

Mr. Underwood interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Ipswich West will now leave the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Ipswich West withdrew from the Chamber.

Dr. EDWARDS: This Government has backed industry throughout the whole of the community. Many hundreds of industrial activities throughout the State, including rural product activities, are in a viable and buoyant position today because of Government guarantees. In those instances obligations have been fulfilled. The reason we could not give a Government guarantee to this particular operation was that the company did not fulfil the requirements laid down by the Act. Furthermore, on the advice given to me, it did not appear to be viable, and it was my responsibility to make certain that it could fulfil the requirements of the Act in that respect.

The honourable member for Lytton referred only to land deals. I do not want to comment today on his remarks.

I was disappointed that the Opposition made so little effort to make a useful contribution when it had an opportunity to

debate economic affairs. Honourable members opposite are totally lacking in economic responsibility, and they will be known throughout the community for that.

Motion (Dr. Edwards) agreed to.

Resolution reported, received, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

COMMITTEE

VOTE OF CREDIT—\$1,223,000,000

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer): I move—

“(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1979-80, a further sum not exceeding \$530,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1979-80, a further sum not exceeding \$605,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1979-80, a further sum not exceeding \$88,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

ALL STAGES

A Bill founded on the Resolutions was introduced and passed through all its stages without amendment or debate.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

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

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, 28 August 1979.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.